5.26.'03.

From the Library of

Professor William Henry Green

Bequeathed by him to

the Library of

Princeton Theological Seminary

BS2555
.S85
1864
V.1

THE

WORDS OF THE LORD JESUS,

THE RISEN SAVIOUR AND THE ANGELS.

BY

RUDOLF STIER, D. D.,

LATE CHIEF PASTOR AND SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHKEUDITZ.

Translated By

REV. WILLIAM B. POPE.

Revised by

JAMES STRONG, S.T.D.,

AUTHOR OF McCLINTOCK & STRONG'S CYCLOPÆDIA,

AND

REV. HENRY B. SMITH, D.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK,

COMPLETE IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOLUME I.

FOURTH AMERICAN EDITION,

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED BY N. TIBBALS & SON,

37 PARK ROW, AND 145 NASSAU STREET.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1864, by
N. TIBBALS,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

PREFACE TO THE AMERICAN EDITION.

The attention of the American Editors, in this reprint from Clark's "Foreign Theological Library," has been chiefly confined to the translation of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin words occurring in the pages—which very often render the meaning of the author's comments wholly unintelligible to the English reader, and to the correction of many erroneous and inelegant phrases which had escaped the notice of the translator and proof-reader in the Edinburgh edition. They have occasionally, but rarely, appended (within brackets) a very brief foot-note illustrating or modifying the author's views. Beyond this they have not deemed their legitimate province to extend. These features, however, together with the more compact and cheap form of the work, will, it is believed, be found to be material improvements in this edition.

Dr. Ewald Rudolph Stier was born at Frankstadt, March 17, 1800; he died at Eisleben, smitten by paralysis, December 16, 1862. From his birth to 1815, when he was matriculated at the University of Berlin—"the only examination to which he submitted in all his life"—his years were passed in straitened circumstances, since his father was compelled to move from place to place, in the agitated condition of German affairs. But he early showed great zeal in learning. He began his academic career as a jurist, but soon renounced the law, under Schleiermacher's influence, and studied theology at Berlin and Halle. His ardent temperament made him prominent in the *Bürschenschaft*, and for a long time he fell under the influence of the prevalent rationalism. His first literary productions were *Poems and Tales*, in which he followed the lead of the romantic school, as represented by Tieck and Jean Paul. A severe family affliction, and a renewed study of the Bible, with the aid of Bengel's Gnomon and Von Meyer's Bible-Work, effected a total revolution in his views, and he burnt an immense quantity of youthful manuscripts, and devoted himself henceforth to the investigation of the Word of God.

In Berlin his faith was strengthened by intercourse with the Baron Von Kottwitz, Von Bethmann-Hollweg, Tholuck, and Neander. From 1821 to 1823 he studied in the Preachers' Seminary at Wittenberg, under the guidance of Nitzsch, Schleusner, and Heubner. Krummacher, Tholuck, and Rothe were here his companions. Dr. Heubner said that "the Seminary had never before had such an interpreter as Stier, nor such a philosopher as Rothe." To relieve Krummacher's doubts about the canonicity of the *Song of Songs*, Stier in one week wrote out a striking commentary upon it, afterwards published in the first volume of his *Andeutungen für gläubiges Schriftverständniss*, 1824. After teaching a year in a Seminary for Teachers in Karklene, he went to Basle in 1824, to the Mission Institute, having previously been married to a sister of Karl Immanuel Nitzsch. Here he remained four years; among his pupils were Gobat, Isenberg and Lenpolt. Compelled by impaired health to quit this post, and opposed for his pietism, he passed some time in comparative seclusion, still pursuing his Biblical studies, until he was called to be pastor at Frankleben, near Halle, in 1829. Here he preached and labored with

ardor; though bitterly opposed by the rationalists, he was encouraged by the friendship of such men as Tholuck, Guerike, Von Gerlach, Harnisch, and Bunsen. He developed his views upon a more Biblical style of preaching in opposition to current theories in his *Biblische Keryktik*. In 1833, he published a *Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*, and his *Siebzig ausgewählte Psalmen*. He read the Old Testament in Hebrew twice through, "without points." In his *Gesangbuchsnoth* he criticised with severity the prevalent hymnology. In 1838 he was called from his secluded parish to Wichlinghausen, in Barmen; and here, in the Wupperthal, he preached and began to publish that series of commentaries which has made his name famous — on the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, on *James*, and on the *Words of the Lord Jesus*, and also the first volumes of the well-known *Polyglot Bible*, which he edited in conjunction with Thiele. Here, too, he lost his first wife, who had been to him a constant solace and faithful help. His zeal for reform led him into conflicts with his presbytery, which, however, were all adjusted before he was compelled by bodily prostration to give up his parochial charge, and again seek in Wittenberg a place of comparative retirement. During a residence here of three years he wrote his commentaries on the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, on the *Second Part of the Prophecy of Isaiah*, three works on the *Proverbs of Solomon*, and a volume on the *Epistle of Jude*, besides completing his great work on the *Words of our Lord*. In 1850 he became Superintendent in Schkeuditz (between Halle and Leipsic), and in 1859 he was transferred to the same office in Eisleben; in both places he was earnest in his labors, and especially blessed in the "Bible Hours," which he devoted to comments upon that divine Word in which he found his chief delight. In 1857 he published his *Words of the Word*, extracted from his larger work, which were supplemented in 1859 by *Words of the Lord from Heaven*, and in 1860 by his *Words of the Angels*. His projected works on *Job*, and on the *Prophecies of the Old Testament in Word and Type* were not completed.

His literary activity is also attested by several other volumes. In 1825 he published a volume of *Hymns and Poems*, and another in 1845. In 1851 appeared his *Private Agenda*, now in its fifth edition, containing forms for all ecclesiastical services; in 1854 a volume of *Evangelical Discourses*. One of his main objects in life was to edit a revised translation of the Bible, on the basis of Luther's version. In 1828 he wrote on the *Old and New in the German Bible;* in 1836, *Ought Luther's Bible to remain Unrevised?* in 1842 he aided in a new edition of John Fr. Von Meyer's translation, and, after the death of the latter, he published in 1836 still another edition, with manifold corrections, defending it in 1861 by a pamphlet on the *Correction of the German Bible*. He was an ardent adherent of the Union and opponent of the revived extreme Lutheranism, writing in this controversy *Aphorisms to Greet the Militant Church*, 1847; *A Confession from the United Church*, 1848; and *Unlutheran Theses*, 1854. He also maintained that the Apocrypha should be retained in the popular edition of the German Bible. During all his life he struggled with many corporeal infirmities. His death was sudden. After a day spent in his usual labors, he was struck down by apoplexy at midnight, Dec. 16, 1862, and soon afterwards expired. A widow, and eight children from his first and second marriages, survive him. A few days before his death he said, "That it was a good thing for man to bear the yoke even in advanced life. So much better will it be to rest from our labors."

His chief work is his *Words of the Lord Jesus*. It has been widely circulated in Germany, in England, and in other lands, not only quickening the faith of believers, but also instructing scholars by its depth, its originality, its fervor, and its variety. His personal Christian experience, and his devout reverence for God's word, shine out on every page.

Many of the above facts have been derived from an instructive article in the *Neue Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* (March 14, 1863) which says of him, that "he is known as an interpreter wherever the Evangelical Church extends." "He suffered much for the sake of Christ and that truth, which he fearlessly preached in word and writing. The words in 1 Cor. ii. 12 may be applied to him with entire justice; for that full assurance of knowledge, which God gave him in rich measure, was his strength, and laid the basis of his peculiar cheerfulness and confidence in respect to doctrine, and of that straightforward purpose in action, with which he walked in the way prescribed by his inmost spirit."

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

THE work which is now introduced to the English reader has been for fifteen years in high esteem among the divines of Germany, as well as of several other countries. The respect which occasional extracts have received, and the ample references to it among recent expositors, warrant the expectation that it will be no less cordially welcomed among the British churches.

No one will read it, as such a book should be read, without feeling that he is under the guidance of one who is profoundly imbued with the mind of Christ. The author's aim is the loftiest that mortal man can set before himself — to unfold the meaning and harmony of all the recorded words that fell from the lips of the Word made flesh. That the Lord's own sanction is manifestly given to the attempt, is the highest tribute we can pay to it.

The *form* of the work may possibly be in some respects repulsive to the reader unaccustomed to German theology. The minute subtilty of its analysis, its keen inquisition into the secret thread of every discourse, with some occasional novelties of theory or exposition, will not disparage it to the student who keeps the original text always before his eye, and understands the rare value of criticism which combines deep thought with deeper devotion. The very frequent vindication of the true meaning against fanciful or infidel interpretations sometimes interrupts the current of the exposition; but it must be remembered that the work is throughout an unwearied protest against Rationalistic opinions. These bring its own distinguishing excellencies into relief; and every work of orthodox German Theology has, as such, a strong preliminary claim to our favor.

Finally, as the Translator is not necessarily responsible for all the opinions of the original; so neither ought the original to be absolutely judged of by the translation, which but faintly reproduces its peculiar qualities of style.

LONDON, April, 1855.

GENERAL PREFACE.

Discourse—the revelation of the inner man by utterance to others—admits of a wide variety of gradation and method; and one kind of revelation may be more direct and distinctively such than another. As this is true of man, so is it also of God the Lord. He had spoken *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*, "at sundry times and in divers manners," in past time, before as yet the Eternal Word Himself was made flesh; but now the human exegesis of the *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*, "oracles of God," can have no other or higher, nor propose to itself a loftier aim, than to repose with John, the eagle of the Church of the last times, upon the full assurance: *Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πώποτε· ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο*, "No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

In hearing him, and his Spirit, who takes of the things of Christ in the Apostles, we find the only sound principle for the interpretation of the ancient Scriptures which bear witness of him, and pointed to him. No historical or psychological *ἐπίλυσις*, "interpretation," of ours, may ever avail to empty or invalidate for us one single כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה or נְאֻם יְהוָה, "thus saith the Lord;" but, on the other hand, whatever is recorded in the inviolable *γραφή*, or "*Scripture*," though without this preface, is regarded by us who discern the power of God in such Scripture, *ῥηθὲν ἡμῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*, "spoken unto us by God," Matt. xxii. 31. But then we also at the same time perceive the distinction which still subsists between all the former revelations of God, and the last by his Son: a distinction which is indicated in the prophetic Scripture itself. In the very centre and heart of the revelations of God by Isaiah, which are yet waiting for their true interpretation, that, namely, which shall accord with the word of Christ and his apostles, the God of Israel promises (Isa. ii. 6), that when his people's true and everlasting redemption shall come, *He himself, who spake, would be there*, and evidence his presence by a new, then first openly proclaimed חִנֵּנִי, "Behold, it is I!" (comp. ver. 7 with ch. xl. 9). But the perfect theophany thus promised was to be accomplished, according to the uninterrupted testimony of Isaiah—a testimony which grows in clearness from that first עִמָּנוּ אֵל, '*Immanuel*," and גִּבּוֹר אֵל, "*Mighty God*," shining out of the darkness, like a faint star of hope, to the very end of his closely-connected and ever soaring predictions—by him who is at once the Servant of the Lord and the Lord himself. The twelfth and thirteenth verses of ch. ii. are inseparably united, but the אֲנִי הוּא הַמְדַבֵּר, "I am he that doth speak," of ver. 6 refers back to ch. xl. 5, and also to ch. xlviii. 16. From this latter point — the transitional termination of a second main division of the entire Isaiah-prophecy — the Messianic vision emerges clear and distinct from the type out of which it grew, and becomes absolutely independent of it. Whatever system of interpretation wilfully turns back into the type again, must necessarily lose the full and entire sense of the letter itself; in which beneath Israel's deliverance from Babylon the true and everlasting redemption is pretypified, and in Cyrus the builder of the Temple is indicated that one עַבְדּוֹ יְהוָה, "Servant of the Lord," to come. Then cries the prophet, as the type and in the name of That coming one: *From the time that it was, there am I; and now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me!* Here, for the first time, the eternal Sent of the Eternal, came forward in the first person to announce himself; an announcement which grows progressively more distinct in the third great division, from ch. xlix. onwards. The

emphatic suffix in מֵעֵת הֱיוֹתָהּ, "from the time that *it* was," refers back to the creation of heaven and earth, ver. 13 (comp. ch. xlv. 18–19), and the proper antithesis of מֵעֵת "from the time," is the anticipatory עַתָּה, "*now*," and הִנֵּנִי, "*Behold it is I!*" of the Revelation in the flesh. I, the self-same אֲנִי הוּא, "*I am He*," ver. 12, who was present at the beginning of the existence of all things, at that first וַיְהִי וַיְהִי, "Let there be! and there was," when the Eternal Word was with God (Prov. viii. 27 has also שָׁם אֲנִי, "there was I"), come now as *Sent*, and also as יְהוָה גֹּאֲלֵךְ, "the Lord thy Redeemer," ver. 17. Thus he is truly הַמְדַבֵּר, the Eternal Word, *He that speaketh*, not merely here by the prophets, but in the most absolute sense from the beginning and from eternity. To both these places in Isaiah,* the Lord refers in John xviii. 20 and viii. 25. The sublime and mysterious answer, in the latter passage particularly, to Σὺ τίς εἶ, "Who art thou?" of the Jews, is only rightly understood when we regard the Lord as asserting himself in the absolute ἐγώ εἰμι, אֲנִי הוּא, "I am He!" to be the λαλῶν, or "speaker," and as referring to his *words*, which all must *hear*.

Oh that all those, who, like these Jews, are still for ever putting questions, could understand and *hear* this answer, and all that the Truth sent from the Truth had to say and to judge concerning them and the world. Had it not been too bold, I would fain have prefixed this title to my book, *The words of the Word.* If, as one of the Fathers says, every act in the history of the Eternal Word incarnate, is itself Word and Doctrine — how great is the claim upon our attention, when we hear it said of him: *He opened his mouth and spake!* There is deeper significance in any one word of the Lord Jesus, which he himself spake (Acts xx. 35), than in all the sayings of the Apostles and Prophets. His λόγοι, "words," are the most express outbeamings of the λόγος, "Word."

But have we these words, just as he spoke them? This is the question of modern criticism, which refuses to take for granted what should, however, be taken for granted by all who believe in a revelation of the Son of God; namely, that his words cannot have fallen to the ground, cannot have dropped and been lost through the sieve of erring human composition.† Yes, we possess what he spoke. Not, indeed, in the letter of the *verba ipsissima*, but through the mediating witness of the Evangelists, elevated in the Spirit. Yet are they truly and essentially the *ipsissima* (identical), as his teaching for the world and the Church. Thou shalt know them to be such, if the same Spirit under whose influence the Gospels are written, shall explain to thee and illustrate their letter. John, the fourth Evangelist, who adheres with the least tenacity of all to the literal, original expression, gives us nevertheless, as is manifest to every one, the words of the Word in their most spiritual and living reality. Each Evangelist has his peculiar gift from the Lord, his own peculiar plan and aim in his Spirit-moved spirit; but, through the combination of all, the *Holy Ghost* has so wrought out one wonderful scheme, that the whole of what these four Evangelists present to us as the utterance of the Son of God incarnate, carries with it its own evidence in its perfect harmony. Alas, that it should be said of us, "Sed nos non habemus aures, sicut Deus habet linguam" (but we have not ears as God has a tongue)! —Oh that we could but *read* and *hear!*

We must assuredly read as men, what the Lord has humanly spoken, and consigned to human record. But to every man who reads *as of the truth* (John xviii. 37), it is given to *hear* and to *see* the glory of the incarnate word; for in these Gospels his manifestation, his life, his teaching, are truly transfigured into an ever-living and life-giving *Spirit-word*. It was necessary that the Word should first be made flesh, but equally so that the flesh should become spirit again; and it is as such that the Word now speaks to the world. This is the essential principle of life; from which — as an incorruptible seed — the Faith and the Church derive their being. Could we imagine — I speak as a fool — the Church of Christ utterly vanquished, and expelled from the face of the earth; yet, if one of these four gospels—and let that one be even Mark's—were to fall into the hands of conscientious and sincere readers, out of this that Church must of necessity, and assuredly would, spring up anew.

The theological investigation and exposition, even of the orthodox, has to this very day been far too much occupied with inquisition into the tradition-threads that bind

* For the exposition of which, I may appeal to my *Jesaias, nicht Pseudo-Jesaias* (Barmen, 1850).

† To borrow Hase's expression, a "supernatural preservation of these archives" must be classed among "those unknown propitious circumstances" which establish the authority of the Gospels.

together the human and the divine, with the harmonizing of the histories and so forth, leaving far too much in abeyance the task of penetrating to the substance — *the words of the Lord Jesus*. We are too much disposed, if not to ravel what God has woven into its thread again, at least to pry too curiously into warp and woof, into its minutest fabric and texture. But just as this answers no good purpose, generally speaking, in the κτίσις, or "physical creation," so will it not avail in the γραφή, or "Scripture," which itself is a καινὴ κτίσις, or "new creation." It is because this is not sufficiently remembered, that while we have commentaries enough upon the Gospel of Matthew, Mark, etc., we have very few indeed upon the words of the Lord which they contain.

The latest, most extravagant criticism of the Gospels—which to many thousands of those who hang upon the lips of their Master, and live from day to day upon his words of eternal life, is nothing less than sheer madness; this frenzied infidelity is utterly unable now to hear, by reason of the raging of its fever-fantasies. Could these victims of delusion but begin to give heed to *what he says to them*, from his first Μετανοεῖτε, "Repent!" to all that he signified in that great cry Ἐγώ εἰμι, "I am He!"—then would the history itself in this light soon become clear and self-convincing. All right understanding of the origin of the Gospels, so far as we may understand it, must rest upon the living, believing, apprehension of their contents, which are unlike aught else in the world's history. Without the most profound exegesis of the words of our Lord, all the labor of the harmonists must be exposed to perpetual error. We find, for example, in the latest and best of them, that of Ebrard, an occasional separation of things essentially united, or sometimes an incorrect identification of discourses uttered at various times.*

To my believing brethren, therefore, I would fain administer a useful hint: Look well at what now lies under your shears; take heed lest sometimes, if not often, you be tempted incautiously to clip it even as others do. And as to these others? Unhappy men, they will be likely enough to say concerning me and my book, if it happens to meet their eyes: Here is one coming out of his dark corner again with all hardihood, who seems to know nothing of what we have long since made plain, who is bold enough and simple enough to put faith in the so-called discourses of our Lord—that marvellous medley which has been compounded under the inscriptions κατὰ Ματθαῖον, Μάρκον, "according to Matthew, Mark," etc. (we know this and can explain it all, as if we had been there)! Yes, dear sirs, you may indeed *say* this; but what conflict it would cost your conscience to read for yourselves, let your conscience answer. Permit me, on the other hand, to tell you in all friendliness—There are those who have given patient and industrious attention to every thing that has sprung from the lofty wisdom of your unbelief, but whose faith in

* Once more, and more earnestly than ever, must we in the second edition protest against Rauh's method of defence against Baur (*Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christl. Wiss.*, etc.), which, with its homœopathy, is little likely to cure this criticism run mad. It is itself merely the same sophistry, though practised on the other side; the same perverse method of dealing with the word — first rending it asunder, then patching it together again. Poor Synoptics! how must they suffer for the honor of John! "The confused and fortuitous synoptical narration—evidencing but faint traces of any connection—broken threads!" Such is the style in which they are spoken of. "In helpless, perplexing nakedness" this thing or that appears in their account. A "perfectly misleading answer of the Lord, following some external sound, has wandered away" to the place where it now stands, and the Johannæan connection is absolutely necessary in order to our "understanding, in any degree, the Synoptical narrative." "Things somewhat similar are easily enough joined together," and so many things are "drawn one to another, which have no internal connection." We are told of "reminiscences, which have passed out of buried controversies into the traditional form of gnomic sentences, or rather, these sayings have been collected together out of traditions, true in particular cases, but widely dispersed." The "traces of connection" which are allowed to exist, are *just enough* to bind together the whole into one mechanical conglomerate. Let me be laughed at or not, let men shrug their shoulders or not, I *rebuke*, in the name of the Spirit of Truth, that *license* of our youngest licentiates which leads them so far astray as to censure and sit in judgment upon the Recorders on whose word the whole Church rests. Does not all ecclesiastical experience down to this very day demonstrate that precisely this mechanical conglomerate, these broken threads, these helpless, perplexed and naked relations and sayings which in themselves are so inexplicable, do most mightily take hold of the living and simple believer, and so inexhaustibly instruct him, that he needs no help of any of the theologians? Therefore, we hold it better to say, that wherever there is any actual deviation from specific historical truth, any transposition, dislocation, etc. (of which instances do occur, but far, far less frequently than is now-a-days generally supposed; always occurring, moreover, in non-essentials, and never involving the slightest falsification)—*the Holy Ghost*, the true and only *traditor* of this tradition, has intentionally and significantly so ordered it, with that *Wisdom* which we, the learned, should be willing to learn from, since it is continually and most undoubtedly justified of those simple ones, its children. I may presume, that *some little* theoretical and scientific justification of it, also, for the learned, may be derived from my books, if their suggestions and views are admitted by unprejudiced minds.

the testimony of God's Spirit in Holy Writ, has not seldom found its most effectual invigoration and its most convincing argument in the self-contradictory folly of your books —the darkness of which has only served to make the others' light the brighter and more precious.

It will now be once more made evident that I, for my own insignificant part, belong to the number of those who, themselves enjoying the kernel, and inviting others to its enjoyment, will not allow themselves to be involved in the contests that are everywhere raging about the mere shell; who would rather sit as *convivæ* (guests) than as investigating and over-curious *coqui* (cooks), at the Lord's well-spread table; who rather take the medicine than chemically analyze it. Let others inspect the swaddling-clothes of Immanuel with even greater anxiety than the wise men of the East, my regard is fixed upon Himself, who is folded within them. But in saying this, I cannot forget that both swaddling-clothes and manger, though woven and built by sinful hands, were consecrated for him and through him. That I, in like manner, hold fast the rigid *inspiration* of the word in which we find and possess the Christ, yet not in the mechanical fashion of that orthodoxy which seems sometimes to gaze in blank amazement at him who was born of woman, as if he had fallen from heaven in his swaddling-clothes: this I must finally and most earnestly beg every one to observe, *on account of the persevering injustice with which I have been treated in this particular.**

To construct a detailed historical harmony of the Gospels I regard as a thing impossible,† inasmuch as the testimony of the Spirit leaves behind and transcends the mere common and subordinate historical truth; and has something far better to teach us than merely when and where, and with what relations one to another, this and that was spoken or done. Who ever asks with such fond pertinacity about the date of any saying of Plato or Goethe? But to acknowledge this, and in consequence to concede willingly to sound criticism more than they at any cost are willing to do, is certainly a better defence against that pseudo-criticism which now rushes in to the assault, laboriously seeking out untruthfulnesses, in that which to all essentials is pure truth itself, and contains not a single iota of what is actually false. Ingeniously and diligently to investigate *that* historical element of which we have no record, may, in profane literature, be a blameless pastime of learned curiosity; but to neglect and perplex that which is given us in Holy Writ through such bye-play of inquisitiveness, must ever be a perverted *πάρεργον*, "by-work" (work of secondary importance), where man ought earnestly to seek what he has *to do*. So also while adjusting and arranging the minute specialities which *are* before us, to sacrifice the contemplation and ever-growing knowledge of those great momentous matters which are plainly revealed, and thus with the best intention through too much labor upon the shell, to neglect to taste, or to be diverted from enjoying the kernel, is scarcely a less perversion. There is for thoughtful criticism an uncontroverted and real basis of fact in which we have ample scope; so ample, that our very reason requires, and much more our faith, that we should not adventure upon further subtle investigations until that which we have—I do not say is fixed upon its sure external foundations, for it is given to us for a higher purpose than that, but — has passed into our whole knowledge and life. Seek we, in this matter also, the kingdom of God and his righteousness, so shall the needful critical knowledge be added unto us; and our position with relation to the Great Fact of Redemption in Christ be more like that of the Apostles.

That Jesus of Nazareth, as the Son of God come in the flesh, did, in his generation, so live, so teach, so suffer, so die, so rise again, as the four Evangelists with all their differences unite perfectly in relating, is a truth, attested to be the most certain of all certain truth by the whole history of the world before him and since, by Israel's permanence among the nations, as well as that of Christianity itself. The entire mystery of all history finds in this its centre and only solution. Similarly the longing, and questioning, and seeking of every man's inner spirit, finds here its simple fulfilment and answer—here, where all the lines so wonderfully converge, and every thing significantly tells us that the Revelation of the Divine penetrates all human individuality. Simply to accept this is no false simplicity but the highest wisdom, which reverently hearkening, in obedience of faith,

* That unjust treatment still continues—eight years after this was first written. Probably I may be able to exhibit, after a while, more clearly, in what way my *rigid* and yet not *mechanical* view of Inspiration is on either hand distinguished from the old and the new doctrine.

† [The author evidently means that all such chronological arrangements must rest in part upon conjecture, and therefore cannot have the absolute certainty throughout of explicitly connected history.—Am. Ed.]

to the Eternal Wisdom, is rewarded by the right perception of the truth which is unto salvation.

From this point of view it appears to be in most cases altogether a matter of indifference, whether this or that was spoken and done here or elsewhere. Wherever it *is* matter of importance, the providence of God has ordered that it shall be authentically plain before us, and be easily found by that modest and earnestly-seeking investigation, for which in his condescension scope has been left. But, otherwise, we should thankfully receive what through God's grace is written for us, remembering that the true meaning, which the Eternal Wisdom calls us to seek, lies rather in the how it is written than in the how it took place.

The spirit and design of this exposition is purely and properly *exegetical;* and all who, like myself, adhere firmly to this, may be justified in making it their glory. To be inveighed against by enemies, and blamed by friends, for reading and understanding the Old Testament as Christ and his Apostles read and understood it, is an honor for which one may meekly thank his God. When theology shall direct its aim to that point where "Prophecy and Fulfilment" meet together and are united in their interpretation (more entirely and firmly than in Hofmann's book, which does *not* fulfil the sounding prophecy of its title); then will it find no more reason to blame any simple apostolical ἵνα πληρωθῇ, "that it might be fulfilled," or any such reading of the ancient Scripture, as those of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But to be rebuked and set aside, as if acting upon one's own caprice and imposing the meaning instead of expounding it, when one only aims to let the King of Truth speak, as he is pleased to speak with evidence which breaks through all obscurity and concealment; to be rebuked for this, that one would rather take to his ears and to his heart the wonderful words of the Eternal Word in all their immediate power as they are uttered and beam forth from himself, instead of their so much prized translation into the poor and narrow language of man, with all the concomitant perversions, and endless disputations (through which process of so-called exposition the very essence of the text is ofttimes lost): to be blamed for this would be indeed a most grievous affliction, and yet one must be prepared for it.

That discussions and treatises concerning the recognition of the one object of exegesis should be exceedingly in vogue among those to whom that all-holy object as exhibited in the Gospels is not yet established as such, is as natural as it is useful. Let every man labor according to his call. It is quite necessary, indeed, that the decision as to the object of faith—"here speaks the Son of God, who preserves and illustrates to us through his Spirit, all that he spoke in the flesh"—should precede the exposition of those sayings as his. Then only when this *criticism* has reached its positive goal, does *exegesis* properly begin. But we find naturally enough among those who take the other position with respect to the Word, a system of compromise with doubt, through which even orthodox men sometimes are led to deny the faith in particulars which they acknowledge on the whole, and to mix matters with their exposition, which have no more relation to it than philosophical prolegomena on the being and attributes of God would have to the Lord's Prayer; and then to speak *upon* the word and *round about* the word, in a spirit of confused and undecided half rejection and half acceptance of its contents. But it is natural enough, on the other hand, that we should decline to term this exegesis, which speaks *out* of the word is given to us.

Our exegetical stand-point is not that of seeking and finding, still less that of missing here and rejecting there: but that of *having*. The great הִנֵּנִי, "Behold it is I!" of the revelation of God in the flesh, of the spirit in the letter, has become to us of all certainties the most certain. Let us be permitted on our part, while so much license is given, to speak as we believe and because we believe; out of the word, not round about it; according to its own peculiar system, not according to the system of any science, theology, or philosophy, nor of any dogmatics or confession; not translating it into any heterogeneous form of speech or of thought, and not raising again upon every point the discussion of the possession of our sure and certain foundation. Nor let it be thought unbecoming, that in order to *such* hearing and acceptance, we offer with all solemnity what should be heard and received by the *entire man*. All sound exposition of the Divine word of salvation must, at least, have a hortatory element, for that word itself is hortatory throughout: in these pages there is not the smallest paragraph which simply ministers food to our critical curiosity. Nothing seems to us more unnatural than a certain *dead, dry* handling of the Word of life — never speaking from the heart to the heart — which is called the "purely scientific." But just in this manner does our falsely-boasted science in its latest

fashions—which, after all, are more or less scanty and pitiful, with their "πίστις" (faith), and their "Jahve"—run along its course side by side with the living confession of the Lord in the faith of his church. The Bible has never failed, since it was given, to speak *for itself* without the assistance of the learned; and it produces in its believers a believing apprehension of itself, without which it would long ago have gone the way of all waste paper. In its *application to preaching* in the church, it has ever preserved its living power, and ever will: there is the exegesis of the Spirit *at home*. If the mere professor (who *sits* so comfortably upon his master's chair, whereas he ought to feel himself obliged to *stand* in the pulpit before "the *Established* Church" [sic] of the only Master and Lord) cannot use his wisdom in preaching, nor minister therewith to those who do preach, then is that very fact the most decisive testimony against such wisdom.* For the Bible is not, once for all, a mere old document for the learned, but a text for the preacher to the church and the world, ever and inexhaustibly new. Here do those *emanationes scripturæ*, which Bacon referred to, flow freely forth; not in the wranglings of commentaries, whose Mishna and Gemara confound and obscure the student with the text itself, so that the word, before it can be read, is utterly prevented from speaking by its own exposition.

I have not, as already said, neglected commentaries, whether believing or heterodox; but I have, with still more diligence, for now about thirty years, sought out, collected and put to the most living use in my own heart and ministry, the immediate emanations of the living word. I avow publicly before God and the world that all the theology and criticism of the age, whether infidel, or one-fourth, one-half, three parts orthodox, has since then only served to strengthen and confirm me in my joyful boast: I know in whom I believe. I *know* that what I read and possess in the word will remain when the world passes away; and that its slightest sentence will prove a better dying pillow than all else that man could conceive or possess. I know that to interpret to the world the words of the Lord Jesus is the loftiest task of human teaching or writing. The Lord is my witness that I approached it, in the publication of this book, with solemn diffidence, being deeply conscious that here and there error might too probably have intruded. Much even now may have escaped my most conscientious revision, which found (I must confess) little to retract; but these "Discourses of the Lord Jesus" have, as a whole, since then received the confirmation of a large circle of the faithful, whose acknowledgments in many ways rendered, of the grace and truth which they contain, I can thankfully lay at the Lord's feet.

In his name, then, let this book once more go forth, and let all men everywhere, who cannot accord with what they deem my too rigid adherence to the written word, hear once more a testimony, which, thank God, is still unchanged: I read the canonical text of the Bible as written through the Holy Ghost; but I so read it, not because I have framed for myself beforehand any inspiration dogma about, or have devoted myself as a bond-slave to the old dogmatic theology; but because this word approves itself with ever-increasing force as inspired to my reason, which, though not indeed sound, is through the virtue of that word daily recovering soundness. It is because this living word in a thousand ways has directed and is ever directing my inner being, with all its intelligence, thought, and will, that I have subjected to it the freedom of my whole existence.

The great and fundamental deficiency of *nearly* all learned exegesis, with which mine must for ever differ, is its misapprehension of the *depth and fulness of meaning* which, in accordance with its higher nature, necessarily belongs to every word of the Spirit. Though believed to be the word of God, it is treated superficially and on principles of partial and one-sided deduction, just as if it were the word of man. In the endeavor to understand it that depth is not explored where, from the one root of the "sensus simplex," the richest fulness of references spring up and ramify in such a manner, that what upon the ground and territory of its immediate historical connection, presents one definitely apprehended truth as the kernel of its meaning, does nevertheless expand itself into an inexhaustible variety of senses for the teaching of the world in all ages, and especially in the Church, where the Holy Spirit himself continues to unfold his germinal word even to

* "A minister who for many long years has drawn edification from the Word of God for his people, may well have sometimes a stray thought, of which a professor of theology need not be ashamed"—so says Theremin in his *Abendstunden*, with significant irony. I will be more bold and severe, and maintain, that the professor of exegesis often puts forth notions at which the preacher instructed in the living use of Scripture must blush.

the end of the days. While this applies to every word of the Spirit in its several measures, to the *words of the Word* it applies without measure to an extent which eternity only will disclose. Many of Christ's utterances make upon the most obtuse mind the overpowering impression of a mysterious, superabounding amplitude of meaning. If others, even the most part of them, appear in their slight drapery of proverbial, Rabbinical, parabolical forms of language so humanly simple; yet approach them closely, contemplate them in their ever new applications to various times, and they will be so transfigured before you, that you will cease to deem it incomprehensible that the Church through the process of centuries of reading and preaching, has never grown weary of them, or that this word, in its unchangeable might, has triumphantly lived down all the fleeting words of men. If all that enlightened preachers have found for their preaching, or believing readers have found for their edification, in any one parable or any one single ecclesiastical *Pericope* (lesson) could be collected and comprised in fit words—that would be the *entire* exegesis—so far as this might be possible before the words in futurity shall unfold perfectly its own yet more perfect meaning.

In the words of Christ all the scattered and intersecting rays of truth extant in humanity are collected and blended into the full and perfect light of day. Ἐγὼ τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω, ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια, "I speak the truth, I *am* the truth"—he cries, standing in the midst of Israel, and in the centre, therefore, of all nations. The preparatory, prophetic word, finds its end and goal in the word of Christ: the apostolical word rests upon him as its foundation, and is in him already in its rudiments performed. To grasp and illustrate in all their significance the entire relations of his perfect revelation—to Judaism, such as it was when the Lord came, compounded of the truth of God and man's inventions; and to the elements of truth scattered in heathenism which he confirmed, as well as to all the errors of the Gentiles which he condemned—is the right province of sound theological science. True philosophy, that is, the self-consciousness of humanity and its history, can only reach its perfection through a profound understanding of these. For Christianity, or to speak more correctly Christ, is not indeed that *Deus ex machinâ* (mechanical Deity) which inspires the false speculation of historical inquiry with so much affected horror; but that to which old Hippocrates, with all his art, was after all constrained to do homage (at the close of his treatise περὶ ἱερῆς νόσου), as the point to which all the eminent in science come back, though without at first understanding what he meant—that πάντα θεῖα καὶ ἀνθρώπινα πάντα, "all divinity and all humanity," finds its full realization only in him, who is the God-man; whose מוֹצָאוֹת, "goings forth" (Mic. v. 1), according to his humanity mount upwards to Adam, as according to his divinity they go up to the bosom of the Father. The Son of God enters into history as the Son of man; and all history has been made by the finger of God to prepare for him, and to aspire towards him. But to embrace this wider field in our comprehension, which indeed before the fulfilment of the mystery of God and the second revelation of all the secrets of that which we too readily dignify with the name of "history," can only approximately be done, is not the more immediate design of exegesis in its stricter sense; although this alone will ultimately set the seal of completeness upon the interpretation of the entire manifestation of Christ, and more especially of his word. In the mean time true exposition suffers the light which is concentrated in the sun of personal truth to shine immediately upon it, and understands Matt. iv. 17 without the help of any Rabbinical מַלְכוּת הַשָּׁמַיִם, "*Kingdom of Heaven*," as also Matt. xxviii. 19, John xvi. 13 to 15, without the אָדָם קַדְמוֹן, "first man," or the אֲרִיךְ and אַצִּיל אַבְּדִיךְ (זְעִיר אַבְּדִיךְ) "*long-suffering* and *quick-tempered*," of the Cabala, and without the *Triad* of Plato or Philo. Hearkening with open ears, it immediately attests that only which Christ testifies: and every man can then, according to his ability, go forth from Christ to understand the world and history, and returning back again find rest in him. Let this be understood as spoken in explanation to those, who find wanting in our book the usual *derivations* into Christianity from its connection with the teachings of the age. We deny not that connection, but we much prefer to regard the derivation as proceeding *in the opposite direction*, not from the age, but into it.

Let the word of Christ explain itself. This is and must ever be a matter of fundamental importance, and we would fain hope at least to assist many a reader to gain this central point for its understanding. But that for sinful man with his infirm reason, there is now no other *understanding* of divine things than *that of faith*, in the sense of the scholastic *Fides præcedit intellectum* (faith precedes intellection), and of the Pauline

αἰχμαλωτίζειν πᾶν νόημα εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, "bringing every thought into subjection to Christ," so that the private judgment must submit itself to the heart's experience through faith—let him dispute either with God or the devil who is inclined to do so; let him contend against it in his Edom-wisdom who has a mind to be dashed to pieces by this stone of stumbling. To show that on the other hand faith also has an ever-increasing *understanding* of its own, and need not be abashed before any pseudo-reason whatever, (which, indeed, it alone can help out of its *πρῶτον ψεῦδος*, "original falsity," into the *γινώσκειν τὴν ἀλήθειαν*, "knowledge of the truth"), is the proud design of this little contribution of ours—a design which, in the name of the Most Lowly, known to heaven and earth, and in opposition to all the proud, we dare openly to avow. But as to those who believe in the Lord, and yet through a pernicious and false science, either cannot or will not bow to that miracle of the Holy Ghost—the sure transmission of his life and words in the Gospels, which are the central word of the whole invisible Scriptnre, may the Spirit of Truth bear more and more convincingly his own witness to his own testimony, which tolerates no correction of man!

They are but *hints*, after all, which are now offered—with all their diffuseness they are nothing more. For the author is deeply conscious that upon no one single word has he done more than very partially draw out that fulness of meaning, which is vaster than the ocean and deeper than the abyss. Yet it may be hoped that the reader will find many things that will abide with him, and bear to be further worked out. The apology which in the first edition here stood for the imperfect form and presentation of the work on account of little and fragmentary leisure, may be repeated, so far at least as concerns the first part; for this second edition goes forth amid the duties of a very unpropitious official situation. Yet have I, as it will be seen, done my best to review, revise, and supplement the whole, with especial reference to what has appeared since or was overlooked at first, so far as this could be done without too much altering or enlarging the book.

To those of my dear readers who call the Lord Jesus their Lord in faith, I give my brotherly greeting. All others may the Lord himself greet at the outset with his own most solemn words, words which blend his loving kindness with their severity: *Ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσητε, ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν*, "For if ye will not believe that I am He, ye shall die in your sins." Do they still ask, *Σὺ τίς εἶ*, "Who art thou?" there is both answer and advice in his reply: *Τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅ, τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν*, "The same that I said unto you at the beginning." Hear these his words to you, so shall you apprehend who he is, and what you are, and further learn to cry — Lord to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we believe and are sure that thou art Christ, the Son of the living God; that thou art indeed Christ, the Saviour of the world.

Isa. lii. 6:

כִּי־אֲנִי־הוּא הַמְדַבֵּר הִנֵּנִי׃

I am He that doth speak: behold it is I.

PREFACE TO THE GOSPELS OF MARK AND LUKE.

When wicked men were about to condemn the Holy One of God, with intent to murder the Prince of Life, he, whom the Father had sanctified and sent into the world, with deep humility putting himself on a level with us, appealed to the principle of their divinely-given law: "In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall everything be established." He did so as if even he, when lying under a weighty criminal charge, must yield to such a testimony, should it be found consistent. He refers, however, much more to the double and yet single testimony borne by himself on behalf of his own person and cause; the testimony, viz., of the Father and of the Son. For of course it is only God himself, in the person of the God-man, who convincingly attests himself to the world. When this testimony was, after the resurrection and ascension, completed and glorified by the Holy Spirit, it re-appeared still as a divinely human testimony in personal forms. First and foremost, every one was such a witness who had received power from on high to see and hear, in whom the risen Saviour lived. But even at this early period the Apostles occupied a place of special prominence: We are his witnesses. They spoke what they had seen and heard, as those who had been with him from the beginning, during the whole time that the Lord Jesus had gone out and in among men, until the time that he was taken up into heaven. From this time onward they told of his deeds, they reproduced his sayings; the Church of believers received the impress of the life and word of her Lord with increasing zeal and enjoyment, in the full strength and depth and assurance of the life which it had received in and from him through the Holy Ghost. Then the Evangelists and teachers particularly were confirmed in their office—an office bordering on that of the Apostles, and the object of which was to retain sure possession of a treasure which they guard with tenderest reverence and warmest affection.

This is the brief first period of the fresh stream from the opened fountain—apostolical tradition held in the strength and assurance of the Holy Ghost as he brings to remembrance, and explains the truth; dwelling as he then did in the whole Church; teaching some to recount and teach, and others to retain and preserve. This is the ground and soil out of which our four Gospels grew. For, inasmuch as this first fresh life in the earthen vessel of erring sinful humanity was exposed to the constant danger of perishing, without an objective *κανών*, "canon," it was fitting certainly that the revelation of the Eternal Word which had taken place in flesh should also be made in writing, for the Church of all ages, and for the whole world. The Lord who is the Spirit, therefore, chose and prepared special witnesses in order that his cause might again stand, for all faith, and against all unbelief, in the mouth of two, three witnesses; nay, he added yet a fourth witness, thereby superabundantly completing his plan. The Church was enabled by the same Spirit to recognise the gift thus bestowed upon her; and she has continued to possess ever since the self-testimony of her Lord in the writings of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

These sacred writers did not avail themselves of each other's works according to the common practice of book-making; but they drew from the one common fountain of the stream which was still flowing on mightily in them and around them. It is thus exactly in accordance with the principle which appeared in the God-man himself, that in them also the Divine is at the same time individually human. This fourfold composition sets before us, in inseparable connection, the two things: viz., the most perfect unity of the

facts related, through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, on the one hand, and the most perfect freedom, and personal life of human composition, on the other.*

So far as we are concerned, we abide by the ancient conviction that the *order of sequence* of the Evangelists, which has scarcely ever varied since their writings were put together, depends upon the *order of time;* in this order of time, however, there is involved the order of the *Spirit*, progressing and developing as it advances to the close. In propounding the view which we take of this matter, we find that on the whole we agree with Lange, who has in this case, to a certain extent, the merit of having been the first to point out the right way. Would that he had not, in particular instances, by the arbitrary procedure which influences so many of his views, again extinguished the light which he had kindled!

The publican, called to be an Apostle, is the first who was raised up to testify, against the scoffing Scribes and Pharisees, that Jesus had been proved to be the *Christ*, and had entered *by suffering into glory.* The first word is in the exercise of long-suffering patience addressed to Israel the first-called: Matthew writes for the Jews in their own language. He takes care, however, within a longer or shorter period, by furnishing a free spirited translation, of equal value with the original, that no interpreter shall, on his own responsibility, translate his Gospel into that language of the world by which the Hebrew was to be so soon supplanted.† This is our Gospel according to Matthew, in which the Apostle and eye-witness, so ingenuously confident, so free in spirit, and yet without making one mistake even in the smallest word, fashions into form the first firm kernel out of the living tradition; a Gospel which no criticism, except one which knows how to penetrate in faith to the depth of this origin, can avail either to own or to understand. "He is the first who played upon the sacerdotal trumpet:" this expression of Origen has more in it than is at first apparent. The current appropriation of the cherubic figures to the four Evangelists is certainly false: that introduced by Lange is alone correct, according to which Matthew is represented in the sacrificial cow, and Luke in the man.‡ The first evangelist shows us the Messiah; but this means the great deliverance, redemption, and expiation of a lost people and world in the person of Him who has come (chap. i. 21, viii. 17, xx. 28). *This* is the fundamental thought lying behind all; here, at the same time, we may freely say that Matthew royally sublime, majestic and unbiassed, wielding imperial sway, testifies of the *King.* But we shall immediately have more to say of him who (chap. ii.) was rejected in Israel: this tragic conflict and issue, related in the light of Christian faith, the existence of which is taken for granted, is the first *history* which leads us out from the Old Testament into the New.§

Israel proceeds to reject his King; and the kingdom is given to the Gentiles. For the election's sake the seed of Abraham still has its right given to it; after that the Gospel goes to the heathen. The same Peter who uttered the first word in Jerusalem was here also the first to be employed in this work of transition. He himself, who represents‖ not so much the Jewish Christians as the transition and exodus from them, was less called to write than to speak the Gospel; he merely furnishes, therefore, his son Mark with the apostolical material for a second Gospel, intended in the first instance for the use of the

* Or, as Lange says: The relation of the four Gospels to each other is a mystery, on which criticism has expended much hard labor, and which can be understood only when we come to acknowledge that the most perfect inspiration is one with the most perfect freedom of the individual; so that the unity of the different witnesses demands, in its highest strength, the purest individual difference of the testimonies.

† The idea that Matthew himself translated his Gospel is in itself not a very absurd one, as is evident from the example of Josephus. Thus writes Delitzsch in the *Luther. Zeitschrift*, 1850, 3. He very truly remarks, that in the well-known passage of Papias it is manifest that at the time of that account, no one, so far as he knew, was *any longer* under the necessity of translating for himself the Hebrew Gospel: The whole treatise, thoroughly understood, leads to the above-mentioned result: viz., that a Hebrew original had been authentically translated.

‡ The sequence referred, in the first instance, to the life of Jesus, "the cow, the man, the lion, the eagle," according to Oetinger (in Auberlen, page 284 ff., 319 ff., 465), is a complete blunder—the subject spoken of being the "labor of the ox."

§ It is amusing to true Protestants to read, that Sepp, a man of no real scientific acquirements, notwithstanding his immense superficial knowledge, degrades the first Gospel and assigns it to Philip—all in the cause of the Romish suppression of the Bible, and with a view to give Peter the first place (*Leben Christi*, vii. 71 ff).

‖ Finally, however, in his second epistle, and when in the prospect of death, he testifies his oneness with the beloved brother Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles. Scripture torn to pieces by pseudo-criticism, and history turned upside down, teach now certainly something different; but it is not real scripture and right history.

Romans. Mark is Peter's true son in power; corresponding to the figure of the lion of the cherubim, he exhibits before his readers the mighty acts and works of the Son of God —in clearly defined and on that account more powerful forms; in lofty contrast to Roman might, which knows nothing and effects nothing except what is earthly—a style of composition in accordance with the genius of the Roman mind. As Matthew, partly owing to his disposition for argument, and partly on account of the task assigned him, had already given prominence to the sayings, these in Mark's Gospel retire into the background. Still, there is many a striking particular introduced from the more exact knowledge of Peter for the sake of elucidating those sayings, and to heighten the pictorial effect of the histories already recorded in Matthew; for, with these the reader is supposed to be acquainted. Mark, therefore, is *not* to be placed after Luke:* he relates as the second, yet unbiassed witness, along with and next to Matthew, drawing his incidents from the one fountain of apostolic tradition.

Luke occupies another, and also in the development a later stage; although we are to conceive of the sequence of time in this first development as following in quick succession. We refer with pleasure to the well-grounded statements of Lücke,† which are very striking, at least as regards the point from which they set out, and which we accept in order to draw from them more definite conclusions. The Gospels of Matthew and Mark certainly belong to the first kind and grade of evangelic composition, *the pure collection of tradition;* here, however, we claim the really "pure" collection for the authors of these Gospels. "The Gospel of Luke occupies a *higher* grade:" here, again, we make our own reservation in regard to the little word "higher," which other people, perhaps, understand differently. "Here more attention is paid to connection of time and event; here we find a fruitful commencement of ecclesiastical research and description." All very true, so far as I see; although I must conceive of the "Gospel formations" of these grades very differently from Lücke. Suffice it that the *third* Gospel shows an advance upon the former two; it therefore justly occupies the place after Mark in genuine historical order, even though the commencement of the new arrangement may have taken place altogether at the same point of time. We find here a leaning on Paul, corresponding to that on Peter; for it was needful that the two of the Evangelists who were not Apostles should stand upon a sure apostolic basis. Here the transition to the Gentiles is, for the first time, quite completed; for, to write for Greeks (as all the Gentiles at that time were designated, in opposition to the Jews) was a still further advance towards general humanity. Now Luke, a Greek by birth and by nature, wrote, as is evident, not merely for Theophilus (he may have lived either at Rome or anywhere else), but for the Greek Gentile world. Thus in the third Gospel there is completed the progress of the testimony for the world onward from its commencement at the first rejection of the Messiah by Israel, as narrated in the first; up through the intervening member, the imposing manifestation of might, as detailed in the second; and thus this third Gospel, a εὐαγγέλιον σωματικόν, "bodily Gospel," became acknowledged as a sure foundation. The Evangelist to whom must be given the appropriate cherubic figure, *the human form*, shows us the most beautiful and the most gracious of the sons of men, the Saviour born to us, the Friend of Sinners, the Physician of Men, the grace which appeared in him calling and alluring all nations. The character of Luke corresponds in a peculiar manner to what is now called the human character; this principle being that which was represented by ancient Greece.

At the same time, at this stage we find manifest evidence of an active appropriating inquiring spirit. The researches of Luke, which, bearing as they do the new stamp of the Apostle Paul, and now no longer rooted in the tradition of the first chosen Apostles, take a deeper hold upon the Gospel of the past infancy of the Church, and a wider grasp of the era then just commencing; an era in which it was of importance to blend firmly the subjective conviction of the individual, won over as a catechumen, with the tradition of the Church, which was already losing its unbiassed character, and when an ἀσφάλεια περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων, "certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed," because necessary for the ἐπίγνωσις, "knowledge." This is exactly the historical and no

* As Clemens Alexandrinus, alone against the unanimous voice of antiquity, asserts, and as Guericke again maintains. Many in the present day follow them in this (Thiersch, in his *Versuch zu Herstellung*, etc., which recently he has not retracted in the *Kirche im Alterthum*); Delitzsch assumes it as a "certain admitted result;" we, however, do not agree with them, but claim for Mark the second place, though on other grounds and in another sense than Hilgenfeld. We cannot say more in this preface.

† *Kommentar über das. Ev. Johannis.* 3d ed. vol. i., p. 201.

less the symbolical character of his dedication to Theophilus and his prologue. These λόγοι, *words*, as the subject matter of ecclesiastical κατήχησις, "instruction," are not a mere system of doctrine, which must, of course, rest upon a history, but also and especially the history itself, which had been handed down by tradition, including, of course, the words of the Word. They are the πράγματα, *transactions* ("things"), which might certainly be called to the end of time πεπληροφορημένα ἐν ἡμῖν, "most surely believed among us," but whose διήγησις, "declaration," even at the time when Luke wrote, had begun to be multiform, and therefore uncertain.* Still, Luke does not in reality blame (it is only the Spirit that does so inferentially through him) those who had begun what they had undertaken; his design in his ἔδοξε κἀμοί, "it seemed good to me also," is to clear himself and to add to what had already been done. "He has found in general that these treatises agree with this tradition" (Lange). He is therefore, on his part, less *conscious* than the others are of the inspiration which guides him in his inquiries and his composition." So far is he from desiring to be henceforth regarded as "the first censor and critic of the Gospels previously existing," that he has even "conceded the imperfection of the synoptical Gospels!"† No, he is well acquainted, especially with Matthew and Mark, and fully acknowledges them, the αὐτόπτης and ὑπηρέτης, "eye-witness" and "minister" (for these are the very classes which they respectively represent). But, because other αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται had also παρέδοσαν, "delivered," what was not equally authentic; and further because the accounts of this additional matter had already begun to be of various kinds, he brings forward his contribution with the most scrupulous assiduity; and the Spirit elevates it to the rank of a third Gospel, and allows the other productions to disappear in the Church. He has investigated ἀκριβῶς, "perfectly," everything (πᾶσιν, scil. πράγμασιν, as is manifest from the παρακολουθεῖν, the usual expression for this), even up to the ἄνωθεν of the ἀρχή, "the very first." In him we make acquaintance with the evidence of criticism: and he himself, in his continuation of his πρῶτος λόγος, "former treatise," in the Acts of the Apostles, has given to all later criticism a sure safeguard; directing it to conceive of Church history, down to the present day, as growing out of the life of Christ as we have it in the Gospels: this is the origin of the Church, and the producing cause of the apostolic foundation of the Church. Even at the present day it is found that the Gospel according to Luke and the Acts of the Apostles are the portions of Scripture most suitable for Bible classes, where the object is to re-establish the ἀσφάλεια περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων, or certainty of catechetical instruction.

These are the Three; who after a long period were joined by a fourth, bearing the indisputable seal of the Spirit. Matthew had given special attention to the sayings of the Lord; and John completes these by such sayings as it was competent only for him who lay on the breast of Jesus to hear and to preserve. Mark had used the appellation *Son of God*,‡ with marked emphasis, after *Son of David;* and John gives us, therefore, the deep direct self-testimony of the "only begotten Son," in words which make a deeper

* The λόγοι in Luke are exactly the same as the λόγια which, according to Papias, Matthew συνεγράψατο, "compiled." It is the fixing in writing by selection and arrangement that is meant. The explanation given by Lange (*Leb. Jes.* i., 161) after Lücke, holds its ground, when understood aright and explained, in spite of Ebrard's *Recensirende Zurechtweisung* (Tholuck's *Litt. Anz.* 1844, p. 502. Compare *Stud. und Krit.* 1833, 2. 501). Certainly λόγιον, λόγια cannot mean "oral, running, historical communications; evangelic history still found in the stream of conversation," as Lange precipitately and inexactly says. But from the idea of "sacred utterance, revelation" there might very well arise a form of speech, which might not exactly signify a "sacred book, a revealed scripture." Here, it would be in the plural τὰ λόγια, equivalent to "the things, as well the sayings as the deeds and events, in which God revealed himself through Christ," and naturally equivalent at the present day to the above, with the addition, "as they were circulated in their yet unwritten form." For συνεγράψατο denotes a certain opposition. Delitzsch is wrong (*Luth. Zeitschr.*, 1850, 3) in understanding the expression as denoting "*chiefly* the utterances of the Lord." The most correct view, in our opinion, is that of the Catholic Schwartz (*Neue Untersuchungen über das Vemandtschaftsverhältniss der synopt. Ev.* p. 114 ff. Λόγια is the Greek word corresponding to the Hebrew דִּבְרֵי; and it follows from the nature of Christianity that a revelation of fact applied to the purpose of instruction is what is meant. Papias places himself in the same relation to tradition when he writes the λόγους of the Apostles. The *whole* of Christian truth, says Schwartz, is called sometimes λόγια κυριακά, sometimes λόγοι or διδασκαλία, sometimes ἀπομνημονεύματα or εὐαγγέλιον. In Ignatius *ad Smyrn.* c. 3 (larger edition), λόγια stands for "the Acts of the Apostles." Very right, we say, as Luke's prologue with its πράγματα and λόγοι belongs to the second treatise as well as the first seeing that the ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν (mark this consequence) was only the beginning of the whole.

† As may be read in Sepp, vii. 211, 212.

‡ Compare Matthew i. 1 with Mark i. 1; next at Mark i. 24, also further chap. iii. 11, xv. 39.

impression on the spirit of man than is made even by his mighty deeds. After he had labored during a whole apostolic life, quietly and deeply; had even suffered for the testimony of Jesus, and had sent forth the Apocalypse from his place of banishment in Patmos; after Jerusalem had been destroyed, and the prophecy given by the Lord of his first coming had been fulfilled in earnest of that of his second; then at last, and not till then, does John write his Gospel, as the higher and highest Apocalypse for all who believe and shall believe on the name of the Son of God, irrespective whether they are Jews or Gentiles, Romans or Greeks.* As Luke, indirectly and in the sense of Paul, opposes Jewish narrow-mindedness; so now the last controversy of John is one in which he strikes down all unbelief and every heretical infidel opinion. But he does not, properly speaking, lay down, in order, a collection of carefully investigated historical data; though he too, on his part, supplements his predecessors, and, for example, introduces some mighty deeds, such as the healing of the man born blind and the resurrection of Lazarus. But he looks like the *eagle* upon the "Light of the World." His prologue begins with the most appropriate commencement in the bosom of the Father, and his Gospel unveils for all genuine speculation the deepest *basis* of fact.

We have here the latest help against all the misconception and mistakes of the *latest* times, prefigured as these were by the rising ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις, "science falsely so-called," of early Christian times; *against* all Idealistic and Pantheistic perverted speculations.† For — though it can only be indicated — the four Evangelists, in their fourfold cherubic figures, correspond finally and prophetically to a historical process of development of the Church throughout its entire history. The idea has before this been thrown out,‡ that the cow, the lion, the man, and the eagle, symbolize the apostolic, the Roman, the Reformed, and the last Church; if we reflect upon it we shall find that the four-formed Gospels admit of being applied in the same way. On this subject, however, we prefer not entering at large.

These are the four witnesses, whose varied testimony agrees with marvellous harmony. Thus has the Church accepted it; having rested securely upon this testimony from the beginning.§ Is there to be now for once no more agreement? Far from it! Rather, as it is written that before the Sanhedrim two and three witnesses were not to be brought together at once; so at this day wherever such a procedure is adopted, false witnesses never do agree. By separating the Gospels from each other, we obtain a brilliant proof of their unity. And certainly the accusation is groundless precisely where it is well-founded; for it must first falsely assume that the Evangelists intended to write as if they were writing chronicles or minutes, in order that the differences which certainly do exist, the apparent contradictions which mark the *Life*, may, along with this vicious assumption, make out a charge of real contradiction.

These volumes have already shown, and will still further show, that the person and history—that the word of the Lord Jesus—remain essentially the same in all the Evangelists. That, on the other hand, a chronologically arranged harmony which shall (in all cases and conclusively) exhibit the particular circumstances and words is scarcely possible, we have also admitted and avowed. The design of our Commentary is to invite all readers, but especially all learned readers, to apprehend the deep reason why the wisdom of God has denied us such a history of the wonder of wonders in history; and to persuade them in the midst of all the laborious disputings and demonstrations about the shell, not to lose the kernel. Let it not, however, be said that we must be contented to remain in a state of pure uncertainty and perplexity as to the external course of the life of Jesus

* Or even Germans—we say against Lange, for here every peculiarity ceases.

† In so far there is a remarkable presentiment of what is right in the preposterous remark of Fichte, which tells much more than he designed it should do, and than the awkward clause itself really expresses: "It is only with John that the philosopher can come to terms." (*Anweisung Zern sel. Leben*, p. 155.)

‡ Meyer has a beautiful poem on this subject in his own way, in the *Blätter für höh Warh.* iv. 71.

§ The fundamental thought to which we gave expression in the preface of the first volume, "that by all who believe in a revelation of the Son of God, it must be taken for granted that his word cannot have fallen to the ground; cannot have dropped and been lost through the seive of erring human composition," depends upon the yet more general position, taken for granted, also, as implied in believing, and applicable to the life and works, as well as the sayings; viz., "that the image of Christ, as it is handed down to us in the four canonical Gospels is genuine." The 126th § in Martensen's *Doymatik* contains an admirable statement expressed in a few striking words against the new criticism; and concludes with the following unanswerable sentence: "Even the conviction of the internal truth and original perfection of the testimony of the Gospels, is a fundamental experience which is renewed at every age in the Church and in every individual believer."

in the Gospels. That we may not be thus misunderstood, we now give, in a tabular form, our view of the harmony. We do not arrange the materials in this table with any degree of dogmatism; but with the conviction that many particulars may reasonably be arranged differently by others. We append it for the purpose of showing that we have not expounded the sayings blindly, and at random; and also that an investigation conducted in a spirit of dogmatism, which will not allow of anything remaining undetermined, will meet with enough in the first place to bring it to a pause. This table will at the same time serve as an Index to a considerable part of this work, so as to enable the reader at once to turn to any particular passage which we have expounded. The continuation of this table, applicable to the rest of the work, will appear in due course in the subsequent volume:

	MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.	JOHN.
Annunciation of the Births of John and Jesus	.....	.....	i. 5–38	.....
Visit of Mary to Elizabeth	.....	.....	" 39–56	.....
Appearance of the Angel to Joseph,	i. 18–25	.....	.....	.....
Birth and Circumcision of John	.....	.....	" 57–80	.....
Birth of Jesus in Bethlehem, and his Circumcision	" 25. ii. 1	.....	ii. 1–21	.....
Presentation in the Temple, Simeon and Anna	.....	.....	" 22–38	.....
Visit of the Magi; Flight to Egypt; Abode at Nazareth	ii. 1–23	.....	" 39, 40	.....
The Child twelve years old in the Temple	.....	.....	" 41–52	.....
The Appearance of the Baptist (September or October), and his Work	iii. 1–12	i. 1–8	iii. 1–18	i. 6–8
The Baptism and Temptation of Jesus (December)	" 13–iv. 11	" 9–13	" 21–iv. 13	.....
Immediately upon this: the Message to the Baptist and his Testimony	.....	.....	.....	" 15, 19–34
The first Disciple and the first Miracle in Galilee	.....	.....	.....	" 35–ii. 11
Brief abode at Capernaum; *first Passover;* Purification of the Temple, and Miracles in *Jerusalem*, Nicodemus	.....	.....	.....	ii. 12–iii. 21
Longer Residence and Baptizing in *Judea*, Controversy and Testimony thereon	.....	.....	.....	iii. 22–36
Journey to *Galilee* through *Samaria* (the end of December); the Woman of Samaria	.....	.....	.....	iv. 1–42
Second Miracle in Galilee	.....	.....	.....	" 43–54
Preaching in Galilee; Rejection at *Nazareth*	.....	.....	iv. 14–30	" (44)
Imprisonment of the Baptist	xiv. 3–5	vi. 17–20	iii. 19, 20	(iii. 24)
Jesus in Capernaum and Galilee; Continues the Preaching of John.	iv. 12–17	i. 14–15	.....	.....
Calling of the Fishers of Men, Peter's Draught of Fishes	" 18–22	" 16–20	v. 1–11	.....
Powerful Teaching and Healing in Galilee	" 23–25	" (22)	.....	.....
The Choosing of the Apostles, and Sermon on the Mount	v. 1–vii. 29	iii. 13–19	vi. 12–49	.....
The Leper and the Centurion's Servant	viii. 1–13	i. 40–45	v. 12–16 / vii. 1–10	.....
Capernaum: the Demoniac in the Synagogue, Peter's Wife's Mother, Many Sick Folk	" 14–17	" 21–34	iv. 31–41	.....
Jesus withdraws from the Crowd, Visits other Cities	.....	" 35–39	" 42–44 / (viii. 1–3)	.....

	Matthew.	Mark.	Luke.	John.
One Day: The Calumny about Beelzebub, Reply to it, the Woman who pronounced Him Blessed, Mother and Brethren	xii. 22–50	iii. 20–35	xi. 14–36 } viii. 19–21 }	.....
On the same Day (on account of Matt. xiii. 1, Mark iv. 35), Intention to Cross the Sea	viii. 18.	.....	.....	.....
Still before this: the Offer of a certain Follower	" 19, 20	.....	.....	.....
(A later Incident of the same Kind and Parallels to it of uncertain date)	" (21, 22)	.....	(ix. 57–60	.....
Further Abode in consequence of the People: *Preaching in Parables*	xiii. 1–53	iv. 1–34	viii. 4–18 } (xiii. 18–21) }	.....
Actual Passage: Stilling of the sea, Gadarene Demoniac	viii. 23–34	" 35–v. 20	viii. 22–39	....
After the Return (another day): the Sick of the Palsy, Matthew's Call and Entertainment, Question on Fasting	ix. 1–17	ii. 1–22	v. 17–39	.....
The Daughter of Jairus, and the Woman with the Issue of Blood	" 18–26	v. 21–43	viii. 40–56	.....
Two blind Men and a Demoniac	" 27–34	.....	.....	.....
Some Time after: new Attempt and *Second* Rejection in *Nazareth*	xiii. 54–58	vi. 1–6	.....	.....
Raising of the *Young Man* at *Nain*	.....	.....	vii. 11–17	.....
Message and Question of the Baptist	xi. 2–30	.....	" 18–35	.....
(Undefined incidents of this early period): Anointing by the Woman who was a Sinner; another Entertainment in a Pharisee's house	.....	.....	" 36–50 } xi. 37–54 }	.....
Journey to *Jerusalem* at the Feast of *Purim* (in Adar); Bethesda	.....	.....	.....	v. 1–47
Plucking of the Ears of Corn; Withered Hand; Deadlier Enmity. (Beginning of Nisan, again in *Galilee*)	xii. 1–21	ii. 23–iii. 12	vi. 1–11	.....
Sending out of the Twelve	ix. 35–x. 42	vi. 7–13	ix. 1–6	.....
Narrative of the Death of the Baptist; Fear of Herod	(xi. 1) xiv. 1–12	" 14–29	" 7–9	.....
Return of the Apostles from their Mission (after a few days)	.....	" 30	" 10	.....
First Feeding, Five Thousand. About the Time of the *second Passover*	xiv. 13–22	" 31–45	" 10–17	vi. 1–15
Miraculous Passage over the Sea. Temerity of Peter	" 23–34	" 46–53	.....	" 16–25
Discourses in Capernaum about the Bread of Heaven; Offence and Confession	.....	.....	.....	" 26–71
Many Sick People Healed	xiv. 35, 36	" 54–56	.....	.....
Discourses about human Traditions to the Scribes	xv. 1–20	vii. 1–23	.....	.....
Departure to the Phœnician Coasts, the Canaanitish Woman	" 21–28	" 24–30	.....	.....
Once more many Sick People Healed; before this (by the way), the Deaf and Dumb Man	" 29–31	" 31–37	.....	.....
Second Feeding, Four Thousand; Demand for Signs; Warning about Leaven	" 32–xvi. 12	viii. 1–21	.....	.....
The Blind Man at Bethsaida	.....	" 22–26	.....	.....
Journey to *Jerusalem* at the *Feast of Tabernacles* (September); probable Residence till the *Feast of the Dedication* of the Temple (December)	.....	.....	.....	vii. 1–x. 39

	Matthew.	Mark.	Luke.	John.
Cesarea Philippi: What do the People say of the Son of Man? *First Intimation of his Sufferings*	xvi. 13-28	viii. 27–ix. 1	ix. 18–27	.....
Transfiguration, Lunatic. *Second Intimation of his Sufferings*	xvii. 1–23	ix. 2–32	" 28–45	.....
Tribute Money and Stater (in Adar?)	" 24–27	.....	.....	.....
Controversy about Precedence, the Little Child. Sayings of wider Import	xviii. 1–35	" 33–50	" 46–50	.....
Last Journey to Jerusalem. Luke's Account of it (with incidents and sayings of a somewhat earlier date interspersed)	(xix. 1)	(x. 1)	" 51–xviii. 14	.....
Of Divorce; Blessing of the Children	" 1–15	" 1–16	xviii. 15–17	x. 40–42
Resurrection of Lazarus	.....	.....	.....	xi. 1–53
Good Master, What shall I do? Forsake all! What shall we have then?	" 16–30	" 17–31	" 18–30	.....
Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard	xx. 1–16	.....	.....	.....
Up to Jerusalem! *Third Intimation of his Sufferings*	" 17–19	" 32–34	" 31–34	.....
Petition of the Sons of Zebedee	" 20–28	" 35–45	.....	.....
The Blind Men at Jericho	" 29–34	" 46–52	" 35–43	.....
Zacchæus; Parable of the Pounds	.....	.....	xix. 1–27	.....
(Jesus in Ephraim)? The date quite uncertain	.....	.....	.....	" 54–57
Six Days before the Third Passover: Anointing by Mary	xxvi. 6–16	xiv. 3–9	.....	xii. 1–11
Sunday.—Entrance into Jerusalem, Weeping over the City	xxi. 1–11	xi. 1–10	" 28–44	" 12–19
The Lord *begins* to *Inspect* the Temple	" 12	" 11	" 45	.....
Greeks, Voice from Heaven, Sayings,	.....	.....	.....	" 20–37
(General Summary of the Testimony of Jesus)	.....	.....	.....	" (44–50)
In the Evening to Bethany	" 17	" 11	.....	.....
Monday.—Cursing of the Fig-Tree	" 18, 19	" 12–14	.....	.....
Proper *Cleansing of the Temple*, at the end as at the beginning	" 12–16	" 15–18	" 45–48	.....
Tuesday.—The Fig-tree is Withered	" 19–22	" 19–26	.....	.....
Vindication and Parables	" 23–xxii. 14	" 27–xii. 12	xx. 1–19	.....
Ensnaring Questions by the Pharisees and Sadducees	xxii. 15–46	xii. 13–37	" 20–44	.....
Woes on the Pharisees and Jerusalem	xxiii. 1–39	" 38–40	" 45–47	.....
The poor Widow	.....	" 41–44	xxi. 1–4	.....
Prophecies and Parables	xxiv. 1–xxv. 46	xiii. 1–37	" 5–36	.....
(Residence in these days)	.....	.....	" 37, 38	.....

A few explanations may be added to this table, for the purpose merely of guarding against the contemptuous charge that we have not thoroughly weighed what has been advanced; and these, at the same time, from the aphoristic form in which they appear, may direct and stimulate to deeper inquiry. We confine ourselves to individual remarks, where they seem especially needed, or to references to what will be found treated of in these volumes; we shall, after that, take a comprehensive view of the course of each synoptical Gospel in reference to the order of time.

That the angel appeared to Joseph previous to Mary's visit to Elizabeth, appears to us not to be in accordance with real decorum, or with the delicately conducted progress of the history.

We hold it extremely arbitrary to regard Luke iii. 1, 2 as speaking not of the first commandment from God to enter upon the duties of his office, but as a "later call" addressed to the Baptist shortly before his imprisonment (according to Wieseler). That

the baptism and temptation of Jesus occurred in summer or spring, appears entirely unfounded; the winter seems to us the far more suitable time,* parallel to his birth and in accordance with Luke iii. 23. From his baptism till the passover there are few occurrences; but the period would be an extremely long one, according to Wieseler, p. 258, during which we have no notice of any occurrence having taken place. On the other hand the commencement of Jesus' work in Galilee is naturally very rich and full.

In placing the events related from Matt. iv. 12, to xi. 30 so early as before the feast of *Purim*, we again differ from Wieseler; who, however, has by no means shown that the journey of John vi. 1 is identical with that of Matt. iv. 12. To carry out such a view will involve us in many difficulties in regard to particular points in the narratives of the synoptical Evangelists, since John vi. must harmonise with Matt. xiv. Matt. iv. 12 itself intimates that a period of time must have elapsed to which the events related down to John iv. 54 belong; then Matt. v. 1 is still more manifestly connected with chap. iv. 25 by the τοὺς ὄχλους, "the multitudes;" the Sermon on the Mount, therefore, cannot have been brought in from a later period, or be made up of portions of later addresses, as some would have it.

Mark i. 21 is by no means to be regarded as following in immediate connection after ver. 20; ver. 22 rather intimates a *preceding* powerful teaching (*for*, generally applicable to his teaching), and that in the same expression which Matthew uses to denote the impression made upon the people by the Sermon on the Mount. We do not consider it necessary to show that ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις, "in those days," Luke vi. 12, is not a formula of sequence, but a general expression applicable to the first rich period of the work of Jesus.

The definite statement in Matt. viii. 1, 2, 5 (which again agrees with Luke vii. 1), is quite sufficient to fix the place of Luke v. 12, notwithstanding the indefinite form in which it appears.

Matt. viii. 18, with its indefinite πολλοὺς ὄχλους, "great multitudes," is by no means in immediate connection with the preceding verses, the 16th and 17th; for Mark i. 35, and Luke iv. 42, agree in giving an entirely different conclusion of the evening spent at Capernaum. For the arrangement in Matthew, see page 138. From this we are to understand that his statement in chap. viii. 23 is to be referred to the day, if, according to chap. xiii. 1, the parables had preceded; as the definite statement of Matt. iv. 35, must remain unbroken. This was certainly one of the richest days; of these, however, there must have been many, occasioned by the great crowding of the people and the unwearied activity of the Lord in the first period.† Matt. xiii. 1 is to be understood in a *pluperfect* sense, as giving a repetition of the discourses spoken of as having already begun to be delivered, in chap. xii. 22, and the delivery of which had taken place before the multitude of the works narrated in chap. viii. and ix. The calumny about Beelzebub may have occurred in the early part *of the same day*, at the commencement of his work (notice also in Mark iv, 1 the πάλιν ἤρξατο). And the offer of the man to follow him (as to the others who made a similar offer see p. 139 ff.) when he was preparing to cross the sea; after that, the preaching in parables to the people as they pressed upon him (chap. viii. 18, Luke viii. 4), still before he actually departed; on the passage the stilling of the sea, on the other side, the Gadarenes, who immediately forced him to return (still on the same day, or more probably after a night's rest, for according to Mark iv. 35, it was already evening); all this is not too much for one day. And when in Matt. ix. 2 the same day *appears* to have embraced a multitude of events—Mark v. 21, and Luke viii. 40, 41, present the same appearance—the explanation is to be found in the peculiarity of the Evangelists, who do not pay much attention to divisions into days when, in filling up some magnificent, comprehensive scene, they hasten on from one event to another by a καί, "and," or a καὶ ἰδού, "and behold." It is not only the evening, Mark iv. 35, that gives light here, the entertainment of Matthew requires at all events an invitation and a preparation; and yet this entertainment undoubtedly occurred between the return from Gadara and the raising of Jairus' daughter.

* On the appearance of the Baptist in October, Sepp, among many very strange things, gives some hints not to be despised (*Leben Christi*, p. 118 ff.).

† Schleiermacher speaks of the very wonderful appearance presented by the life of Christ when we notice the striking contrast between a great day in which everything is heaped together, even to the highest degree of improbability, and a great and almost empty intervening space. But such great days occur in every great life; and should not the history give us an account of some of these? Yet it does not affirm that the intervening empty spaces were in reality empty.

Matt. ix. 9 hangs quite naturally upon what goes before, exactly as does Luke v. 27. In like manner Matt. ix. 14 is a natural continuation of the narrative, and Luke v. 33 gives a comprehensive view of the whole scene. We cannot see why, in opposition to the express statements of these two narratives, Ebrard places the question about fasting *before* the entertainment. A clear reason, however, is contained in Matt. ix. 18 for placing the healing of the man sick of the palsy, and the matters connected with it, *before* the daughter of Jairus; indeed, the formulæ, Mark v. 21, Luke viii. 40, leave no room for hesitation.

Matt. xi. 2 does not carry forward the narrative in regular order, but, after the general closing formula, ver. 1, steps backward into an earlier period, as is manifest from the loosely connecting clause, ch. xii. 1, at the end of this chronological parenthesis. Matthew desired to *reserve* the contents of ch. xi. as an important conclusion to a first part of his description of the Messiah establishing his claims by works and words.

On Matt. ix. 25, see page 213.

Matt. xii. 1 again comes in correctly in chronological order, with the exception that the journey at the feast of Purim is omitted. We have the rubbing of the ears of corn placed, not after the Passover, but fourteen days earlier: see p. 218. There thus remains before the time when the thousands were fed about the Passover (John vi.), sufficient time for the sending out and the returning of the twelve; whose journeyings, moreover, we are not to consider as having lasted any length of time. They came back in their simplicity very soon to the Lord, as may be seen in Mark vi. 30, and still more manifestly in Luke ix. 10. The idea of Gemberg, that they spent nine months on their missionary tour, is to us inconceivable.

That Matt. ix. 35, till x. 42, has *anticipated* the chronology is again in accordance with the plan of the Evangelist to conclude with chaps. viii.–xi. a first cycle of the works and sayings of Christ.

By placing Matt. xii. 22 so early (we are compelled to do so by the other Evangelists), the τότε, "then," certainly loses every special chronological import. In constructing a harmony, however, it frequently occurs that we cannot avoid either giving up the most manifest data in one Gospel for the sake of another, or abandon the task altogether of reconciling apparent contradictions, in any other way than by taking such a view of indefinite formulæ:* and it is well known that τότε, when it stands alone, is usually employed throughout the first Gospel as a particle of this kind. We have already seen that chaps. xii. and xiii. are connected together, and we have proved (p. 249) that the parables could not possibly have been spoken before the Sermon on the Mount.

On the rejection at Nazareth, which, as related in Matt. xiii. 54, we are to regard as having occurred a second time, see our exposition of that passage.

Matt., chaps. xiv. and xv., hang quite well together, and fall into the time generally indicated in John vii. 1.

We protest on behalf of Matt. xvii. 24–27 against Wieseler's chronology, on the ground that his exposition of the *δίδραχμα*, or "*didrachm*," as denoting the civic tribute money paid to the Roman Emperor, is quite untenable. See what has been said on this subject, p. 327.

In Matt. xix. 1 we find the last journey of Luke pointed out. See our remarks in the exposition.

Although the connection between Matt. xix. 15, 16, and also that between Mark x. 16, 17, appear to be close, we do not know where else to bring in (and here for once we agree with Ebrard) the *resurrection of Lazarus*—an event for which it is very difficult to find a place. Here there is peculiarly a great *non liquet* (it does not appear) for the special point of time of this mighty event; still a poor harmonist must even for this put down at least something that is possible. We require only not to read (and we are not compelled to do so) the 15th and 16th verses of Matt. xix., in immediate sequence; but ἐπορεύθη ἐκεῖθεν, "he departed thence," as the concluding formula, and then the Καὶ ἰδού, "and behold," as beginning a new paragraph.

Mark does not arrange his pictures in his first part up to chap. vi. 7 in exact order. This is an axiom which requires certainly to be well proved against many critics. In

* Every one knows this who has had the least experience in such matters. Many a result laboriously wrought out has been dashed to the ground by some intervening statement; for every example the whole proof must be examined on every side. The author has given such proofs for many of his positions: whoever examines his results will find it to be so.

chap. ii. 1, for example, the wide expression δι' ἡμερῶν, "after some days," certainly allows our transposition.

Mark iii. 20, 21 cannot possibly, as Ebrard expounds, be a special occurrence after the Sermon on the Mount (and after the leper). The ἔρχονται εἰς οἶκον, *they come home* ("they went into an house"), is an indefinite beginning of a new picture, whose frame is not finished till we reach ver. 35. Οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ, *those about him* ("his friends"), must be *his relatives*, for ver. 31 is manifestly connected with ver. 21 by an οὖν, "then;" referring back to something going before, after the πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει, "he hath a unclean spirit," of the Scribes had been put down as parallel to the ὅτι ἐξέστη, "he is beside himself," of his relatives. See the exposition of that passage. The short notice in Luke viii. 19–21 is in its right place, at least so far as that what is related took place on the day of the parables.

Luke gives in chap. iv. 31, 32 only a general *formula*, which, therefore, does not immediately connect ver. 33 with ver. 30: still the general foundation for the particular miracle here has the same weight as at Mark i. 21, 22.

In Luke vi. 6 it is the following Sabbath, probably the Sabbath immediately following, that is meant; and thus the passage agrees with Matt. xii. 9, and we obtain an explanation of the πάλιν, "again," in Mark iii. 1.

In Luke vii. 11 the reading ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς, "the day after," is the only correct one, and is merely an indefinite *formula* for a really later occurrence.* For the raising of the dead recorded by Matthew, ix. 24–26, as having taken place *alone*, is certain; this selection itself leads us to this supposition—indeed the whole history looks like it, especially the *former case*. See p. 162, and our remarks on Luke vii. 13, 14. Ebrard has overlooked this, p. 144. According to his arrangement the young man at Nain was brought to life immediately after the daughter of Jarius; and yet this event must be connected (on account of the ἐν τῇ ἑξῆς) with the whole section containing the Sermon of the Mount and the events down to Peter's wife's mother, which, as we have proved on satisfactory grounds, must have taken place before the raising of Jarius' daughter.

Luke ix. 57, 58 is probably a very conceivable *repetition* of the event and the word, Matt. viii. 19, 20, in the real life of Jesus. We can scarcely, with Ebrard, refer the μετὰ ταῦτα, "after these things," of Luke x. 1, merely to the sending out of the twelve, and not also to what had been immediately related at chap. ix. The history of the other individual may in this case have been anticipated by Matthew as a parallel case.

We must, in opposition to Ebrard, place the whole contents of Matt. xv. 1 to xvi. 12, *before* the journey to the feast of tabernacles, John vii., and all matters connected with that journey as far as chap. x. 39; for otherwise the two feedings would be too far distant from each other, not to speak of many other considerations. Bengel's simple and probable idea is, that the Lord remained at Jerusalem from the feast of the tabernacles till that of the dedication of the temple. We have already expressed ourselves doubtful (p. 284) whether the "Scribes which were of Jerusalem," Matt. xv. 1, Mark vii. 1, had returned from the feast of the passover, John vi. 4. That, according to Mark, the confession of Peter followed immediately after the conversation about the leaven, is not true; Mark viii. 27, opens a new scene with an indefinite *formula*.

How then, according to the above assumptions, does each of the synoptical Evangelists stand related to the chronological order of his contents? We shall now take a glance at this, for the purpose of making manifest at least the possibility of our table.

Matthew passes over between the 11th and 12th verses of chap. iv. the following matters of which we have the record given us by John; viz., the provisional engaging of disciples, the first miracle at Cana, the first passover at Jerusalem, a residence in Judea, the journey through Samaria, and labors in Galilee, which are as yet rather divided into separate portions, and do not possess any very public character, as far as the imprisonment of the Baptist. Still there remains in his Gospel, chaps. v.–vii., what is really the proper commencement of the Lord's ministry; the first solemn preaching of his real public appearance, the tone and scene of which were anticipated by a preparatory work and collecting of disciples. In chap. viii. 13 he passes over the demoniac

* If we adopt τῷ, there is no reason why we should also adopt καθεξῆς, as at chap. viii. 1; since the fact of the passage being the only one w ere the phrase occurs is not sufficient to prove that phrase tc have been one commonly used by Luke: there is as much reas n for altering the τῷ ἑξῆς in that passage to make it conform to this one.

in the synagogue; and ver. 17 is consequently, in the first instance, a concluding formula. In ver. 21 he appends, as has been already observed, a later parallel to an event which occurred at that time, vers. 19, 20. The parables delivered on the day mentioned ver. 18 when the Lord was still on the sea, and before he set sail, Matthew reserves for his chapter of instruction, as he confines himself in the first instance to the Lord's *works*. See p. 164. He relates, therefore, immediately, the stilling of the storm, and the story of the Gadarenes, together with what follows it, as far as chap. ix. 34. After he had given, in vers. 35, 36, a general transition-formula, he opens a new scene: the programme of the teaching on the Mount is entered upon; disciples are called; miracles in abundance are wrought, though the hostility only of the Pharisees is excited; then he sends out the twelve: to this paragraph we have a general conclusion in chap. xi. 1, similar to the one already noticed, and which is again repeated in chap. xiv. But now he goes *back*, chap. xi. 2, to the message from John which had been sent at an earlier period (when accounts of the *works* of Christ first reached him); passes over the feast of Purim, yet inserts, in correct historical sequence, chap. xii. 1–21, what had taken place previous to the sending out of the twelve. With chap. xii. 22, he still goes further back, using his indefinite τότε, "then," in order to exhibit the origin of the hostility now mentioned for the second time, and to narrate its *first* outbreak; he consequently introduces here what had happened before the stilling of the storm. Chap. xiii. 1, therefore, has this meaning: even *then* he had, after such sayings addressed to his enemies, spoken the following parables to the *people*. Finally, after all these transpositions he restores chap. xiv. again into the chronological order left off at chap. x.; brings up from an earlier period the imprisonment and beheading of John, vers. 3–12; and, with the single exception of the passage, chap. xxvi. 6–16, which also belongs to an earlier period, carries on the chronological order till the end. He thus passes over the feast of Tabernacles and that of the dedication of the temple between the 12th and 13th verses of chap. xvi.; in chap. xix. 1, also, he passes over the incidents and sayings of this last journey, which Luke has preserved; the resurrection of Lazarus also is not mentioned.

Mark, who begins at a later period of the history than any of the other Evangelists, passes over, like Matthew, the first year—which bears the character of a year of gradual quiet preparation—and begins chap. i. 14, 15 exactly as Matthew does chap. iv. 12–17. But then, for the purpose of pressing forward *in medias res*, and εὐθέως, "immediately," opening up before us with imposing effect the great scene of the works of Jesus, he deals in nothing but chronological transpositions, and *heaps picture upon picture without the least concern about the sequence of time*. He falls all at once, chap. i. 21, into the events which took place after the Sermon on the Mount; and these events follow each other in chronological succession down to ver. 39; again in vers. 40–45 he brings in what happened at an earlier period and passes over the Centurion altogether. In chap. ii. 1–22 he anticipates, in like manner, the events that took place after the journey to Gadara; and from ver. 23 to chap. iii. 12 he brings in matter of a still later date. Now for the first time, chap. iii. 13 (referring by the εἰς τὸ ὄρος, *into the* [Engl. vers. "a"] *mountain*, to the well-known tradition), he goes *back* and begins with the Sermon on the Mount; of which, however, (except by the allusion to it in "the mountain"), he gives no account except as regards the choosing of the Apostles.* He has already related what happened immediately after this; he therefore passes over it, and proceeds in exact chronological order, through chap. iii. 20, 21; till he mentions the calumny about Beelzebub, and from that point again, in exact order (according to our harmony), to chap. v. 20. He had already anticipated in chap. ii. what *followed* this (Matt. ix. 1–17); he therefore proceeds straight onward in chronological order from chap. v. 21 to chap. vi. 6. He then passes over the young man at Nain, the sending out of the twelve, the feast of Purim (as well as what he himself had previously related, chap. ii. 23–iii. 12), and continues the narra-

* Because, as our Table shows, the sending out of the twelve followed immediately after Mark iii. 5, 6, it occurred to the Evangelist immediately to go back to their choice. There is a relation of combination of the same kind in Luke vi. 12; and another in Matt. xi. 2, where, instead of what followed chronologically in chap. xiv. 1, 2, there is introduced for the first time a statement about John of what had occurred at an earlier period. Gemberg gives an entirely different combination, which, proceeding from the idea that Mark narrates according to the order of time, leads to very peculiar results (*Stud. und Krit.* 1845, 1). We do not feel inclined to allow our system to be overturned by this; we must not, however, confute it at length. Meanwhile it is enough that our view of Mark's Gospel agrees with the oldest view we have, that of Papias.

tive after chap. vi. 7, exactly as Matthew does, putting in, also like him, at the wrong place, the death of the Baptist and the anointing at Bethany.

Luke, after having narrated the appearance of the Baptist, and the baptism and temptation of Jesus, passes over, like Matthew and Mark, the first year, except that he relates our Lord's first sermon at Nazareth, and his rejection by the inhabitants of that city. (In chap. iii. 19, 20, he has appended at once the imprisonment of the Baptist, the account of which the other Evangelists have introduced at a later part of their Gospels.) In chap. iv. 31–34, he anticipates the progress of the history as Mark does; in chap. v. 1–11 he brings up from a former period a special example of the early calling of disciples; in chap. v. 12 he introduces a narrative which he manifestly avows to be wholly indefinite; the portion from chap. v. 17 to vi. 11, is of the same character, all the events there recorded having happened at later periods. He now brings up, chap. vi. 12, from an earlier period, exactly as Mark does, the solemn choosing of the disciples and the Sermon on the Mount; appends to this, chap. vii. 1–10, an event which happened not long after; with chap. vii. 11–50, again he springs forward, and with chap. viii. 1–3 introduces a general description as a *resting-point*. From this he turns back in chap. viii. 4–39 to the discourse delivered in parables, to the storm and to the Gadarenes; the proper connection at this point appears to have been unknown to him; hence he brings in, vers. 19–21, what took place before the parables, and in ver. 22 a phrase implying *want of knowledge* is used in manifest opposition to iv. 35.* Finally he has introduced the Gadarenes quite correctly after the storm. What happened upon this, according to Matthew, he has, like Mark, already anticipated; he, therefore, proceeds with the narration of Jairus and of the woman with the issue of blood, down to ver. 56. Again, he has already given an account of the young man at Nain, of the message of John, and also of the rubbing of the ears of corn, and of the withered hand; he therefore advances in chap. ix. to the sending out of the twelve, and from this point onward abides by the chronological order. The only peculiarity is that in chap. ix. 17 he omits much that happened after the first miracle of the loaves, as is seen in the Table, and does not join the other two Evangelists till he reaches the matters related in the passage from the 18th to the 50th verse.

With chap. ix. 51 he begins the portion which is peculiar to himself, and which has been called the *journey-narrative*. This name, as applied to this portion of the Gospel, may be justified *a parte potiori*;† as at least the greater part of it manifestly rises out of the last journey to Jerusalem, *i. e.*, out of a journey and tour in connection with the determination expressed at its commencement, "*Now to Jerusalem, there to suffer and to die.*" We may see from chap. xiii. 22, 33, xvii. 11, xviii. 31, 35, xix. 11, 28, that this thought was at every point brought to the remembrance of our Lord. The sequence is not indeed perfect in every particular; the Lord is not in reality always approaching nearer; but for example, even in chap. x. 38, he has already advanced from the neighborhood of Jerusalem, though not when approaching it for the last time. In like manner, perhaps, Luke inserts here and there some sayings from a preceding period; certainly this is not the case with chap. xii. 22 (as we saw in our exposition), or with x. 21. It may be so, for example, with chap. xiii. 18–21; and most certainly it is so with chap. xi. 14–36, where we have a narrative of what, according to Matthew and Mark, happened at a much earlier period. With what are we to connect the expression of the 37th verse, incapable as that expression is of having any more definite aspect given to it, ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι, "while he was speaking?" We certainly are not to read it as if it were followed by ταῦτα, *these things*; it can be understood only as meaning, "when on one occasion (at that time), he was saying such and such things."‡ Nothing more satisfactory can with any degree of certainty be made of these *Singularia Lucæ*; although ingenuity may make the attempt and—lose its way. From chap. xviii. 15, again, Luke agrees with the other two Evangelists.

* We may remark, however, on this most instructive example, that Luke, even when he had not ascertained everything exactly, yet remains free from positive inaccuracy. His phrase καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν, although, in the same breath, he had related the events of *that very* day, *borders on a direct contradiction* of Mark's authentic and definite expression, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὀψίας γενομένης—but it does nothing more.

† At least better than that other description which finds here a "*Gnomology*," a *corpus doctrinæ*, formed out of all kinds of fragmentary sayings without any regard to the history; as, for example, was at one time maintained by Vertling against Bengel; *Collectanea Lucæ*, as Roos called it. We find it impossible to admit that Luke ix. 57, after the significant intimation of ver. 51, does not refer to the journey to Jerusalem.

‡ See what is said on this subject in our remarks on the above passages.

Such is our unbiassed view of the chronological relations in the synoptical Evangelists; in the defence and confirmation of this view there is much that we could say. Those who do not feel any interest in harmonies may drop the subject. Any one, however, who desires seriously to enter upon the subject may *study* diligently what we have thrown out in the form of brief hints, and as incentives to study. We can have nothing to do with those who quarrel and vex themselves about these matters under a twofold false hypothesis; as if the fixing in every individual case of the chronology, which is left so undetermined by the sacred writers, were the very first thing to be attended to in the life of Jesus; and, further, as if our wisdom could, must, and should arrive at unquestionably certain results in this matter. The man who begins his studies in this department with such a state of mind will never end them; the man who has not, *first* of all, thoroughly examined and understood the words and works of the Lord in themselves, and as they lie before us, had better not touch with hasty hand the subject of harmony. A thorough exposition of these words and works should come first; and, after that, their arrangement in chronological order; first, let us get the picture, and then frame it. The reverse practice, so much in vogue, receives the punishment due to it for being contrary to nature. The intention and aim of all who are conscious of their own duty and the limits of their own ability, and therefore of all really scientific men, can only be *to make attempts* at harmony; and in the midst of the different possible attempts that may be made, to resent the imputation of unanswerable inaccuracies, and to maintain a correct theory of inspiration. If the Son himself did not know the time of his second coming, should we be surprised that the Spirit has allowed his Evangelists to remain in much *ignorance* (significant and salutary) as to many matters of detail connected with the times and the days of his earthly life? But that *positive* and *essential* mistakes, even as to a day or an hour, have anywhere been made, has never yet been proved: the most keen-sighted scrutiny has rather issued in unexpected solutions. How much, according to John xxi. 25, might still have been written! But the wisdom of the most holy accommodation to our capacity has meted out what is felt to be at present an abundant fulness out of this inexhaustible wealth. Although χωρῆσαι in that passage does not mean ability to comprehend in the understanding, yet the hyperbolical expression, "That the world itself could not contain the books," is a judicious figure and a proverbial saying, meant to express the sentiment, that "human nature could not completely comprehend and apply the whole."

To show, finally, *why* each of the three Evangelists has left the chronological order as he has done, is a question which belongs to the last and most difficult department of real Gospel-criticism; that, namely, which has for its object to ascertain the plan of arrangement which must have been adopted by the Evangelists according to fundamental thoughts and important real connecting links. We think it right to abstain in this Preface from making any remarks *on this subject*, and have, in the course of our exposition, only occasionally thrown out a remark or a hint, where the text or the contents of the passage naturally suggest a thought. According to the design of our book, we to a great extent omit discussing the peculiar character of each individual Evangelist, that we may not be drawn aside from the simplicity, above all other things necessary, which receives what is related as really the works and the words of Jesus. The selection and arrangement of events, though much less the exhibition and classifying of documents, belong to the individual plan: to expound this latter plan is probably a prize reserved for simplicity in future times; for, at present all with much, too much ἰδία ἐπίλυσις, "private interpretation," are occupied with it. Even what Lange has prepared for the construction of this plan, correct though his fundamental views are, appears to us to be by no means conclusive; on the contrary, he is, often enough, not exempt from the danger which he is well aware is incident to the attempt of making a harmony, viz., of becoming entangled by a prying curiosity in the enchanted forest, and in the depths of some more "secret order for here this danger is certainly greater than it is anywhere else.

DEUT. XIX. 15.

עַל־פִּי שְׁנֵי עֵדִים אוֹ עַל־פִּי שְׁלֹשָׁה־עֵדִים יָקוּם דָּבָר׃

At the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall this matter be established.

LUKE I. 4.

Ἵνα ἐπιγνῷς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν.

That thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

THE FIRST WORDS.

CONTAINING THE FIRST WORDS OF OUR LORD ACCORDING TO ALL THE EVANGELISTS: EMBRACING MATTHEW, CHS. IV.—XI.

PAGE

The First Words of all—to His parents concerning His Father, Luke ii. 49 1
The First Word of Consecration to His office, Matt. iii. 15 5
The First Words of Victory over the Tempter, Matt. iv. 4—10; Luke iv. 4, 8, 12 8
The First Words of the Master to the first Disciples, John i. 38—51 13
The First Word of Majesty at the first Miracle, John ii. 4—8 19
The First official Words to the opposing Rulers of the Temple, John ii. 16—19 21

THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

The Substance of the first Preaching to the People, chap. iv. 17; Mark i. 15 27
Calling of the Fishers of Men, chap. iv. 19; Mark i. 17 (Luke v. 4—10) 28
The Sermon on the Mount, chap. v.—vi. 8 31
The Lord's Prayer, chap. vi. 9—13 83
The Sermon on the Mount—Continued, chap. vi. 14—vii 95
The Extract from the Sermon in Luke vi. 20—49 127
The Leper, chap. viii. 3, 4; Mark i. 41—44; Luke v. 13, 14 133
The Centurion, chap. viii. 7—13; Luke vii. 9 135
Two several Followers, chap. viii. 20—22; Luke ix. 58—60 138
The Stilling of the Sea, chap. viii. 26; Mark iv. 35—39, 40; Luke viii. 22—25 142
The Devils in the Swine, chap. viii. 32; Mark v. 8, 9, 19; Luke viii. 30—39 144
The Paralytic and the Scribes, chap. ix. 2—6; Mark ii. 5, 8, 8—11; Luke v. 20, 22—24 147
The Physician for the Sick, chap. ix. 9—13; Mark ii. 14—17; Luke v. 27—32 150
Answer concerning Fasting, chap. ix. 15—17; Mark ii. 19—22; Luke v. 35—39 154
The Issue of Blood, chap. ix. 22; Mark v. 30—34; Luke viii. 45—48 160
Jairus' Daughter, chap. ix. 24; Mark v. 36—41 (43); Luke viii. 50—54 (55, 56) 162
The Two Blind Men, chap. ix. 28—30 164
The wretched Sheep and the great Harvest, chap. ix. 36—38; (Mark vi. 34; Luke x. 2) 165
Mission of the Twelve, chap. x. 5—42; Mark vi. 8—11; Luke ix. 3—5 167
The Reply and Discourse concerning John's Imprisonment, chap. xi. 4—30; Luke vii. 22—35 (xvi. 16, x. 13—22) 191
The Disciples Pluck Corn on the Sabbath. The Son of Man Lord of the Sabbath, chap. xii. 3—8; Mark ii. 23—28; Luke vi. 3—5 218
The Withered Hand. Is it lawful to do good or to do evil on the Sabbath? chap. xii. 11—13; Mark iii. 3—5; Luke vi. 8—10 223
Beelzebub. Christ defends himself against the charge of being in fellowship with Satan, chap. xii. 25—45; Mark iii. 23—29; Luke xi. 17—36 224
Christ's Mother and Brethren, chap. xii. 48—50; Mark iii. 33—35; Luke viii. 21 244
The Seven Parables, chap. xiii 246
Wherefore in Parables? chap. xiii. 11—17; Mark iv. 11, 12, 21—25; Luke viii. 10, 16—18 249
The Seed in the different kinds of Ground, chap. xiii. 3—9, 18—23; Mark iv. 3—9, 13—20; Luke viii. 5—8, 11—15 254

PAGE
Wheat and Tares, chap. xiii. 24—30, 37—43 261
The Mustard Seed. The Heaven, chap. xiii. 31—33; Mark iv. 30—32; Luke xiii. 18—21 269
The Treasure in the Field. Pearl and Net, chap. xiii. 44—50 273
The Stores of the Householder, chap. xiii. 51, 52 276
The Feeding of the Five Thousand, chap. xiv. 16—19; Mark vi. 31, 37—41; Luke ix. 13—16; John vi. 5, 10—12 278
Christ Walking on the Sea, chap. xiv. 27, 29, 31; Mark vi. 50; John vi. 20 281
The Commandment of God and the Statutes of Men. What defileth a Man, chap. xv. 3—20; Mark vii. 6—23 283
The Canaanitish Woman, chap. xv. 24, 26, 28; Mark vii. 27, 29 291
The Feeding of the Four Thousand, chap. xv. 32, 34; Mark viii. 2, 3, 5 295
Reference to the Signs of the Times, chap. xvi. 2—4; Mark viii. 12 297
Beware of the Leaven! chap. xvi. 6, 8, 11; Mark viii. 15, 17—21 299
Confession of Peter. Christ's First Announcement of his Sufferings. Taking up the Cross and following Christ, chap. xvi. 13—28; Mark viii. 27—ix. 1; Luke ix. 18—27 302
The Transfiguration. The future Elias, chap. xvii. 7, 9, 11, 12; Mark ix. 9, 12, 13 316
The Lunatic. The Unbelieving and Perverse Generation, chap. xvii. 17—21; Mark ix. 16, 19, 21—29; Luke ix. 41 321
Second Announcement of Sufferings, chap. xvii. 22, 23; Mark ix. 31; Luke ix. 44 326
The Tribute Penny and Stater, chap. xvii. 25—27 327
The True Greatness of the Disciples of Christ. The Power of the Church to bind and to loose, chap. xviii. 3—20; Mark ix. 33—50; Luke ix. 48—50 330
The Wicked Servant, chap. xviii. 22—35; Luke xvii. 3, 4 345
Of Divorce, Celibacy, and the Coming of the Little Children, chap. xix. 4—14; Mark x. 3—16; Luke xviii. 16, 17 349
On following Jesus, and the Renunciation belonging thereto. (The Rich Young Man and the Laborers in the Vineyard,) chap. xix. 17—xx. 16; Mark 18—31; Luke xviii. 18—30 358
Third Announcement of Suffering: Answer to the Sons of Zebedee, chap. xx. 18—28; Mark x. 33—45; Luke xviii. 31—33 375
The Two Blind Men at Jericho, chap. xx. 32; Mark x. 51, 52; Luke xviii. 41, 42 383
Christ sends for the Asses, chap. xxi. 2, 3; Mark xi. 2, 3; Luke xix. 30, 31 384
The Den of Robbers, and the Children's Praise, chap. xxi. 13—16; Mark xi. 17; Luke xix. 46 387
The Fig-Tree. The Power of Faith and Prayer, chap. xxi. 19—22; Mark xi. 14, 22, 26 390
Christ's Answer respecting his Authority to the wilfully Ignorant: The Baptism of John: The Two Sons: The Wicked Husbandman: The Corner-Stone, chap. xxi. 24—44; Mark ix. 29—xii. 11; Luke xx. 3—18 393
The Marriage of the King's Son, chap. xxii. 2—14 403
Christ's Answer respecting the Tribute to Cæsar, chap. xxii. 18—21; Mark xii. 15—17; Luke xx. 23—25 409
Answer respecting the Resurrection, chap. xxii. 29—32; Mark xii. 24—27; Luke xx. 34—38 414
Answer to the Question, which is the Great Commandment, chap. xxii. 37—45; Mark xii. 29—37; Luke xx. 41—44 422
Woe to the Pharisees: All Blood upon this Generation: Farewell to Jerusalem, chap. xxiii. 2—39; Mark xii. 38—40; Luke xx. 46, 47 (Luke xi. 39—52; xiii. 34, 35 434
The Prophecy, chap. xxiv. and xxv. 451
The First Coming: Destruction of Jerusalem: Dispersion of Israel, chap. xxiv. 2, 4—28; Mark xiii. 2, 5—23; Luke xxi. 6, 8—24 454
The Middle Coming: Appearing of His Kingdom: Gathering together of the Elect, chap. xxiv. 29—44; Mark xiii. 24—33; Luke xxi. 25—36 465
First Parable: The Faithful and Wise Servant, chap. xxiv. 45—51; Mark xiii. 34—37 (Luke xiv. 42—46 474
Second Parable: The Wise Virgins, chap. xxv. 1—13 476
Third Parable: The Faithful Servants, chap. xxv. 14—30 (Luke xix. 12—27) 481
Last Coming: General and Final Judgment, chap. xxv. 31—46 487

THE GOSPEL OF MARK.

To the Unclean Spirit: Hold thy Peace, chap. i. 25; Luke iv. 35 491
To Preach in other Places also, chap. i. 38; Luke iv. 43 492
The Sons of Thunder (The Little Ship Ready), chap. iii. 17 (9) 493
Parable: The Seed Growing of Itself, chap. iv. 26—29 495
Ephphatha, and the Prohibition to speak of it, chap. vii. 34, 36 498
The Gradual Healing of the Blind Man, chap. viii. 23, 25, 26 500
The True Greatness of the Disciples of Christ: The not following with us: The Fire and Salt prepared for self-denial, chap. ix. 33—50; Luke ix. 48—50 (Matt. xviii. 3—20) 501
The Widow's Mite, chap. xii. 43, 44; Luke xxi. 3, 4 511

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.

PAGE
The First Preaching in Nazareth, chap. iv. 17—27 (Matt. xiii. 57; Mark vi. 4) ... 514
Peter's Draught of Fishes and his Calling, chap. v. 4—10 (Matt. iv. 19; Mark i. 17) ... 522
The Raising to Life of the Young Man at Nain, chap. vii. 13, 14 ... 524
The Woman who was a Sinner, and Simon the Pharisee, chap. vii. 40—50 ... 526
Disowning of the Zeal of Elias. What Spirit should ye be of, Children? chap. ix. 55, 56 ... 532
Yet a Third Word to a Follower: About looking back, chap. ix. 62 ... 535
The Sending Out of the Seventy, chap. x. 2—16 ... 536
The Return of the Seventy: False and True Joy of the Disciples of the Lord, chap. x. 18—24 ... 539
What shall I do to inherit Eternal Life? The Compassionate Samaritan, chap. x. 26, 37 ... 543
Martha and Mary. One thing is needful, chap. x. 41, 42 ... 550
The Lord Teaches us to Pray, What and How: The Heavenly Friend and Father, chap. xi. 2—13 (Matt vi. 9—13, vii. 7—11) ... 554
The Benediction pronounced upon His Mother transferred to all, chap. xi. 28 ... 559
An Earlier Woe to the Pharisees and Scribes, chap. xi. 39—52 (Matt. xxiii. 2—39) ... 560
The Disciples warned against Hypocrisy. The Fear of Man and Littleness of Faith, chap. xii. 1—12 (Matt. xvi. 6, x. 26—33, xii. 31, 32, x. 19, 20) ... 563
The People and the Disciples warned against various Folly. Covetousness and Earthliness of Mind; Lack of Watchfulness and Fidelity in the Disciples; Folly of the People in not observing the present Day of Grace, and thinking of the coming Judgment, chap. xii. 14—59 (Matt. vi. 25—33, vi. 19—21, xxiv. 42—51, x. 34—36, xvi. 2, 3, v. 25, 26) ... 564
Threatening Appeal to the Impenitent, occasioned by the Report of Pilate's Injustice, chap. xiii. 2—9, 574
Healing on the Sabbath: The Daughter of Abraham loosed from the Bonds of Satan, chap. xiii. 12, 15, 16 ... 578
Answer to the Question whether there are few that be Saved: The Strait Gate and Shutting out of many, chap. xiii. 24—30 (Matt. vii. 13, 14, 21—23, viii. 11, 12, xx. 16) ... 580
Reply to the Hypocritical Warning against Herod. The Fox and the Prophet-Murderess. Prophetic Departure from Jerusalem, chap. xiii. 32—35 (Matt. xxiii. 37—39) ... 583
A Second Sabbath Healing, chap. xiv. 3, 5 (Matt. xii. 10, 11) ... 586
The ungrounded Pretensions of proud Pharisees and unreflecting Followers repelled. Three Parables twice over: the being invited, our own Inviting, and the Refusing Guests; the Requirements of Discipleship; the true Ability both for Building and Warfare, chap. xiv. 8—35 (Matt. xxiii. 12, xxii. 2—9, x. 37, 38) ... 587
His receiving Sinners Vindicated from the Censure of the Self-righteous. The Sinner's Repentance or Punishment, in a Series of Parables, chap. xv. 4—xvi. 31 ... 600
The Seeking of the Lost, the Joy over the Found: the Lost Sheep, and the Woman's Piece of Silver, chap. xv. 4—10 (Matt. xviii. 12, 13) ... 602
The Seeking, Receiving, Forbearing Love of the Father towards the Penitent and the Self-willed, the Open and the Concealed Sinner: The Two Sons, chap. xv. 11—32 ... 608
The Converted Sinner's Prudence in Escaping from Punishment which yet threatens even him: the Unjust Steward, True Fidelity in the use of Worldly Goods, chap. xvi. 1—13 ... 625
The Unconverted Sinner's first Punishment among the Dead, after rejecting the Word of Repentance and Faith: the Rich Man in Torments, and Father Abraham, chap. xvi. 15—31 ... 640
The True Faith which overcometh Offences, chap. xvii. 1—10 (Matt. xviii. 6, 7, 15, 21, 22, xvii. 20), 660
The Thankful One: the Unthankful Nine, chap. xvii. 14, 17—19 ... 666
When Cometh the Kingdom of God? chap. xvii. 20—37 (Matt. xxiv. 23—28, 37—41, 17, 18 ... 668
The Importunate Widow before the Unjust Judge, chap. xviii. 2—8 ... 675
The Pharisee and the Publican, chap. xviii. 10—14 ... 680
The Tarrying with Zacchæus, chap. xix. 5, 9, 10 ... 680
Parable of the Servants of the Nobleman who goes away to receive a Kingdom, chap. xix. 12—27 (Matt. xxv. 14—30) ... 689
The Entrance into Jerusalem: the Stones Crying Out. The Great Destruction, chap. xix. 40, 42—44, 692

TEXTUAL INDEX.

		Page
Matt.	iii. 15	5
"	iv. 10	8
"	iv. 17	27
"	iv. 19.....28,	523
"	iv. 19—21	564
"	v. 25, 26	564
"	v.—vii	31
"	vi. 9—13.....83,	554
"	vi. 14—vii	95
"	vi. 25—33	564
"	vii. 7—11	554
"	vii. 13, 14, 21—23	580
"	viii. 3, 4	133
"	viii. 7—13	135
"	viii. 11, 12	580
"	viii. 20—22	138
"	viii. 26	142
"	viii. 32	144
"	ix. 2—6	147
"	ix. 9—13	150
"	ix. 15—17	154
"	ix. 22	160
"	ix. 24	162
"	ix. 28—30	164
"	ix. 36—38	165
"	x. 5—42	167
"	x. 19, 20	563
"	x. 26—33	563
"	x. 34—36	564
"	x. 37, 38	587
"	xi. 4—30	191
"	xii. 3—8	218
"	xii. 10, 11	586
"	xii. 11—13	223
"	xii. 25—45	224
"	xii. 31, 32	563
"	xii. 48—50	244
"	xiii	246
"	xiii. 11—17	249
"	xiii. 12	587
"	xiii. 3 to 9, 18—23	254
"	xiii. 24—30, 37—43.	261
"	xiii. 31—33	269
"	xiii. 44—50	273
"	xiii. 51, 52	276
"	xiii. 57	514
"	xiv. 16—19	278
"	xiv. 27, 29, 31	281
"	xv. 3—20	283
"	xv. 24, 26, 28	291
"	xv. 32—34	295
"	xvi. 2—4.....297,	564
"	xvi. 6, 8, 11.....299,	563
"	xvi. 13—28	302
"	xvii. 7, 9, 11, 12	316
Matt.	xvii. 17—21	321
"	xvii. 20	660
"	xvii. 22, 23	326
"	xvii. 25—27	327
"	xviii. 3—20.....330,	501
"	xviii. 6, 7, 15, 21, 22,	660
"	xviii. 12, 13	602
"	xviii. 22—35	345
"	xix. 4—14	349
"	xix. 17—xx. 16	358
"	xx. 16	580
"	xx. 18—28	375
"	xx. 32	383
"	xxi. 2, 3	384
"	xxi. 13—16	387
"	xxi. 19—22	390
"	xxi. 24—44	392
"	xxii. 2—14.....403,	587
"	xxii. 18—21	409
"	xxii. 29—32	414
"	xxii. 37—45	422
"	xxiii. 2—39.... 434,	560
"	xxiii. 37—39	583
"	xxiv. 2, 4—28	454
"	xxiv. 23—28, 37—41, 17, 18	668
"	xxiv. 29—44	465
"	xxiv. 45—51....474,	564
"	xxiv. and xxv	451
"	xxv. 1—13	476
"	xxv. 14—30....481,	689
"	xxv. 31—46	486
Mark	i. 15	27
"	i. 17	523
"	i. 25	491
"	i. 27	28
"	i. 38	492
"	i. 41—44	133
"	ii. 5, 8, 8—11	147
"	ii. 14—17	150
"	ii. 19—22	154
"	ii. 23—28	218
"	iii. 3—5	223
"	iii. 17 (9)	493
"	iii. 23—29	224
"	iii. 33—35	244
"	iv. 3—9, 13—20	254
"	iv. 11, 12, 21—25	249
"	iv. 26—29	495
"	iv. 30—32	269
"	iv. 35—39, 40	142
"	v. 8, 9, 19	144
"	v. 30—34	160
"	v. 36—41 (43)	162
Mark	vi. 4	514
"	vi. 8—11	167
"	vi. 31, 37—41	278
"	vi. 34	165
"	vi. 50	281
"	vii. 6—23	283
"	vii. 27, 29	291
"	vii. 34—36	498
"	viii. 2, 3, 5	295
"	viii. 12	297
"	viii. 15, 17—21	299
"	viii. 23, 25, 26	500
"	viii. 27, ix. 1	302
"	ix. 9, 12, 13	316
"	ix. 16, 19, 21, 29	321
"	ix. 29	393
"	ix. 31	326
"	ix. 33—50.....330,	501
"	x. 3—16	349
"	x. 18—31	358
"	x. 33—45	375
"	x. 51, 52	583
"	xi. 2, 3	384
"	xi. 14, 22, 26	390
"	xi. 17	387
"	xii. 11	393
"	xii. 15—17	409
"	xii. 24—27	414
"	xii. 29—37	422
"	xii. 38—40	434
"	xii. 43, 44	511
"	xiii. 2, 5—23	454
"	xiii. 24—33	465
"	xiii. 34—37	474
Luke	ii. 49	1
"	iv. 4, 8, 12	8
"	iv. 17—27	514
"	iv. 35	491
"	iv. 43	492
"	v. 4—10.....28,	523
"	v. 13, 14	133
"	v. 20, 22—24	147
"	v. 27—32	150
"	v. 35—39	154
"	vi. 3—5	218
"	vi. 8—10	223
"	vi. 20—49.....31,	127
"	vii. 9	135
"	vii. 13, 14	524
"	vii. 22—35	191
"	vii. 40—50	526
"	viii. 5—8, 11—15	254
"	viii. 10, 16, 18	249
"	viii. 21	244

		Page
Luke	viii. 22—25	142
"	viii. 30—39	144
"	viii. 45—48	160
"	viii. 50—54 (55, 56).	162
"	ix. 3—5	167
"	ix. 13—16	278
"	ix. 18—27	302
"	ix. 41	321
"	ix. 44	326
"	ix. 48—50....330,	501
"	ix. 55—56	532
"	ix. 58—60	138
"	ix. 62	535
"	x. 2	166
"	x. 2—16	536
"	x. 18—24	539
"	x. 26—37	543
"	x. 41, 42	550
"	xi. 2—13	554
"	xi. 17—36	224
"	xi. 28	559
"	xi. 39—52.....560,	434
Luke	xii. 1—12	566
"	xii. 14—59	564
"	xii. 42—46	474
"	xiii. 2—9	574
"	xiii. 12, 15, 16	578
"	xiii. 18—21	269
"	xiii. 24—30	580
"	xiii. 32—35.....583,	434
"	xiv. 3—5	586
"	xiv. 8—35	587
"	xv. 4—xvi. 31	600
"	xv. 4—10	602
"	xv. 11—32	608
"	xvi. 1—13	625
"	xvi. 15—31	640
"	xvii. 1—10	660
"	xvii. 3, 4	345
"	xvii. 14, 17—19	666
"	xviii. 2—8	675
"	xviii. 10—14	680
"	xviii. 16, 17	349
"	xviii. 18—30	358
Luke	xviii. 20—37	668
"	xviii. 31—33	375
"	xviii. 41, 42	383
"	xix. 5, 9, 10	686
"	xix. 12—27.....481,	689
"	xix. 30, 31	384
"	xix. 40, 42—44	692
"	xix. 46	387
"	xx. 3—18	393
"	xx. 23—25	409
"	xx. 34—38	414
"	xx. 41—44	422
"	xx. 46, 47	434
"	xxi. 6, 8—24	454
"	xxi. 25—36	465
"	xxi. 3, 4	511
John	i. 38—51	13
"	ii. 4—8	19
"	ii. 16—19	21
"	vi. 5, 10—12	278
"	vi. 20	281

THE FIRST WORDS.

Not, indeed, absolutely the first words. The *child-words* of that most marvellous, most holy childhood, in which the Divinity, gradually beaming through the veil of pure, lovely humanity, comes forth from its profoundest mystery into manifestation, an ever-continuous birth of the eternal Spirit into the human spirit, the human soul; who could comprehend, retain, record? Joseph stood at reverent distance, Mary felt and anticipated all that the purest, most simple faith was capable of—and yet very little. The angels more remotely learned the wisdom of God, while they worshipped before the *swaddling-clothes* in which *the Lord*, who should bruise the serpent's head, first moved. Satan began to inquire and make the experiment whether he has nothing in this One too; and could not understand this new thing. The mighty One grew up secretly into the consciousness and possession of his inherited dignity—secretly even, at first, to himself. Just as Christ first fully understood the development of his youth, when he looked back upon it from his manhood, after he had come to the full knowledge of himself; in like manner will it be vouchsafed to his Church, arrived at maturity, to understand the first earthly history of her Lord, which is reserved for her heavenly study. For nothing befell him, which was not to be fully and perfectly known. Then will Mary remember and relate all. But for the time that now is, we have the mature Christ in his word, fulfilling his office among us. One word of the child we have recorded for us, as a note and witness of the hidden portion of his growth and development—that one word of great moment, in which his self-recognition first distinctly breaks forth from the depths of his childhood's unconsciousness. Thus it is the *last* peculiar word of his childhood, but at the same time, the *first*, which the *Son of the Father* speaks. In this we find much, here below, to meditate and observe upon—both as to what preceded and what followed it—so far, that is, as we may now understand it. It was entrusted by Mary's lips for record to Luke, whose gospel in its first two chapters already goes beyond Matthew and Mark, reaching forth towards John's introduction concerning the Word made flesh.

THE FIRST WORDS OF JESUS TO HIS PARENTS CONCERNING HIS FATHER.

(Luke ii. 49.)

Solitary floweret out of the wonderful enclosed garden of the thirty years, plucked precisely as the swollen bud, at a *distinctive crisis*, is bursting into bloom. To mark this, is assuredly the design and meaning of the present record. The *child* Jesus sought to know himself, and his whole life of childhood was this seeking: here he begins to find out his own mystery, and it is not merely a *first word* to his parents and to us, but also a first word of the eternal Spirit in the human spirit of the person of the God-man. This is attested in ver. 50, which intimates that this was the first "My Father" that had fallen from the lips of the child.

The history connected with this word must be recalled, in order to its being rightly understood. It is pre-eminently objective, simply traces the occurrences as they transpire, and thus says in the best manner, and exhibits most lucidly, what on this occasion was to be said and exhibited. It is not even mentioned at the outset that his parents took the *boy* Jesus with them to Jerusalem; yet there is a latent proof in the "twelve years," as indeed the whole narrative, that this was the *first time*. Scripture is very sparing of words, where the right reader is able to catch the right meaning. We learn from other sources, that the youth of Israel in that period were reputed בְּנֵי הַתּוֹרָה, (*sons of the law*). All things from his circumcision onwards proceed in the ordinary course with this extraordinary child.

Luke simply relates that the child Jesus remained behind, without imputing blame to the parents or vindicating him: the sequel sufficiently explains all. They were justified in leaving the youth to his own discretion in Jerusalem, as they had often done elsewhere; and *supposed* quite innocently, that he would be found in his own place in the company: their error lay not in this. But that the youth wholly absorbed by the Temple and all that was to be seen and heard there, would give his thoughts to nothing else, that he now would belong *to it*, they considered not before, nor even when it should have been obvious to them, upon their *seeking* him. Hence we may again collect that it was both for him and for them the first time.

The mistaken idea that Jesus *taught*, contrary to the appropriate order of human life *generally*, and much more of *his* lowly life, is refuted by ver. 46. He *sat* as a learner, *hearing* those who taught and *asking* them questions;* strictly, indeed, and properly, as one who yet knew not, but whose progress and learning went on into ever-increasing wisdom (vers. 40–52). His questions were the pure light-questions of innocence and truth, which keenly and deeply penetrated into the confused errors of the Rabbinical teaching. Rightly to question is the highest wisdom which the learner, as such, can possess. For one genuine question of him who seeks in the right direction itself contains, more realized truth than a thousand disjointed answers of the false wisdom of books and words. Thus does the Galilæan youth in his divine-human simplicity *confound* the masters in Israel sitting in the loftiest chairs of the erudition of the age, and the seat of the learner predicts the future throne of the teacher.† His light shines forth upon the world now at the first with such simple conviction, that many of those who were susceptible were astonished at the *understanding* displayed in his questions, and in the *answers* which he gave when, as would naturally enough follow, he was questioned in return; at least all who *gave heed to him*—which many who were "offended" at him might not as yet, strictly speaking, be disposed to do.

Jesus brings with him a knowledge and understanding of the written word of God derived from the school of home: he finds this to some extent reproduced in Jerusalem, but only as falsified and overlaid by the errors of human teaching. This contradiction, which at the very first so glaringly manifests itself, stirs mightily his truth-seeking spirit. He had innocently expected to receive from the masters in the house of God the full and much desired answer to his accumulated questions, and nothing but truth and wisdom; but he finds it otherwise, and detects the disparity by that sense of truth which from the beginning recoiled from every error. He *could* already have taught, but it enters not his mind that he could; he rather *asks questions*. And what questions, did we but know them! Many a preintimation, we may suppose, of his later manner of asking—How is it written, then, in this or in that Scripture? Thus by Holy Writ he presses hard upon the precepts of man, even as babes and sucklings‡ have done by his Spirit in all ages since; and thus without designing it, or being even conscious of doing so, he opens out the meaning of Scripture. The main subject of their communications is the Messiah and his kingdom: this theme arouses most fully the ready presentiment with which he came there, and in the course of this questioning, which is but the asking after himself, he finds that great answer which the Spirit alone could give him, he makes the discovery of himself, in the first consciousness, not yet mature but now truly beginning—*I am He!* This he conceals, in deep and pure humility, from the astonished ones around him; but this first reproof of his parents, now least expected, extorts from its profoundest sanctuary this great utterance.

It was the *first* reproof which he received. They had all along addressed him as "child" with many a direction and admonition, but had never found anything to reprove. The foster-father even now remains standing, as ever, at reverent distance; the mother alone ventures with a mother's right to speak, yet at the same time in the father's name. She indeed only ventures upon a question appealing to his tested integrity as a child, as if she would say—What thou hast now done, I understand not for the first time! Done *to us*,—this gave an unanswerable pathos to her question; for he had never given them pain before. Thy father—thus had Joseph till now been spoken of. Never, indeed, had Mary's lips as yet been bold to say to the "Son of the Highest" (Luke i. 32) concerning the Most High: Thy Father! Yet are her words—not *We, thy parents*, but, *Thy father and I*—a most exquisitely delicate expression of that sacred secret which had almost faded away in her soul, but the consciousness of which is already prepared to anticipate the great word which her son is about to utter.

And he said unto them—*How is it that ye sought me! Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?* Instead of acknowledging any error or uttering any regret for their sorrow and anxiety, he gives them a kind and earnest lesson, though without appearing to do so, concerning their whole parental relation, especially in time past. There are two counter-questions in answer to the two questions of his mother. First of all, he puts another *wherefore* against hers, as he becomes conscious of the feeling with which they had *sought him*. It had been so natural to him to be and to abide where he was, that he had not thought of their seeking him at all; and he shows that he regards it as quite needless, at least to seek him *sorrowing* in grief and anxiety, as if it were possible for him to be in wrong or in danger. The reproof is thus given back, and in such a way, that the blame (as is too often the case, alas! in the human

---

* Not as Sepp (*Leben Christi*), who supposes that a chair of instruction had been instantly given him in the midst of the teachers, in order to resolve questions and propose them.

† "To answer children is indeed an *examen rigorosum*," says Hamann. But there is herein foreshadowed the future wisdom of Jesus, as Hamann says again: "He who will stop the mouths of scribes and sophists, must—know how to put questions" (Edition of Roth, ii. 424).

‡ Hence the Rabbins themselves know, that the word of God out of the mouth of childhood is to be received as from the mouth of the Sanhedrim, of Moses, yea of the blessed God himself (*Bammidbar Rabba*, 14).

education of children of sin) is reflected upon the parents.* But he speaks without any design to shame or correct them; he innocently *asks the question* of his parents, as he had done before of the doctors; and all the shame lay in the circumstance itself. Incomparably and inconceivably *artless*, as elevated as it is childlike, is that *Wist ye not?* That which he here now, while he utters it, begins for the first time to conceive and understand clearly, becomes at the same time so natural to him, that it is as if he had ever known it, as if it could not be otherwise than it was, as if it must be equally self-explained to every one else.

Mary and Joseph assuredly *knew* who the child of their charge was. But so naturally had the human side of his development proceeded before their eyes, and so accustomed had they been to this alone, as time passed on, that they may well have sometimes nearly lost sight of that which was higher and peculiar in him. Even now, when they were reminded of it by this impressive circumstance, they do not rise above their mere human ideas. And *this* was their fault: not that they for a while trusted him, uncared for, out of their own hands, and not that they at first supposed that he would re-appear in his right place; but that afterwards, when they found it otherwise, they could sorrowing *seek* him in any other than that which was *his* right place.

The opposition between his own "*My Father*" and Mary's "Thy father," referring to Joseph, is very distinct. In this designedly spoken and well-weighed expression, lies the deep significance of this whole word. No human lips had hitherto pronounced it, for the approximations to it in the Old Testament and in the Apocrypha† are clearly to be distinguished from this *my Father*. Here already, as ever afterwards, only *my Father*—never conjoined with us, *our* Father! This *my* deepens into a most exclusive, personal appropriation, when the Son of the Highest thus responds to his parents—Ye—sought *me!* Wist *ye* not that *I*—? The great truth rises before him out of Joseph's name of father, that his own true *Father* is he, whom no one in Israel had ever addressed by that name, and himself never till now: He, in whose house and Temple he now stands.‡

Yet he does not simply say, in my Father's *house*, but according to the more extensive and undefined ἐν τοῖς of the Greek, *in my Father's matters*. The Spirit in the youth speaks at once in the later manner of the man,—with profound meaning in concise expression. The first and most obvious meaning refers certainly to the place, the *house*, namely, where they should at once have sought him, or, rather, supposed him be, without seeking him at all; but when we thoughtfully penetrate through the surface to the heart of the expression, we find much more than this included in it. The next sense is that of a conclusive justification of his remaining behind in the temple without reference to his parents' knowledge and permission—In my Father's *will*, by his guidance and inward direction. When hitherto any specific objection in his mind, conceived rather as a presentiment, had come into collision with the parental will or the ordinary subordination of childhood, he had subjected and denied himself; but now, his full age commencing, this also must begin to cease, and from this time forward they must, as he now shows by a virtual injunction to be his will, leave him without any further guidance of theirs, knowing by this token that he is about his Father's business. But this emancipation from his earthly parents takes place only as springing from a most firm adherence to his heavenly Father. *To be in any thing*, as a common expression among men, denotes the occupation of the whole life in it, the being wholly given up to it. Viewed thus, the phraseology gives a yet further answer, *how* it came to pass that he remained behind, and is a disclosure of the most secret self-justifying reason of the circumstance: *I thought of nothing else*, it was my meat, the instinctive aim and impulse of my being, that higher law within me, by obeying which I was not disobedient to you, —I *must!* Here already is the germ of that sacred *must*, which the Lord so often utters in the subsequent way of his obedience. The contrary among other children might have been more or less marked—dissipating attention to the wonders of the great city, visitations among friends and acquaintances, thoughts about the journey and the return. But both the thoughts and the actions of the holy child were entirely absorbed and wrapped up in this one thing. Thus, as Von Gerlach observes, this first utterance is even thus early "a word of *self-renunciation*, of self-sacrificing surrender to God, in holy zeal for Him and His House."

Again, if we yet more deeply penetrate into the meaning of this word in relation to the occurrence to which it refers, the question arises, What drew and impelled him as the youth (for such as yet he was) to the Father? The parents found him occupied in *learning*

* Joseph and Mary had scarcely been quite free from such blame in the bringing up of the holy child. "They often treated him as only *their* child, and probably afflicted him many times by an inappropriate exercise of their parental authority" (Roos, *Lebensgesch. J. Chri.* New edition).

† Isa. lxiii.; Mal. ii. 10; Wisd. xiv. 3; Ecclus. xxiii. 1; not so much in the sense of a personal relation, as in that which is indicated by Deut. xxxii. 6; viii. 5; Psa. ciii. 13.

‡ With this *first* word, which was spoken, withal, in the presence of the doctors of Israel, K nig (*Menschwerdung*, p. 305) combines that last one also spoken to them, Matt. xxii. 42. From beginning to end Jesus thus sets aside the paternity of Joseph, and testifies his own consciousness of a supernatural origin.

and *asking questions* in the place where *God's word* was to be learned. Then he tells them once more, why he remained, and must have remained there—I am in my Father's *school* for my own instruction. Inasmuch as he does not say, Among the doctors, masters, and wise men, but instead of them names only the Father; his word may be regarded as containing that great and weighty disclosure of his own previous and subsequent inner *education*, for the sake of which principally this record is given to us. Just now, when he begins to be a "son of the law," he first calls God his Father—his master, teacher, educator.* Jesus was most inwardly taught of the Father, although not without external and human instrumentality. Life, instruction, holy writ, awakened what was within him; he seeks his God in the Temple, in order to find him as his Father; among the masters in Israel he asks questions, in order that through them he may receive from on high the true answers; and the Father's inner guidance even connects itself with the custom to take the youth of twelve years' old first up to the feast to present them before the Lord. Thus it was the Father alone who taught him when his mother early recited or read to him out of Scripture; and not otherwise was it with the youth, the young man, and the man in the synagogue at Nazareth. And *what* was it that he learned, upon what were his questions and investigations set, in that secret education wherein he "heard of the Father" concerning all things, but especially concerning the Old Testament Scriptures and dispensations? That one word was the rudimental object of his study, which at the close of his life's development was unfolded to him by the Spirit in all its clearness and power—*Thou art my Son!* He inquired concerning himself with vehement desire to know the mystery of his own being and the problem of his life, and concerning the will of Him who had sent him to finish His work (John iv. 34). In the "labor of his childish spirit, to admit into itself and rightly adjust all things," divine things according to the word of God in the Old Testament were of chief concern to him. "Therein lived the childish consciousness of Jesus, in all the profundity of his secret presentiments."† As he himself had ever, from the beginning, possessed a consciousness of the object of his life, but as yet concealed in his childish capacity;‡ and as this first disclosure (to be followed itself by many such, in advancing clearness and assurance) seems to him at once as natural as if it had never been otherwise than clear to him; so in like manner does he in childish confidence ask his parents—*Wist ye* not then every thing concerning me long since? And assuredly, however much such a saying must have astonished them, there was so much in it that was right and true, that they could not but take shame to themselves that they had been troubled about the Son of the Highest, as if any evil could befall him before the accomplishment of the mission of his life; that they should have thought it needful to guard him, as if, when out of their immediate care, he could possibly stray beyond his Father's *hand*, and *guidance*, and *protection*. With this last meaning his inquiring word comes round again to the obvious *reply* which the occasion demanded, and gives the reason of his first question: How is it that ye could seek me sorrowing? *Considered ye not* that I am always in my Father's hands and care? But yet once again was this altogether forgotten, under the cross, by the deeply-stricken mother—I am not alone, for the Father is with me (John xvi. 32).

Let the whole fulness of this significance be once more gathered into this question, which sublimely presupposes the profoundest mystery as manifest—*Knew* ye not all this long ago concerning me? Thus his word contains an impressive reference to the past, in order to point the view to the future; an explanation concerning the whole life of the child, and its development into the youth, the young man, the man.* Not as if the mind of the child had specifically conceived all that we deduce from his word, but he speaks prophetically of himself. The Spirit of Christ in himself spreads its wings, and that word which spontaneously gushed from the deepest source of his life in the Father, becomes to the Son a holy text, which he, too, may search into yet more diligently (1 Peter i. 11). Yet is it a pure and genuine child-word, the immediate and unstudied utterance, on the border of childhood, of child-like simplicity; and thus it discloses the first independent acting of him who, passing the limit of childhood, abides still in his Father's business.

And they *understood it not*. This is recorded concerning the first word of the Word, and of those who, as being nearest to himself, had every advantage for understanding it! They pondered the sacred mystery, and thought not that in catching its most obvious sense, they understood it in its fulness. Even Mary herself, like the rest, appears not yet to understand, before the day of Pentecost, the mystery of the person of Jesus—and who is there below that fully *understands* it? Thou, vain expositor, hast not the heart

* As Henry Alford says very excellently in his *Commentary on the New Test.* (London, 1849)—he has so repeatedly mentioned my *Reden Jesu*, that I am bound in gratitude to make similar reference to him.

† So Braune, in his admirable *Auslegung der Evangelien*, which we shall now be glad often to compare and cite.

‡ The divine-human self-consciousness under the form of youthful presentiment, present from the beginning, not in any wise superadded later. See Liebner, *Christologie*, i. 311.

* Just for this reason we cannot agree with Braune, that any "calling to *activity* in the kingdom of God" is here signified—this would overstep the limits of childhood.

of Mary probably nothing of the Pentecostal spirit; and yet art thou so ready to cry out—I understand the words which he has spoken?

Luke's supplement in vers. 51, 52 was necessary, in order to obviate misunderstanding. As soon as that word of holy righteousness was uttered—the Son of the Father is free! it was again in a sense annulled or suspended, in order to his fulfillment of all righteousness in obedience. The Father's teaching was ever a discipline of obedience (Heb. v. 8); as the Father had inwardly said to him—Tarry here! so now he says—Go down with them, and be subject to them! Hence he is not from this time forth placed in another relation even to Joseph (for the last time referred to in the little saying "to them"), who is not "his Father," and yet for the sake of his mother and his true Father, was still to be honored as such. The mystery folds itself up again in the self-denial of eighteen years, till the time when a new word brings out its other, mighty significance—"Thus it behoveth us to fulfill all righteousness!" till the time when, on the open assumption of his Messiahship, the mother has become "woman," having no longer any authority, and his "my Father" publicly resounds in his house, and before his people, no more to cease till that *last* word, which coincides with this first—"Father, into thine hands!"

And Jesus *increased*—so that his self-consciousness was not yet strictly speaking perfected and fully developed. As in age, so also he increased through the teaching of the Father, in *wisdom*, in his obedience through the grace of God which descended upon his humanity before it came, through him, upon us all. The bud now burst unfolds itself from within; in the heart of this child there is no foolishness bound up (Prov. xxii. 15); no folly in Israel or Nazareth has power to affect him; he advances into all that belongs to manhood, but contracts from it none of its iniquity or sin; all things are constrained to serve him and minister to his wisdom. The displeasure of God has never rested upon his holy One, but the complacency of God, his *favor* goes on ever increasing with his increase in wisdom, until it is consummated at his baptism. Even his favor with *men* increases likewise, for he forbears entirely as yet from testifying against their folly and their sin; and therefore the world as yet hateth him not (John vii. 7). "Let us go on in friendship together," said they in Nazareth. O, what gracious words may have issued from his lips during those eighteen years, which are not recorded! But the words which, by the Father's ordination, he was to testify to the world, are sealed up till his hour was come. Then one after another burst forth, each, as it were, a deeper stream from the long pent-up fountain of eternal wisdom and truth.

THE FIRST WORDS OF CONSECRATION TO HIS OFFICE.

(Matt. iii. 15.)

The history of our Lord's baptism, like that of his cross, is contained in all the four Evangelists; but the *word* which he then uttered is preserved by Mathew alone, as being strictly a word of *fulfillment*, and therefore belonging especially to the fundamental idea of the first Gospel.

John knew the Lord and yet knew him not. He knew him not, according to his own testimony (John i. 31), as the Messias and the Son of God; but he knew him as one, whose whole life from the beginning had silently cried, Which of you convinceth me of sin? Since he had been in the deserts, he had probably seen him but little, yet often enough, as his life could not have been altogether recluse, to awaken within him the presentiment which now deepens into conviction. His saying in ver. 14 proceeded from the Spirit, who then descended upon him, and is not to be explained on the ordinary principles of human thought. It is a word which marks the transition at that moment taking place within him from presentiment to inward assurance. The question at the same time breaks out in it, which had long lain deep in the heart of the humble Baptist—But who will baptize *me*, who am also myself a sinner? Certainly, acccording to the ordinance of God, his office and function extended over all, whether they were worse or better than himself, for his mission was to baptize with water; and therefore he baptized without hesitation every Simeon or Nathanael as he came. But here was One greater than Nathanael! John *knew* this not, indeed, until he saw the Spirit descend, according to the sign which had been given him; yet his spirit goes out towards him with that anticipatory and presentient feeling, which had moved him in his mother's womb towards the mother of his Lord. Jesus comes in all the spiritual grace of gentleness and humility with sinners to the baptism of repentance; as John beholds him, he sees shining through this deep humility the high majesty of the holy One; and that he has an inward token of this, constitutes his own dignity. He has baptized many, has seen and in some sense seen through men of all kinds; but no one like this had as yet come before him. They have all bowed down before him; but before this man, bows down in the irrepressible emotion of his own most profound contrition, the sinful man in the greatest prophet. It might well have prompted him to cry: Art thou

then a sinner, a man? To that point his question ventures not to go, it remains suspended between the thought of the man, and the superadded presentiment of the Spirit.* Enough, however, is clear to be uttered thus: Who am I in thy presence, that I in the office and ministry of baptism should be placed over thee?

Then answers the Lord with equal grace and majesty, with as much simplicity as fulness of meaning,† by another of his distinctive first words—the first *official word*, with which he prepares himself for his anointing, and consecration to his office. He first of all gently sets aside the prohibition and refusal of John, and utters with dignified grace that single word, *Suffer it now!* Had he said no more, that would have sufficed to the Baptist, for its plainness and dignity were such as to silence all further questioning. It at once intimated, —I know what I now do; I am taught from above to submit to baptism, as thou art taught to baptize. *Now* for a time thou seemest to be the greater, who consecrates the less—soon, as it is fit, will our relative position be reversed! *Now*—it is only a transitional relation (as Neander has well observed)—now: My hour is come, is the Lord's thought for himself: Perform thy function upon me, thou shalt afterwards learn what I do, is his meaning with regard to John. This promise, indeed, is already and instantaneously fulfilled, when, in order to remove all the scruples of this upright man, and to terminate this holy conflict of humility in him, by the sublimest and most commanding humility in himself, he proceeds to testify—*For thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness.*

First of all, we cannot but be profoundly impressed by the lofty contrast between *this* avowal of righteousness, and the *confession of sin* of all the others, who came to be baptized, ver. 6. And it is strange that theologians in their search for testimonies of the sinlessness of Jesus, do not find here the first and most luminous *dictum probans* from his own mouth. This was to John the decisive declaration, which set him perfectly at rest—Thy presentiment was true, in a deeper sense than thou canst now comprehend; *I am He* who knoweth no sin, *but for that very reason* come I in the likeness of sinners to this baptism. And it is to all the world, that shall receive this word, an all-inclusive testimony of the Lord, concerning his own office and ministry as the restorer of righteousness to sinful men.

To fulfill *all* righteousness: this has a large and lofty sound in the lips of a man, of an Israelite, who will speak the truth. And it shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us (Deut. vi. 25). For no man ever in Israel could say, that on account of sin, which yields not to the commandment, therefore is the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins at the end of the economy of the law. He who now comes to this baptism, is not a sinner, but a righteous man who neither needs repentance nor pardon. It is he who for us fulfills all righteousness, who, born of a woman and made under the law which was given to the unrighteous, has already hitherto observed and performed all the commandments of the Lord to Israel; *and for that very reason* now subjects himself also to that baptism which was ordained of God as the concluding commandment of the old covenant, through which is the transition to the new. He received circumcision, though born without the foreskin of the heart; he was redeemed as the first born, though himself the Redeemer; in all probability he offered every sacrifice which was required of an Israelite (as we see in one instance, at least—that of the Passover), though himself the propitiatory and paschal Lamb, the archetype and substance of all these shadows; he visited the temple and the synagogue, he humbly submitted to every custom and ordinance in Israel, and even, when no sin attached to them, to those which were not ordained of God; so likewise must he be baptized "into the coming Messiah," which is nevertheless himself, just as he is the prophet to prepare his own way. In this *now*, therefore, there is a terminating point, not yet absolutely the last, but certainly a typical and preliminary terminating point of his obedience to the Law. In this baptism, inasmuch as it was the last external commandment of God to Israel, *all* righteousness was *fulfilled* by him.

The Lord might now have said again, as he said before—*I must;*—for the same innate necessity, in the obedience of the Father, prompted him now, it belonged to the same unity of his whole life. Because, however, the question is now especially concerning an external transaction, and because he would obviate the scruple of John as to the *propriety*, the fitness, the becomingness of that which was about to take place; he adopts this expression, *It becometh* us by all means! This embraces, besides the obvious reply to the plain question, a concealed testimony to the final principle of the whole course of his self-renunciation and self-substitution in the likeness of sinners. For all the first words of our Lord, especially, have so profound a background of meaning. The πρέπον, *it becometh*, is not simply used as it often stands in the New Testament (Eph. v. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 10), but in the full and sublime sense of Heb. ii. 10, vii. 26. It *seemed fit* to the righteous Father, that the

* Presentiment, not full revelation as in Luke i. 43. So far, therefore, Braune is not *quite* correct, "As formerly the mothers, so now the sons stand before each other." Many suppose, contrary to the whole connection of the text, that the Baptist spoke this after the baptism and manifestation! (Ἀφιῆσιν, "*suffered*," Jerome *dimisit*, which Sepp ridiculously maintains against Luther's false translation).

† Certainly with no such "arbitrariness, departing from simplicity and intended for reproof"—as Schleiermacher finds here.

Son in the sinner's stead should in a human obedience bring back their righteousness: within this boundary of thought did the Son himself in his humanity ever reverently confine himself, beyond it he knew and testified nothing. Thus it was also here, when the Baptist, who might not himself become his disciple, but only send disciples to him, was counted worthy to receive an early testimony of the mystery of his atonement which he then afterwards repeated, John i. 29. The preacher of repentance unto the kingdom of heaven expected, indeed, no earthly Jewish Messiah; he understood, as Zachariah's son and the pupil of the Spirit in the wilderness, whatever might be understood by any Israelite, from the word of prophecy concerning him who was to come. But here at the very first does the Lord openly announce to him—Placing myself in the likeness of sinners, *taking their sins upon me*, I shall and will fulfill righteousness for them. So might he have given back the Baptist's word literally—*I have need* (χρειαν ἔχω) to be baptized of thee, I must be baptized with the baptism which is prepared for me (Luke xii. 50). And so would he have spoken, if he had wished to speak to himself alone; but he says not now: Thus it becometh *me*—but *us*.

But how can he say this, and what does he mean? we ask, and all the more earnestly because we have seen that the profoundest significance of this saying concerns himself alone. The most obvious answer is that he thus replies to the separation between them which the humble scruple had expressed—*I* of *thee*, *thou to me!* He designs *now*, first of all, to induce the doubter not merely to suffer him to go down into the Jordan, but also to fulfill the external function of his office upon him, and *baptize* him, even as others. Thus it has this meaning as it regards John—Who art thou then? The preparer of the way, the forerunner. Now *I am He* that cometh after thee; thy presentiment is right; we appertain to one another, each in his office and ministry. In baptizing me, thou fulfillest all righteousness, and closest thine office: to be baptized of thee, is my righteousnes, and belongs to my ministry and the design of my life. What majesty in this word, which immediately silences all scruple; and, at the same time, what a marvellous emulaion of humility between the Lord and his servant; just as afterwards in the eleventh chapter, where the Lord who was to come, places his servant by his side as one who was also come, and of whom the Scripture had also spoken!

But even this does not yet exhaust the meaning of this great word. The baptism of which it speaks, is only in an external and *typical* sense the concluding point of obedience for the fulfiller of all righteousness; it is truly and essentially the true *beginning-point* of that obedience, the consummation of which, in the death of the cross in order to the resurrection, it pretypifies. The Lord does not say—*Herein*, *hereby* it is incumbent upon me finally to accomplish all righteousness—but *thus!* That is an expression of comparison, which points forward to the thing compared. This baptism to which the mature man comes, who till now has loved righteousness and hated iniquity, is his *anointing* to that sacrifice of himself for sinners which now first properly begins (Psa. xlv. 7). As in this baptism by prophetic figure the righteous one places himself among sinners, so was he afterwards baptized with the baptism of death, in which he as the Lamb of God bore our guilt; which was not to him the wages of sin, but the highest meritorious righteousness for us all. As now the Father confirms his righteousness by a voice from heaven, so then in the resurrection the Father justified him as his Son again (Rom. i. 4; Acts xiii. 33). It follows further, that as now the Spirit descends upon him, so then also descended the outpouring of the Spirit for us all; that baptism with the Spirit to which John alluded, without obtaining it below, and concerning which he unconsciously spoke when he said—I have neen to be baptized of thee. All this our Lord clearly saw when he came to the Jordan; and as he finally spoke of his sufferings as a baptism, so does he now already contemplate in baptism his sufferings. For now his wisdom is perfect, and he no more needs to increase in it. In that last word of his childhood the beginning of his consciousness concerning his own *person* broke forth; when this was grown perfect and finally sealed, this decisive *word of his manhood* utters his full consciousness concerning his *work*. This honour is reserved for him, to testify of himself, before the sign from heaven seals his testimony. He presents himself, saying—Behold I come, to do Thy will; before the Father's response—This is my beloved Son! This acceptance and obligation are to him what the confession of sin is to the sinner. Therein our sins are confessed as done away in his righteousness, and *the future baptism* for the true forgiveness of sins, which should be ours by virtue of his baptism, pre-announced.

And because, finally, the baptism which he *thus* prepares for us, finds its consummation only in the essential, actual fellowship of his death and resurrection; we remark, that the "us" in which he includes himself in his humble condescension before John, means in its deepest signification, *us all*. He utters it as the *Son of Man* in the name of humanity, as the forerunner in the name of his own, with whom he here, at the very beginning contemplating the uttermost end, most entirely unites himself.* He indeed is, pre-eminently, the Fulfiller; but all who become participators of his righteousness, fulfill in him and through

* "He desired and received baptism in the name of the *people*," says Nitzsch (*Prakt. Theol.* i. 167), but too concisely. Mark, mereover, what is said there with perfect truth, that he who comes with water and the word of the prophet to fulfill all the types, must also come with *blood*, then finally and fully with the *Spirit*.

him the same righteousness and in the same way. *Thus* it became us to become like him, as it became him in our likeness to overcome sin, and render obedience. This will immediately become manifest in the wilderness of temptation, where the Son of God not as the Son for himself, but as *man*, as the second Adam and the true Israel, spoils, by faith in the word, the power of Satan.

THE FIRST WORDS OF VICTORY OVER THE TEMPTER.

(Matt. iv. 4, 7, 10; Luke iv. 4, 8, 12.)

These three words are, in their ascending connection, to be reckoned as one; and, indeed, as a third *first word*, approaching still nearer to the goal of his being, and drawn from the yet more profound depth of the mystery of God the Father and his Son. As the Son's first word of all concerning the Father, Luke ii. 49, embraced the whole *inner* life of *his own* most essential personality; and the second concerning his righteousness, Matt. iii. 15, the entire *work* of his active and passive obedience *for us;* so now the *fulfillment of all righteousness* in its three great branches, is maintained and asserted against the tempter to unrighteousness. His obedience approves itself in the renunciation of all enjoyment, of all honor, of all possession, in opposition to the prince of this world: thus does he overcome him in the abasement of faith, to which he had descended from his divine power; and leads human nature back to God again, through the selfsame way, by which it had fallen from him. Concerning the temptation of Christ in itself, its innermost ground in the Father's holy justice, its redeeming might and typical signification for us, and especially the Satanic unity of design in the three temptations of the wilderness; we shall enter into no detailed description here. It is our purpose only to expound the words of Jesus, and to direct particular attention to that which is unfolded in them.

But the words of Jesus on this occasion are not new, nor distinctively his own; they are God's words long ago uttered, and taken from the ancient Scriptures, which he as the fulfiller appropriates to himself. This is, at the outset, of great significance. The child had grown and become strong in spirit, had increased in wisdom; the man, arrived at the mature priestly age, and anointed for the inauguration of his office, is now *full* of the Holy Ghost (Luke iv. 1). But as afterwards the first word of the Spirit at the Pentecost was a proclamation of what had been said by the prophet Joel, so here *the first words of the Lord spoken from the Spirit are only quotations from the Holy Scriptures.* He has now learned them entirely, he is a master in the use of them, and will prove himself such first of all, against the enemy, whom the word of truth, which he has perverted into a lie, must again beat down. What virtue and dignity in the holy letter, which, filled with the Spirit of Christ, now becomes only life and truth! Christ makes his appeal when that old "yea, hath God said" is brought against him, not to the heavenly voice which he had just heard, but to the word of God, written in the book of Moses. The living eternal Word himself vests himself in the written word, which in its deepest foundation is written by him and for him. Let men think upon this! Let this be remembered by that theology, which refuses to accept, even from the consciousness of Christ, the entire and full authority of that which was *Holy Scripture* to him.

But he does not confront Satan with any of those many and clear words of prophecy which are written concerning the future bruiser of the serpent's head. Satan well knows these, but does not understand the mystery hitherto folded up in them, the human abasement and self-renunciation of the Son of God, which is indeed the central mystery of all Scripture, and the essential secret of his victory over the enemy. That enemy must first perceive this in its fulfillment. Here in the wilderness for the first time, he earnestly scrutinizes it, at once doubting and trembling; but does not thoroughly penetrate it, for he came again at the cross with his temptations, and once more foolishly brought forward his already repelled "*art thou the Son of God*, then save thyself!" The Lord does not permit himself to meet him with an express—*I am He:* he was indeed, and would thus have shown himself Satan's Lord, but would not then have been his conqueror *for us.* The first word which he opposes to him, says rather—*Man!* It is taken, as is also the second, from the temptation of Israel in the wilderness; for Israel is a type of the Son of Man, the servant of God for righteousness, that One to come, in whom alone that nature is consummated into perfect righteousness, which in all men else is ever sinking into deeper sin. Adam stood not; Israel after the flesh stood not, when the Lord his God tempted him, but rather like Satan tempted his God: but now comes the second Adam, God's true servant Israel, through whose obedience the way of life is made known, and actually thrown open—that man truly lives by the power and in the strength of the eternal word.

As Eve in the beginning rightly opposed the tempter with "*God had said,*" but alas did not persist therein; even so now the Lord, but he holds firm. Satan knows well the word of God, and must admit its force; when

in full faith and entire obedience it is used in answer against him, the might of his lying delusion is broken. Satan will challenge the wonderful power of God in nature; and his Son, if he be truly such, should make stones out of bread: but *this* is not the power which drives him out of that human nature, in which he now sees with doubting astonishment the eternal Son standing before him. *That* at least the bold challenger knew full well, and he knew it still better, who was come to be victor in this fight. *Christ answered and said*, placing himself as man in the obedience of faith. Thus and not otherwise *does God reply to the Devil*, and indeed through Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man. He himself in his humility—submitting to be tempted in order to conquer—is that living answer of God to Satan, which in holy right resists and casts out Satan's right to humanity. Satan must now learn this, and has not finished learning it yet; for he has not even yet betaken himself to his darkness again, but continues, and will continue to tempt the members of the Head with the same temptation, until he shall also in them all be overcome and condemned.

The first temptation, which through our earthly body is most obvious to universal human nature, is that of seeking the *enjoyment* and *nourishment* of *life* against the will of God and independently of his gift; to make for ourselves our *bread* in the misuse of God's power, entrusted to us over the lower nature and the creature. Our own age exhibits the development of this in those mimic miracles which seek the world's dominion by the industry which conquers nature. Man entering into this temptation, would eat, as the son of God, that of which God has said—Thou shalt not eat of it. That was the case in paradise, even without hunger, and in the midst of the enjoyment of all the fruits of the garden of Eden which were not forbidden; and in the first fall every other was wrapped up. It was exhibited again, especially, when Israel cried in the wilderness, If we are God's people, why have we not bread and flesh at his hands according to our desire? Then did God humble his son Israel, and suffered him to hunger, to show him what was in his heart. The true salvation from this unbelief could not then yet appear, it was only typically *made known* to the unbelievers, that man doth not live by the creature—bread, but by the word of God. Here in Christ, who abundantly makes good what fallen man has turned to evil; who in voluntary abnegation fasts, in entire obedience hungers, and is thus released from the creature, in which Adam was sinfully held captive; here in Christ does that ancient word written concerning manna, find its new and complete significance—that for the sake of which it was before provided in the Holy Scripture.

Man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live. Continually, and in a thousand ways, has the Spirit since then used and applied these words among the children of God, and every interpretation which the Spirit truly puts upon it, is included in its meaning. For this he caused it to be written in the prophecy of Moses, and then to be used in reply to the arch-liar by the lips of the Fulfiller. We seek now only to indicate briefly the leading principles of its interpretation.

Bread is in its general acceptation the food of man's life, regularly appointed for him as the creature instrument of the Divine word of creation and preservation—Thou shalt live thereof (Gen. i. 29; iii. 19; Psa. civ. 14). (The Book of Wisdom [xvi. 26] says instead, —It is not the growing of fruits that nourisheth man). To this stands opposed כָּל-מוֹצָא, פִּי-יְהוָה *every* (*word*) *that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord* (Deut. viii. 3); that is, most obviously, as was demonstrated in the case of Israel in the wilderness, any particular word of commandment or will issuing from the power of the Creator and Preserver, which becomes what man may live upon;—any kind of food given independently of the established order of things, as was the miraculous manna. But such manna itself, again, is only a veil of God's power; a pledge and symbol which is condescendingly reached forth to weak faith, in order that there may be something in man's mouth. Wherefore does God work miracles, and not leave man only and entirely to live upon ordinary bread, but thus oftentimes create a new thing for him? That he may make man know that even in the ordinary and natural course it is by no means nature and the creature which have and give the life, but Himself alone. *Even in bread* man lives not by bread only; for is not the life more than meat? Is not the word, the will, the power of God in everything; so that we do not inhale our very breath from the air, but from the breath of God? "*Word*" does not stand as such in the Hebrew text, but is taken here from the old exegetical translations (the Septuagint). What is the כָּל-מוֹצָא, פִּי-יְהוָה *that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord*, of which Moses wrote? The breath of the creating effluence from the eternal Power and Godhead, the *Spirit*, in and of whom all *life*, even bodily life, consists (Num. xvi. 22; Psa. civ. 29, 30). But the Spirit goes out indeed only in one prepared form, and that form is the *word*. In the deepest meaning of the essential and only truth, which ever contradicts the lie of Satan, all *things* in the world, after their kind, are only variously embodied words of the Creator, inasmuch as by his mighty word alone they are upheld in being. (Hence דָּבָר and *ῥῆμα*, *word*, in the Scripture signify also *thing*.) "God does not speak grammatical vocables, but true essential things. Thus *sun* and *moon*, *heaven* and *earth*, *Peter* and *Paul*, *Thou* and *I*, are nothing but words of God" (Luther). Thus the creature lives not by any other creature, any

more than it lives of itself, but because, and how and of what God will. Therefore the first meaning of the saying of Jesus here—obvious in its profoundness—is: "I commit the sustentation of my life entirely into the hands of God." Moses in the presence of the Lord needed neither bread nor water for forty days (Exod. xxxiv. 28). The man Jesus died not in forty days' fast; but then only at length, when the strength of the Spirit returned to him that there might be place for temptation, felt he hunger.

But we penetrate deeper with the question, which is not always one of simple unbelief—How may this be? and how is this to be understood? Then we may reasonably ask—What is *man?* Not the body with its earthly, animal soul, but the true and proper man, that is, the living spirit which came forth from God, which only *lives* in and by the Spirit of God, which continually goes forth as Word for the preservation of the creature. Even as the body—the abiding product of its soul—only subsists through a continual formative impulse of corporeity, so do the body and soul of *man*, as of a *living* soul in the moulded dust of the earth, subsist only by the *Spirit*. The outer man lives by the inner, as this again by the word of God. Shouldst thou say—By *bread*, and determine in any case to have it, and in thy hunger to procure it for thyself, even at the cost of disobedience—any way thou canst or the tempter places it at thy hand; then art thou captive in that idolatry and delusion, which serves the creature with and instead of the Creator (Rom. i. 25). Then art thou in the way to worship the arch-liar, who promises to give that of which God ever continues the sole giver and Lord.

Nor think that thou *livest* at all as *man*, that is, according to thy pure creation as a son of God, in his image, if thou art finding a so-called life of thine own hand in the greatness of thy way (Isa. lvii. 10). For thou art dead in trespasses and sins, although the bread and the pleasures of the world should plentifully abound to thee. Here belongs, further, that most true sense of this sacred saying, according to which it is preached to those who only labor for the perishable bread of this world, and seek not the everlasting bread of God. But this leads us further and further; and "*not alone*" vindicates again the true life of man in God, against such as in their error cleave to any institution of the means of life, as if it was not God alone in them that gave them efficacy. As a general rule the word of God, externally written and preached, is given for the food of the inner man; but inasmuch as the living word of God in the word, is the true word, thou mayest, if it be his will, without Scripture and preaching, live by his Spirit; without intercourse with brethren, be connected with the Church; even without the physical bread of the sacrament, receive nevertheless the heavenly bread. Every manna given by God in the creature form, is a witness that points beyond itself to the immediate outgoing of God's life for the life of man, out of God's mouth into the *believing mouth* of man.

So does the letter of the writen word testify here in the believing mouth of Christ, to its own most essential Spirit. And the Lord, at the same time that he avows himself to be man in the life of God, gives *to Satan* the true and mysterious answer as to *who himself* is; and that is the last and profoundest sense which makes the old word his own, and transforms it into a *new* word, now fully for the first time exhibited in its truth. Christ, verily, is the *original man*, recovered from the fall, Adam and the Son of God in one. The Son of God gave himself to human nature, and incorporated himself with it; Satan's temptation would (for he now first half understands this) detach him from it again, and thereby destroy his *mediatorial nature* through something, which *for it* would have the nature of sin. Art thou, poor hungry child of man, the Son of God? Then use thy might! But he has wrapped up his might in entire self-renunciation, in order to overcome the enemy, and thus he does overcome him in simple human faith. He is himself the bread come down from heaven to give unto the world everlasting life, and shall he make for himself bread out of stones for his own proper life? Against the tempter's challenge—Art *thou*—he only binds himself more firmly to us all: I am man, I am humanity, I am mankind! (Just as that *us* is used in Matt. iii. 15.) There is, indeed, a twofold nature in humanity, the earthly Adam and that which came forth from God in him; but both in their inseparable *unity* constitute the proper *man*, and as such he is re-established in Christ, the God-man. That *in him Adam lives entirely by the Logos*—is the last and super-abounding fulfillment of the meaning of this word, which thus goes far beyond its application for the instruction of poor fallen man.

Satan has not yet fully apprehended what was said to him; for it penetrates too deeply into that eternal original truth, from which he is fallen, and which he no longer desires to understand: yet he is not repelled, but rather stimulated to a renewed and more earnest attack. The tempter comes again—for this is his manner, and the second temptation proceeds very much like the former. The deceiver had taken his position upon a word of God (Thou art my beloved Son!), though only to pervert it as the deducer of false consequences; he still persists in this method. Holdest thou so firmly to that which is written? Then I know yet another word, which will suit thee well. Dost thou expect, strong in thy faith, the miraculous help of thy God, even as only man? Then, instead of waiting and hungering here in the wilderness—for thou art, nevertheless, the Son of God, and to that I hold—wilt thou not spring down from the pinnacle of the temple among the people, as if thou camest down from heaven, and thus

announce thyself with becoming dignity? Thus both the half-mocking audacity, and the impious enticing cunning of the tempter became more intense. He knows the letter of Scripture, and may also use it for temptation, just as he has free access to the Holy City and the Temple. He takes his word from that Psalm of faith's offence and defence against his own hellish might (Psalm xci. 5, 6, 13), which may have already in times past done him much injury; and designs in his malice and presumption to turn that well-known promise of angel-protection for mortal man, to the destruction of this wonderful Son of Man, who in this conflict will assume to be nothing more. But the Lord answers him, in words which are for ever the true defence and reply to every one-sided perversion of a saying of Scripture: *It is written again!* This *πάλιν, again*, does not mean *contra, on the other hand;* for no one word of the Bible contradicts any other: but it simply signifies that one Scripture teaches us how to understand and use another. We are only fully armed against the cunning of Satan, who presses upon us with isolated and wrested sentences of the Bible, when we are thoroughly grounded in a clear perception of the inner unity of the whole Scripture, which supplements itself and explains its own meaning. Our Forerunner teaches us here to use the word as our weapon in our own succeeding warfare, and teaches us especially to lay hold upon this "*again* it is written!" Moreover, Satan's perversion consisted not in this, that he would have the *figurative* expression taken *literally*, for that is here actually permitted to faith in God's word, and Jesus acknowledges without contradiction this interpretation; but the *again* instructs us in the qualification which averts its abuse.

Jesus continues near to his first quotation. The Lord proved in the wilderness his people Israel (Deut. viii. 2), whether they would tempt him or not, and alas! Israel many times *tempted* his God; so that afterwards in warning reference to the past, it was said to him by Moses—*Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God* (Deut. vi. 16). Wherein consists the tempting of God on the part of man? It is the complete opposite of the seeking in faith, of the waiting upon God in the obedience and confidence of trust, a self-willed demand of the mighty help of God; and, consequently, unbelief, disobedience, and distrust are its innermost principles. Thus did the children of Israel demand flesh for their souls (that is, according to their own lusts), and said, Can God furnish a table in the wilderness? So limited they the Holy One of Israel (Psa. lxxviii. 18, 19, 41), and put him arrogantly to the test:—as now, if he does this according to our will, it shall be well. The manna was before their eyes, and further supplies might come from the word and command of God: but they anticipated, by the word of their own self-will, the word of God upon which they should wait; and this is tempting God. This would the Lord have done now, if he had challenged the angel-guard of his God according to the promise, in order to his passage through the air, which was not his prescribed way according to the divine guidance. As he might not himself make bread for himself, so neither could he seek such a way. Satan's cunning omitted "*in all thy ways:*"* our Lord, however, did not think fit to point out and dwell upon this omission; but instead of such discussion, he set another decisive word of Scripture over against that which had been quoted. The Lord knows his own way, the way of humility and not of vain-glory; the way of waiting upon his God, and not of premature running and anticipation of his will: therefore, the word that is written, remains ever a lamp to his feet.

Every sin in its innermost principle is, properly speaking, a tempting and challenging of God: since he, who should obey, tests the Almighty whether the way of his own self-will shall not prosper. But then, particularly, when the unbelief and disobedience of self-will presses forward in what is false presumption, though seemingly only a firm confidence in promised assistance, as if God must and should hearken to it; this is the masked aggravation of sin, to which Satan here allures. Uncalled reformers, daring enthusiasts, even actual miracle-workers of their own will and for their own honor, have all fallen into this sin, because they have forgotten the word of the Master spoken here in faith and obedience. What if before the eyes of men they have prospered at first in their airy way, it is not because angels have borne them up, but the prince of darkness (who would, it may be, have carried the Lord also in safety down, even as he had lifted him up), yet only to their final fall into the abyss.

Christ remains Lord over Satan in the simplicity and assurance of his human way according to the word of God. Power over his body may the tempter exercise by the permission of the Father, his spirit remains free and firm in obedience to the truth. If, as we perceived, the first answer struck the right point, and protested against Satan's fundamental lie, that in the creature of itself a life was to be sought; the second answer advances still nearer to the crisis, even as the temptation advanced nearer. If the first answer had already sharply and clearly defined the boundary between the Lord God and his creature (in whose stead, and in whose nature, the eternal Son here stands); the second defines it still more sharply, and gives to Satan a further lesson and one peculiarly appropriate to *him*, which indeed he may not be able to receive. For it is Satan him-

* Luke omits this, though he has *τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε, to keep thee.* When Von Gerlach supposes that this omission should have no stress laid upon it, as it was only meant to say, "wherever thou goest"—he most injustifiably presses down the everywhere profound word of Scripture to the narrow limits of our ordinary human speech.

self who in the permitted abuse of his angel-power, for deceit and destruction against the word and will of God, absolutely and now in the most unreserved manner, *tempts the Lord his God.* Therefore did Christ change the letter of the Scripture, and say, *Thou* shalt not; although it is written in Moses, *Ye* shall not tempt. This is the very power of the *Spirit* in the weakness of the tempted one, that while he only thinks to cover himself and to hide himself in the sheltering, defending word; that same humble word approves itself as a sharp weapon of attack and of judgment against the tempter's pride.

Then does the evil one begin finally to mark that in this *man* he has to do with *the Lord his God*, who will maintain over him his right: yet is he unwilling to admit it. He gathers all his might and greatness for one more last and decisive onset; but the result is that he hears more decisively and openly pronounced that which befitted his own true character. Probably the Lord knew not immediately himself with what kind of person he had directly to do. In manifest bodily appearance Satan cannot, indeed, appear, for such corporeity in him, if it may so be called, would be for us the most frightful horror. Therefore does he disguise and mask himself, now as he had from the beginning—yet still comes as a person. Probably the tempter drew near the first time in human form as a *good friend* and adviser; the second time it may be he showed himself as an *angel of light* who might bear him up in his hands.* The Lord, without much questioning, had both times replied to the Satanic design in the temptation, and mediately therefore to Satan himself; but now the "God of this world" comes forward in his naked grossness with the horrible and undisguised demand—Worship me! If thou altogether declinest to be the Son of God, then serve me for that recompense which is in my power, and which I will give thee! He promises to give that which is not his, that which at least, when held and received from *him*, is perverted from glory into ruin; and the price which he demands is what belongs only to God. Then does the Lord recognize the prince of darkness, the archfiend, whom he has come to eject out of a world that he had usurped; and to whom he can now reply in *his own* might and dignity, as peremptorily as the demand was plain: *Get thee behind me, Satan!* This is necessarily the last temptation and victory; for the order observed by Luke, while it has a meaning of its own, must not regulate here the order of time. For the first and the second are so immediately and strictly connected according to Matthew, that we cannot imagine anything intervening: and the repelled one cannot be supposed to have returned again immediately after the third.*

This "*away from me*" might have been enough. But the humility of the Lord, which itself must have been the keenest condemnation of the father of pride, does him a superfluous honor, and even adds a reason from Scripture. This word is found, again, near to the former (Deut. vi. 13, 14), but is here, in its entire appropriation, more severed than that from its literal connection. In the words which had before fallen from the Lord's lips, *Ye* shall not tempt, had become, *Thou* shalt not tempt, for himself and at the same time for the Devil; but now it refers especially and in all significance to the Devil alone; according to Christ's conscious purpose, when he fell back in this encounter, upon that great central word and fundamental commandment of the whole Old Testament, yea of the whole Scripture: *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*† This answer forms one of the sublimest, most comprehensively significant critical moments in the history of his kingdom: and is the most distinctive and definitive *explanation* with Satan. Luther ventured with a good intention to add his well-known little word *alone* to the sacred text (Rom. iii. 28); and in justification of this addition, the Lord's example has been appealed to, who here does the same. But it is not entirely the same, even apart from the difference between our Lord and *Luther* as to supplementing the word of God. The false emphasizing of "faith alone" wrought much evil in the Church from that time, till men learned to acknowl-

* Lange, indeed, thinks that such mask-work and illusion must have been quite ineffectual upon Christ, the pure One, just as children are not deceived by such jugglery in tales. But the self-renunciation of Christ, and the Father's counsel to give him up to temptation, are on such a supposition quite forgotten. Might not the same argument be used against the anguish and the obscuration at Gethsemane and at the cross? To show all the kingdoms of the world at one glance was, undoubtedly, an illusion, for the letter of Luke's account knows nothing of "highly colored description, which turned a high and extensive prospect in the wilderness to a symbolical account."

* The *apostolical* authority of Matthew decides the literal truth of his connection; Luke arranges the events, evidently, according to another point of view. *Τότε παραλαμβάνει, πάλιν παραλαμβάνει, τότε ἀφίησιν* (*then—again—then*), in Matthew import something more than Luke's mere *καί, and.* He, in his account, has the two places in his view and joins them—first wilderness and mountain, afterwards returning to the second: —and he had brought him (already between the two) even to the pinnacle of the temple! The well-considered omission in Luke of the *ὕπαγε κτλ., get thee*, etc., is worthy of notice; for (as Alford remarks) he could not well have left these words in his inverted account.

† See the connection Deut. vi. 4, 14: and Samuel's "Serve him *only!*" (1 Sam. vii. 3). Hence it is in the LXX. and Vulg: *αὐτῷ μόνῳ*, illi soli. Even if this *μόνῳ, only*, of Luke originated in the LXX., yet we have it also authentically in Matthew.

edge, that James' not "strawy" epistle is also 'right" with its enforcement—not through faith alone. But to worship the Lord *alone*, to serve one God *alone* is absolutely necessary to the high and stern truth of this Scripture; and this *alone* can never be too rigorously brought forward in the contest with the lie of idolatry in all its forms. It rejects all the pleasures, power, and glory of the *whole world** as soon as this rises against its Creator; and here, at the close, upholds the *worship* of the one Eternal independently of and above the world. In the beginning of the temptation this distinction between God and his creature was not so express, but in the "*not* by bread *alone*" the creature holds its proper place through the immanence of the creating Word.

One of the most profound among the many views of the process and connection of the history of the Temptation, (all of which may be more or less right according to its many-sided truth), or the most essential extract of its spirit, appears to us that of Zinzendorf, who deduces lessons from it concerning the *mysteries, the right understanding, and the fundamental truths* of the word of God.† The mystery—If thou be the Son of God—is brought forward at the wrong time and in a wrong application by the tempter; therefore the Lord opposes to it that other mystery, which was suited to the occasion. The apprehension of the promised angel-protection, though right in itself, is used partially and turned to temptation; therefore the Lord shows the truth in its completeness, by exhibiting its other side. Finally, when the arch-liar overturns the fundamental truth, that God alone is to be worshipped; the Lord can only re-erect it by asserting it simply again. For, to quote Hamann: "The victory of men over Satan is then most easy, when he most plainly reveals himself. The ten commandments, if they are written in our heart, and we use them in defence against him, will ever drive him away."

Thus, for this reason, do the conqueror and the conquered separate—symbol and type of all future temptation of the Head and the members. The original fundamental truth, in which Satan stood not fast, and which he never more will learn or can, comes to him, as his judgment from the mouth of this humble Son of Man. While the Son of God as man worships and serves with us, he reveals himself as the Lord and God of the god of this world, who, instead of worshiping has tempted him in vain. From this time forward the Devil knew Jesus (Mark i. 24–34, iii. 11, v. 7.)

Thus also is the distinction established between the Redeemer from Satan's power, the rightful King of the whole earth, to whom the ends of the world had been already given by the Father (Psalm ii.); and that false Messiah whom carnal Israel, through fellowship with the deceiving idolatry of the world, had learned to expect. What an earthly-glorious Jewish Messiah would then have been, Antichrist, the Man of Sin, will in the last days actually exhibit, and with an open rejection of the name of God. The time is come and now is, when the worship of the ancient, secular Jehovah, as he revealed himself in the Old Testament should cease, he having through his incarnate eternal Son wrought our redemption; the father of lies offers to men the *glory of this world*, and all who consent to his lie, thereupon abase themselves to worship *him*, concerning whom, nevertheless, they desire to know nothing. But he has here thus early exposed and discovered himself, constrained by Christ; and *all* who abide in the way of Christ, are equipped with the sure armor of that word of truth which he himself first victoriously proved.

THE FIRST WORDS OF THE MASTER TO THE FIRST DISCIPLES.

(John i. 38, 39, 42, 43, 47, 48, 50, 51,)

All this was certainly spoken and done *after the temptation*, for the baptism recorded by John, ver. 32, was immediately followed by the Spirit's leading into the wilderness. This also was now past, and the mission to the Baptist in ver. 19, did not take place until the fortieth day at least, because the testimony, vers. 20—27, cannot have been uttered before the baptism of Jesus. John deems himself not yet authorized to announce publicly him who was to come; but waits till that mysterious one who had retired from the Jordan into the desert returned to him again, which he probably did as soon as the victory in the wilderness was achieved. When he saw him once more, he could *point him out*, ver. 29. Further, those pregnant words, "There standeth One among you, whom ye know not," obviously imply, *I know him* now as erewhile I *knew* him not. So clearly is established the real harmony of the Gospels when they are rightly read. Τῇ ἐπαύριον, *the next day*, in vers 29, 35, 43 successively, can only retain its consecutive and unbroken sense when we regard them as following, not only the day of the baptism, but the forty days of the temptation also. To forget this, as the most recent expositors have glaringly done, and insert

* Not excluding even the remark, that enjoyment entices the youth, honor the man, and possession or power, finally, the old.

† In the *Discourses*, which he delivered in 1742 as Pastor at Philadelphia in Pennsylvania.

them between vers. 28 and 35, is entirely to contradict the chronology of our evangelist, which preserves the strictest coherence.*

The vanquisher of Satan, to whom the angels ministered—the Lamb of God and God's own Son, walks in sublime silence by the Jordan, waiting for the future guidance and direction of his Father. He has come back to the Baptist, for he knows that himself must not first utter—*I am He*—in the presence of the people of Israel; but that his forerunner must bear witness of him, and that his testimony was now ready. The first day passes—John points to him as he thus walks, and directing attention to his whole appearance and bearing said, *Behold*—This is he! Not one of the marvelling and inwardly musing hearers, however, ventures to follow him. But when on the next day the testimony to Jesus still walking thus, is repeated—Behold the Lamb of God!—its meaning is then understood—the two disciples at that time with John begin to follow the Lamb. Only two indeed at the first, but in them we see the first strivings of the great impulse of all after *following*. Another new and sublime initiatory crisis! Beginning of the congregation of disciples, and inauguration of the great teacher into his office; not indeed as yet in public ministration to the people, but according to the appointed and unostentatious procedure of his course, in gentle words to those who are first gathered around his presence. These *first words of the teacher and master* bear upon them that express and wonderful stamp of majesty in lowliness and lowliness in majesty, which is impressed upon the whole of his subsequent speech and action. They commence with the most simple utterances of human language, springing up, apparently, from the circumstances of the moment. What will ye? come, then, and see! But when we think *whose mouth* uttered these words, we perceive the beginning of the shining forth of his glory in them: and soon, indeed, does the word of the Master rise to its full dignity in giving the new name, in piercing the hidden heart, in disclosure of what was secret, and in the promise of yet greater things. The whole, moreover is brief and sufficing, simple and clear, wiih no more words than arise out of the occasion. But these are spoken in lowliness as profound as their majesty is sublime: while they have their simply human and external aspect, they have a profoundly significant and majestic background. These first words to the seeing and hearing disciples have their own glory, full of grace and truth—before the days of mighty miracles and preaching. These also verily are spirit, and they are life.

John saw Jesus *walking*, in silent meditation; waiting for his hour, and his Father's command; in full preparation for the world and its sin; equipped for his testimony to the truth with that armor, which has been tested and approved in his first great conflict, and for the utterance of those new words of God, which the Father has given him. The two disciples had heard the Baptist speak of him, and have so far understood his words, that they now vehemently desire to be the disciples of the true, the higher Master. They follow him in silence, venturing on no address, nor any introduction of their own. But Jesus is conscious in his spirit of the hour that has now come, and *turneth*—beautiful picture for the devout pencil of the artist! Will not some one now come to me? Such a question lay in that *turning*—springing from his consciousness that the time was now come, and from the longing of that love which would soon call all men to himself. Then *looketh he* upon the two, as the first given him of the Father, and opens his mouth in affectionate words. But however humanly and humbly he may begin to speak, yet must what he says become at this *crisis* and from *his* lips, an *involuntary revelation of the deep significance which lives in the high and peculiar passage of this crisis*. He cannot, and he will not avoid this: he knows full clearly with what deep meaning he speaks. If we may so stammer our human thoughts concerning him, in whom all is human as well as divine—a certain struggle between his dignity as God and his humility as the Son of Man, resolves itself into a most profound concert of both. Like a true master, he will not at the very first speak words of instruction to his coming disciples, but rather awake and excite their own consciousness. Thus will he commence their training as disciples. The *question-word* with which he begins will be found to have a latent fulness of meaning, conveying an essential truth which is applicable to all who ever come to him; and leading immediately to that *word of invitation* which is the germ and type of all his future exhortation and teaching.

Τί ζητεῖτε; What seek ye? What will ye? that is, though he designedly omits to say so, of me? with me? Wherefore come ye thus behind me? Spoken with any other tone and look, this question would not have had more than the ordinary meaning with which we may suppose a man asking it in such circumstances; it would have been even repulsive—What would you seek in my footsteps? leave me to my own way!* With his look and tone, on the contrary, it already glides by a gracious transition into the following *Come!* Yet is there

* Hence the unbelieving criticism of *this* method of harmonizing protests that John makes the insertion of the history of the temptation after the baptism impossible. There is but one true answer to this: the baptism and the temptation precede ver. 19. The evangelist confines himself here, as before in vers. 7 and 15, to the subsequent testimony of the Baptist. Compare Gemberg's remarks, in allusion to Schleirmacher (*Stud u. Krit.* 1845, i. 105).

* As a late bishop of the Moravian Brethren, when one following would join him as he walked, with the question, "Wherefore thus alone?" made answer, "I would rather be so." Not so the Lord.

a distinction between them. That first word of all contained a solemn *question*, designed to penetrate the hearts of those who are coming: and this must not be lost sight of in the invitation. He whom they seek, and who is the object of the unconscious seeking of all humanity, he who afterwards stands before the whole world and testifies, "Come ye all unto me and find rest to your souls"—he says not now, *Whom* seek ye? For whom do ye take me, that ye thus seek to be near me? Although this is involved in the matter, he does not express it, but as yet conceals that great "*I am He*" (which might have been the response to the Baptist's "this is He!"); and speaks apparently as if there were nothing in him to seek, in order that they, again, may bethink themselves how all is to be sought and found in him. He thinks not first of himself, but first of those who are coming to him. Those only who *seek* come truly to him, but as they come they are met by the testing word—*What* seek ye? And wherefore from me? First must we in some degree know, by the revelation of the ground of our hearts through the face of the Searcher of hearts turned full upon us, and be taught by the question which he asks, *What* it is that we as men and sinners seek and need: then shall we more and more discover that it is only himself whom we seek, because in him all that man seeks is found. It is our Lord himself, in general ever seeking the lost till he finds them, who meets us in our own way, with that first word of the divine manifestation, which would not give the sinner up: Adam, where art thou? Strive not so hard after death in the error of thy life! Seekest thou to live? Thou shalt not find it in departing from me; return therefore to me as I return to thee. But here are Israelites coming to him, disciples of John, prepared in the old covenant of preparatory grace, by the hidden Christ, for the Christ revealed, when he should come. And now that he is come, they come to meet him, and should know well the fit answer to the first question of the Lord. John and Andrew heard it, too, but they reflect not immediately upon the inner significance of this startling question, as John may have understood it, from their subsequent report. They simply reply as well as they can to its most obvious meaning. They could not yet say—"We seek the Messiah, thyself"—until they had already begun to find him. That remained secret in the depth of their consciousness. But because Jesus stands so *humanly* before them, they are bold to speak in human language—"Rabbi," that is, we would be thy disciples. This would have sufficed as their self-dedicatory profession, Thou art our Master. His question, however, was so gracious, that they gather confidence to go farther—*Where lodgest thou?* That is, we would this day enter into thy nearer fellowship, we would be with thee, hear thee, and learn of thee. The direct answer is concealed in their words, and it is from a right feeling of mingled reverence and shame, that they hold it back—Behold, thou art the Lamb of God, and the Son of God; we are sinners of the world, Israelites who wait for thee, and expect from thee all that our souls yet need. If their counter-question seems to have in it something of uncourteous abruptness—yet how profoundly humble is it, and how full of *trust!*

He said unto them, *Come and see!* If that first word might have been construed by one who was excessively timid, or one who was insincere, into a repulse; this second carries with it its immediate tone of permission, and friendly acceptance—Ye are welcome to me;—but its deepest tone is much more than merely *permission.* He who has come speaks in gracious invitation and with the gentle command of love: Come! and we catch here already the key-note of his preaching and doctrine. *Behold*—the Baptist had said—and now they shall *behold.* The challenge to come *and see* was an ordinary manner of speech in common life: but in some circumstances used with great solemnity, as of the grave of Lazarus (John xi. 34); with great majesty in the Canticles (iii. 11) concerning the magnificence of King Solomon; as in the Revelation (vi. 1, 3, 5, 7) of the heavenly visions—and in the Psalms (lxvi. 5; xlvi. 9) concerning the wonderful works of God. It was at the same time the common saying of the Rabbi to his disciples (as frequently in the Talmud, בּוֹא רְאֵה, *i. e.*, Come and let it be explained to thee). They came and saw *where he abode*—but their Lord had more than merely *where* in his view. They tarried with him, as John adds with emphasis, and saw all they might see in him, his glory full of grace and truth, they tasted and saw that the Lord was gracious (Psalm xxxiv. 9); they beheld in faith the heaven open upon the Son of Man, ves. 50, 51. All this the Lord promised them in that lowly-sublime invitation, which conceals his majesty, yet permits some rays of it to pierce through: Come, *and ye shall* see, experience, receive, and find all that ye seek.* That is the rule and process of his discipleship; the immediate and self-evidencing testimony of the truth in Christ, as Philip, an apt scholar, begins at once to use it against Nathanael's doubt, ver. 46. This is the sum of the apologies, the missionary appeal to all the world; the testimony of every true divine, of John the evangelist, as of John the forerunner, who having himself seen, can bear his witness against all the perverse blindness of unbelief.

What the two who came so readily, found or saw or heard at that time, is buried in silence; it was so much, however, that Andrew can already testify to his brother Simon—We have found the Messiah! When this third, afterwards to be first, comes forward, we hear another word of the Master, still more author-

* Bruno Bauer's cunning eye detects here "feeble pomp, empty superfluity," and is sure that Jesus never could have spoken thus.

itative and majestic. Jesus looked upon *him* and said—*Thou art Simon, the son of Jonas*—I know thee, who and what thou art, from thy birth till thy present coming to me! The allusion which has been over-critically detected in the etymology of the old name in its allusion to the new, we mention and leave undecided: the *hearer*, disciple, heretofore son of the timid *dove*, which flies among the rocks, shall become the sheltering *rock* of the dove. So lately, again, Lange,* although the reading Ἰωάνου, Ἰωάννου is not lightly to be rejected. Enough, that in this place, the design and reference is especially to the *new* disciple-name, and *such* allusion and antithesis can scarcely be deemed consonant with the dignity of the occasion. *Thou shalt be called Cephas*—I now give thee thy new name; for I know what I shall make thee in my discipleship and for my kingdom! Be *my* "disciple" henceforth, and out of what thou *art*, thou shalt *become* something new. The new name which he gives is, first of all, the revelation in the light of his own countenance of Simon's peculiar and natural character, as in the case of the sons of thunder (Mark iii. 17); it specifies his danger and the temptation of his inborn nature, and also its transformation and sanctification in the new birth. Thus it is given as a promise as well as a warning. He who receives his new name from the Lord, and well sustains it, will become that to which he is called. As in the Old Testament, Jehovah, in his supreme authority, gave the new names of promise, *Abraham* and *Israel;* so also now does the Son in his Father's power, and marks out *Peter* here as an originator, to lay the foundation, and as a spiritual progenitor of the new people of God in the similitude of those two great public persons. As "Israel" indicates penitent, wrestling praying faith, so "Peter" refers to the confession, and the building of the church upon the profession and testimony—although it is the Lord himself who makes Peter, and all who are like him, the foundation upon which he himself builds.

Rising still higher in its tone of authority, is the word of the Master to Philip; whom he finds and to whom he forthwith gives a direct summons—Follow me! It appears, at first, like a second "Come and see," but has a farther reach of meaning. It expresses in one word the whole disciple-life of all who have come and have seen, and is the early type of all that is wrapped up in the same oft-repeated call, and of that which is connected with it when it is last heard at the close of the gospel of John (xxi. 19, 22).

And now comes the fifth in this rapid formation of the first circle of disciples†—Nathanael. He is not placed in the first rank of influence, but coming as he now does in virtue of the preparing grace which he had received, he may be regarded rather than Peter, or even than John (who has here faithfully recorded the praise with which his Master's lips greeted *him*) as the fittest type of all disciples—such as the Lord will receive and greatly rejoice over when they come to him. Ah that they all were such! The precipitancy of this hasty question which only catches at the last word—Can any good thing come out of Nazareth? was redeemed from its error by its very sincerity. The error of prejudice, though indeed indirectly connected with sin, does not deepen into the sin of offence as in the case of the other Israelites. Nathanael in Cana, two hours from Nazareth, had no personal knowledge of Jesus—that was certainly not his fault. Jesus now sees him coming just as man should come, seeking, seeking earnestly without guile. O, how few such earnest seekers are there! Here is *a true Israelite in whom there is no guile*, whose sin is already covered, and his iniquity not imputed to him. It is not the humble man himself whom the Lord addresses, for that would not have been as appropriate as in the other instance—*Thou* art Simon—which involved a warning. He spoke to the others *concerning* him (somewhat as the Baptist had spoken about Jesus himself)—Behold, those who come like this man are my joy, these are the disciples whom I would have, thus might and thus ought all Israel to be prepared for me their Messiah.* Though still far from recognizing in the Nazarene the King of Israel, this upright man hears not in vain the "Come and see;" he goes at his friend's suggestion that he may see, and soon is his prejudice lost in his happy experience. This is the sure and direct way to that end. But he who would walk in it to Christ, like Nathanael, must first have gone, through grace, in penitent, wrestling, seeking faith the way of Jacob-Israel: in Jacob's nature, before this first new birth, there is yet deceit and guile. If a sinner, like Zacchæus, believes, the Lord says of him—This also is a son of Abraham. When one who, like Nathanael waiting in preparatory grace for the perfect grace to come, frankly receives what is freely offered to him, the Lord terms him an Israelite indeed, in the purest sense of the word and name. So blessed a commencement of his ministry has the Father prepared for the Son, that in two days five seeking souls are gathered around him—the last, however, the loveliest, whose first misapprehension is at once requited with commendation from his Master's gracious heart.

Nathanael is ashamed and embarrassed; and the more so as he, in his tranquil life, had

* Better, at least, than Sepp's יְגֹנָה, *imbecillitas oppressio.*

† How and by what means? "Nothing but personal influences, few words, trust awakening trust." (So Nitzsch, *Predigten*, vi. Select.)

* Nazareth was even among the Galilæans held in small estimation, nay, despised. More surely is this kind of depreciation signified than—as Alford supposes—out of so small a place so *great* a thing! for it is added—τι ἀγαθόν, what *good* thing?

been intimately known by only a few such as Philip. *Whence knowest thou me?* The doubt and scruple of his pure spirit which shrinks from the Searcher of hearts, is still less displeasing to him than the first surprise on account of Nazareth. If he has seen and spoken to thee, and thou ask him the same question in the same spirit as Nathanael; he will rejoice thereat, and thou shalt soon experience, how entirely he knows and has ever known thee. The inferior human life of the Lord reflects even now the relations of his exalted state, and we see in it even his omniscience and omnipotence; although he was not actively, in his estate of self-abnegation, either omniscient or almighty, any more than every where present. Whence knows he Nathanael? May it have been through an instantaneous revelation of the Father, even as on other occasions, for instance in the case of the Samaritan woman, whose husbands he reckons? Was it, besides this, through that knowledge of man which belongs to the first man, every where penetrating, by a true physiognomy, through the outer into the inner being, and which knows individual men because it knows what was in man? (ch. ii. 24, 25). Neither of these must be entirely excluded here, yet the expression of the Lord, *I saw thee*, points in its simple meaning to something past. As the eyes of the crown prince have been wont silently to seek out the true men in the land, that he may collect them around himself when he ascends the throne; so also had Jesus, during his long eighteen years at Nazareth, the seclusion of which must at least have been broken by the festival journey to and from Jerusalem, most observantly looked around upon men. Hence he knows Simon, to whom he gives his name; Philip also, and Matthew, whom he calls to follow him: so did he also actually with his bodily eyes behold Nathanael under the fig-tree, but at the same time he read the thoughts of his heart with eyes opened by the Father. Therefore does he plainly tell him—I see thee not now, as thou comest, for the first time; reminds him, by the expressive *before that Philip called thee*, of the prejudice against Nazareth which he had manifested (at least thus does Nathanael feel, as the Lord knew); and thus gives him an answer to his question which mightily demonstrates his own divine dignity; *a miraculous word* which goes straight to his heart, as if the all-knowing One himself should speak—I know thee from everlasting, I penetrate thee through and through. And here is *pretypified* how *now* "Christianity grounds the claim to be entirely trusted in for the revelation of the divine treasure to faith, upon the immediate experience of every conscientious man; since as soon as it is known, it seizes him by a glance that penetrates him through and through."* Nathanael's exclamation, "*Rabbi*," thou art more than Rabbi, more than many in Israel deem the Messiah to be, "thou art the *Son of God*," is uttered with a feeling akin to that in Psalm cxxxix—Lord thou hast searched me and known me! Thou knowest all that pertains to me, that which even Philip knows not, what I thought known to God alone.

An Israelite in the kingdom of the king of Israel was said to dwell under his fig-tree (1 Kings iv. 25). But in speaking thus distinctively of the fig-tree under which he had seen Nathanael, the Lord's meaning went beyond this proverbial use of the expression, and signified more than merely—In thy habitation in Israel. Nathanael understands, as is obvious to remark, something special and mysterious, connected with a time when he had repaired to his fig-tree, not for refreshment and solace, but according to the pious custom in Israel, as a place of meditation, reflection, and prayer. There had been a solemn transaction with his God—quite alone as he thought; the prayer of repentance which left him *without guile*, the prayer of deep longing for the consolation of Israel, and what else Nathanael will reveal to us, when all that has been kept secret becomes known. I saw *thee*—said the Lord—thy inner man before God, the true Israelite in thee. We may receive his word, each one for himself, as the assurance: I have known thee from the beginning in all thy ways! Let every one think of his fig-tree, of the places of his pleasure and his prayer, before he was called to Jesus. He whom his Lord can meet with the testimony: Thou art an Israelite indeed,—may and indeed shall cry out in joyful response: And thou art my King!

Then does the King and the Master, in the last and the sublimest of these his first words of kingly authority, bestow a still further commendation upon Nathanael: he distinctly specifies and praises that one thing, for which his eyes have looked upon from the beginning and ever shall look (Jer. v. 3), with which man must come to him, in order from him to learn it still better—faith.* New, great word of his mouth—*Thou believest!* Well, thou art come in the right way; thou hast longed, and thou hast sought; thou art come, just as Philip asked thee, to come and see; thou hast seen and heard, and because I have said to thee what only I could say, thou believest;—then I say for thy further faith: *Thou shalt see greater things than these!* Yes, verily, this promise holds good in its widest sense for all believers who abide with him: greater and yet greater things shall they continue to see, even up to the last "Blessed art thou who hast believed!"

And now that all the relations of the Master to his disciples may, in this first history

* Beck, *Einleitung in d. System der Christl Lehre.*

* No shadow of "slight blame" here (Von Gerlach)—for such "swiftness" to believe as this, is a precious simplicity, which should not be supposed capable of considering all at once the "necessity of higher evidences."

be shadowed out, his words advance another step in sublime elevation; and we hear his first "*Verily, verily I say unto you.*" But he utters it as the Son of God in the unity of the Father, and not like the prophets—Thus saith the Lord. He utters it with his highest dignity, combined with the gracious condescension of the Son of Man. Hence he appends, as a testimony against unbelief, the "Verily" of swearing by himself; though without it all that he may say must be believed, *even because he has said it.* What follows is spoken to Nathanael, but yet he says "to *you*," for he addresses in the person of Nathanael all his disciples, and gives a promise which is recorded for all who, like Nathanael, come, see, believe, and in that faith abide with him.

Henceforth—after ye have thus become my disciples—shall ye *see*, more and more intimately and gloriously experience, the full meaning of my first word, Come and see. The coming in *faith* leads to the *seeing*, yea ultimately to the *highest vision* of all glory; but this is only through the *being seen*, the being penetrated by his eye. The genuine disciple-faith of the true Israelites, to which his praise and his promise are given, is that which needs no other miracle for its confirmation than the miracle-word of the Searcher of hearts—such was found also in Samaria (ch. iv. 29).

But what is that miracle which, nevertheless, the Lord does here predict? *Ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man.* Was this externally and literally fulfilled to those who heard these words first? By no means, assuredly, else would it have been recorded. We know, however, that both had just occurred—the heaven had been opened upon the Son of Man when he was baptized, and the angels had ministered to him in the wilderness. But the former was seen only by the Baptist; the latter by no man. They were secret and mysterious introductory miracles, designed as testimonies for the Lord himself and not for the world; the visible attesting seals of the Father's voice, which by the Spirit evermore said to his spirit—Thou art my Son. One includes the other as a natural consequence; there, where he now is, is heaven open upon him and for him (John iii. 13); but where heaven is, there must also be the service and commerce of angels. At least we thus understand, that the Lord himself, with all his humiliation and self-renunciation, must have had, since his baptism and temptation, an unveiled view of his Father in heaven, and a sure experience of the presence of the angels around him. What further voices and manifestations from above; what further appearances and interpositions of the ministering spirits occurred to him in the mystery of his solitude, it is beyond our province to determine; but we are justified in presuming that there were such by what is recorded in connection with the mount of transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 5) and the garden of anguish (Luke xxii. 43). But of that transfiguration only the three were the witnesses—not Nathanael, Andrew, or Philip, not all his disciples; and that angel-manifestation was, when it took place, witnessed by no one. The notion that the disciples may have often seen appearances of angels around their Lord as he prayed, or slept, or retired into secret from his enemies, which they have not recorded, belongs to some imaginary and poetical Messiah. When the Lord here promises in general terms that those who had come to him should *from that time forward* (that is, withal, since they occurred to himself at the Jordan and in the wilderness) *see* these things with him; we must not suppose him to have intended it externally and literally, but symbolically. He takes from the first secret miracles (especially from that first one of all, which the Baptist had made known to the disciples, and which the other followed as a consequence), the *expression* by which he signifies all the miracles in general which they should behold with him; and were these not, too, heaven-openings and the service of angels? He teaches them that they are so to be regarded; for they are *signs* and tokens of that open communication which subsists between this *Son of Man* upon earth, and the heavenly powers and messengers. For that reason it is that he terms himself the Son of Man, in the full and pregnant sense of that name, which he henceforward commonly assumes to himself; thereby at the same time responding to Nathanael's confession, ver. 49—"Yes I am the Son of God in humanity." He had made latent reference to Jacob-Israel's history when he spoke of the Israelite without guile; he recurs to it once more, and refers to what once symbolically occurred at Bethel. It is written in Moses, concerning the ladder of heaven, that *the angels of God ascended and descended upon it;* and the disciples could not but think of it when the Lord uttered these well-known words. The first word of instruction, consequently, which begins to unlock the Scripture to them, was designed to teach them in the symbolical style of Holy Writ, "Where I am, there is the reality of its fulfillment, the house of God and the gate of heaven; and this ye shall all see and experience by faith." He who in the old time stood above that ladder with his elect Israel upon the earth below, has now descended as the Son of Man, himself the true and proper Israel, in whom the calling and regeneration of all Israelites is perfected. The angels of God, who were wont to hover about man upon earth (wherefore it was there said—They *ascended* and *descended*), are all now gathered together around the person of the Son of God and the Son of Man, through whom heaven is once more opened to all who believe in him. O how often may we suppose them afterwards at sublime critical moments of the revelation of his glory, and not merely when signs and miracles are wrought, to have recalled these

words; how often was it to their faith, as if they had seen that which he had spoken of! But what our faith thus sees, is truly and really more distinctly seen than with the bodily eye it could be. Fellowship with the unseen world is opened up once more in Christ. This is the first of all the promises which he gave to his disciples.*

THE FIRST WORDS OF DIVINITY AT THE FIRST MIRACLE.

(John II. 4–8.)

What was Mary's design in mentioning that the wine had failed? What would she thereby signify to her son? Assuredly not† the expediency of now breaking up the company, in order to save their kind hosts from being thrown into embarrassment. Such departure before the customary and appointed time would have been still more unbecoming and offensive: besides, our Lord's answer, which certainly must correspond with Mary's thoughts, bears a different application. Neither does so decisive a rejection of his mother's interference befit a single suggestion as to the propriety of departing; nor *concerning that* can we suppose him to have said—My time is not yet come. Furthermore, Mary says not expressly—They have no more wine; but simply—Wine is wanting. But this is only to be understood as conveying a hint, question and supplication: Shouldst thou not have resources and help for this emergency? Is not this the fit hour, to manifest thyself in might of miracle? (By supplying, may it be, the marriage-present omitted by us in our poverty?) Mary has very long, and with constant desire, waited for such a manifestation of her son. He has not yet accomplished any miracles,‡ though greater than Moses and Elias; and she is amply justified in expecting them, especially since the testimony of John and his own public presentation of himself. If the first disciples (in whose company they were at this time) had spoken aught of the promise—"Hereafter ye shall see"—this would have stimulated her expectation to the highest intensity. She is even warranted to infer, from his acceptance of the invitation to the wedding, that he would not deem *such* a first use of his miracle-working power unseemly: she perceives, indeed, with exquisite discernment, the intention of the Lord; his will responds to her prophetic wish. It is her prerogative alone, to be capable of conceiving—before it takes place—the amazing grace and condescension of his *first miracle.*§

And does he, nevertheless, repel her? Does he, nevertheless, rebuke her suggestion, and in such wise as to prevent her from ever so speaking again? He actually accomplished afterwards, what she by gentle insinuation had asked of him—because she divined his thought as no other did; and yet, before he does so, there is this severe, sharp word instead of the glad acknowledgment—Yes, thy thoughts are also my thoughts. Wherefore was this? Because with all that was sound and right in her motive, there is yet mingled a certain human impatience, an over-curious intermeddling with a matter, about which even his mother must now keep silence and wait; the slightest possible touch of the purest womanly-motherly complacency (we know no other word) prompting in her the desire to see *her son* honored in her presence. Because, also, from this time forward, he, in his office and function, may no more be her son; and therefore takes the first occasion to tell her so once and for all. Here lies the deep significance of this *another first word*, by which, conformably with that meet dignity with which his heavenly Father had invested him, he releases and disengages himself from every relation of regard and dependence which, as child, he had sustained to his mother according to the flesh. The holy woman who, after having borne him as virgin, became Joseph's wife and widow, is nothing more than this throughout: nor ever may be more; as in heaven she is not, so neither upon earth. He who is not Joseph's son, but the Son of God, at the very assumption of his prophetic office, and through all its functions, shows that he deems himself not the son of Mary, but him whom the Father had sanctified, and sent into the world. How does the idolatrous fancy of his mother's interposition with him in heavenly mediation, fade away before this clear utterance at the outset! Yea rather, even when she approaches nearest to the inner comprehension of his divine-human purpose, even there will her fallible humanity betray its want of perfect harmony: and the Spirit of the Father in him, provident for futurity, prompts this solemn, and earnest, and decisive utterance, as a witness against all the

* See Oetinger, *Schrift von Auberlen*, p. 537.

† Though even Bengel thought so.

‡ For the Apocryphal legends concerning earlier miracles are utterly discredited by a word of John (ver. 11)—This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana. Ταύτην—who would have imagined *this?*

§ Thus much we admit—but no more. That Jesus had previously given a hint of his intention, of which Mary only too prematurely reminded him, we hold to be quite improbable as unsupported by any intimation whatever.

Mariolatry of his future grossly-erring Church. Further on, this error is again most distinctly aimed at, in that other word—Who is my mother? whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister and mother (Matt. xii. 48, 50). And again: Blessed indeed is she whose womb bare, and she whose breast hath nourished me; but only blessed because she hath believed, in common with all who hear the word of God and keep it (Luke xi. 27, 28). In what way he addressed and how he honored his mother, as her child and son, the Scripture does not record; but it is recorded, that his first word to her in his ministry, and the last to her upon the cross—though the testament of his filial love—terms her *woman* and nothing more.

The translation "Woman, what hast thou to do with me?" fails in many ways to convey the spirit of the original text. First of all, the appellation should close the sentence, because the reason why she is not termed *mother*, must at the beginning be indicated in order that such a repulse might be justified to all other women. The Greek *γύναι* bears quite a different meaning from the "Woman!" of our day; it is an appellation by no means derogatory, but, under the circumstances, very affectionate, as in John iv. 21, xx. 15. Lastly, *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί* *—more correctly: What have *I* in common with thee? since his person by right and honor must have precedence—involves no more, no less than this: When my office and its ministry are concerned, is it not for thee to retire, and forget that thou art my mother? "That which in me works miracles was not born of thee" (Augustine.)

This is the first part of our Lord's word, ever solemn and severe as a testimony for the truth in all its near and remote futurity. But no sooner has he, in holy submission to the Father, thus denied the affections of his human filial heart, than he changes his voice, and so modifies his speech, as to console her with all affection for the restriction and repression to which his words had subjected her. The other part of this saying, which is now adjoined, tends to assure her: Thou hast understood me, as I understand thee; I will do what thou meanest. That Mary has so understood him, her own next words to the servants (clinging as they do to his last word, persisting in expectation of a miracle, and more confident than ever) most decisively attest: Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it! Yet it becomes the holy dignity of the Lord to prescribe a set time, in order that Mary, and with her whoever may read this *first word at the beginning of his miracles*, should observe and take good heed, that all his works are done, only in the manner and at the very time when the Son, under the authority of the Father, wills; that *their time and their hour* are fore-appointed, independently of human will and wish—My hour is not yet come! And though it were not even a matter of a day earlier or later (as afterwards when he repeats the same saying to *his brethren* concerning going up to the feast), but, as here to all appearance, about something still less important; nevertheless, he doeth all things great and small alike, at their own critical moment. That is a word of divine value, which is written in Ecc. iii. 11. Hence did the evangelist derive it, when he once and again testified: His hour was not yet come (John vii. 30; viii. 20). He himself knew and bore witness when his hour had finally come (John xii. 27; xiii. 1; xvii. 1; Matt. xxvi. 45).

That was the last great hour of the glorification of the Son of Man in his sufferings: but here he speaks not of that. Of what hour then? Does he refer *merely* to the right hour and moment for the performance of the miracle at the marriage in Cana? If we have felt the depth of meaning in all the other first words of the Lord, we shall scarcely be induced to believe that this sublime expression, so solemnly repeated by himself at his passion, "My hour is not yet come," means no more *now when he utters it first* than just to intimate for the present occasion—A few minutes more and then is the right time. No for we observe finally, that the error which was checked in Mary involved something more than the before-mentioned forwardness of motherly longing and interference. There was fundamentally mixed up with it the notion which was to the last shared by all the disciples, of the earthly glory of his kingdom. The error of supposing that he was come to supply all their need, to defend them from all want, to create around them happiness and joy, had in some degree contributed to the expectation that he would now furnish the wine. It is to this that the Lord's wisdom, which looks through the immediate occasion into the widest connections of his truth, and contemplates in the individual circumstances of the present the last futurity which they pretypify, addresses itself now. When he says, My hour is not yet come, he is thinking, we may presume, in his secret mind (we dare so boldly to penetrate the depths of his thought) of that time when all shall be fulfilled, which the wedding-feast at Cana, and the cheerful wine—the first gift of his saving power and kindness—symbolically foretold. That hour of his established kingdom, when the fruit of the grape shall be drunk new, is *not yet* come—we must say this even yet;* but as surely as the sufferings of Christ did come, and in

* This formula *e. g.* also 2 Sam. xvi. 10; 1 Kings xvii. 18, signifies nothing hard or severe. Whether it was a common phrase of men towards women in general, and not at all for worthy gentlewomen, as Lange supposes, I much doubt, and can find nothing to corroborate it in *γύναι*.

* And also learn, that the very last hour of need must previously come, when the Church will appear ready to give up the ghost. See the beautiful reference to the impatience of the "English apostles" in Bötticher's essay upon them, p. 102.

his Church continue, the hour of glory will come after them.

Mary's confident faith after this humiliation hastened the hour; so that it was probably for the sake of *her* word that he turned to the servants. We may say generally concerning the words recorded as having been spoken to the servants, that they are an example of those altogether external, earthly, and merely human words which the Lord must have often spoken amid the circumstances of his life in the flesh, but which are in general not preserved. Yet when we look more narrowly into them, we find the reason why the evangelist who relates so concisely, and with so much omission, the history of the miracles, has not passed them over; yea, rather this example begins to impress upon us the conviction that the Lord can have spoken scarcely any thing without some deeper meaning underlying the manner and matter of his words. He calls the *water* to bear witness of the existing gift and creature of God, which he will wonderfully change; for every miracle designedly attaches itself to something natural, which it may elevate and transfigure. Only Dr. Paulus' infatuated perversity could suppose, that for a true miracle the wine ought to have been drawn immediately from the empty pitchers. Jesus commands that the whole of the six *water-pots* which were there for the *Jewish* purification (out of which the first manifestation of the glory of his new grace should come forth) should be *filled*, in order that not a little of the miraculous wine should remain over as a dowry; for this was as befitting on the present occasion as in Elijah's gift out of God's fulness, when the oil ceased not, till there was no longer a vessel to receive it. The servants fill them *to the brim*—strictly complying with Mary's direction, that they should do whatever he said unto them; and now they wait, looking at him and not at the water, which *in the meantime* is made wine. Then speaks he majestically, precisely defining the instant of the creating miracle: Draw out *now**—and nevertheless in his humility discloses not what was transpiring. It would not have been possible for him to say: Draw out now the water, it shall have become wine; or, The water which has now been made wine, as John afterwards says. Finally, his directing the servants to carry the wine to the governor of the feast,† apertains to the entire and gracious condescension of the whole. It stands a solitary example in the evangelical history, of his most full and benignant approximation to human order and custom; and that in a matter which belongs to the slighter things of life, rather to its hilarity than its earnest work.

THE FIRST PUBLIC OFFICIAL WORDS TO THE HOSTILE GUARDIANS OF THE TEMPLE.

John ii. 16–19.

The Lord spoke more than the world itself could have contained, had every one of his words been written in books. Which, then, out of the multitude, should be committed to record for the world and the church? Those which beyond the rest had a special importance, although no word of the Word upon earth could be deemed unimportant. The selection and arrangement were not left with man, but were the prerogative of the Holy Spirit, concerning whom the Lord's promise was, "He shall glorify me, for he shall take of mine and show it unto you." That Spirit took a historical picture out of the Lord's whole *life and work* from his birth to his ascension, and so shewed it to the evangelists that in their mutually supplementary records, the glory of the only begotten Son shines forth to us full and unimpaired. The Spirit of inspiration in his mysterious control over those records has also so ordered it, that we have likewise received through the remembrance of Matthew and John, the careful investigation of Luke, and the simple ministry of Mark combined, the substance of our Lord's *discourses*, in a true and genuine abstract. The art and truthfulness of all historical writing, which aims to condense out of an abundance of events a succinct narrative.‡ consists, among other things, mainly in this, that the begin-

‡ Schmieder has some important remarks upon this in its relation to Scripture in his *Präliminarien zu einen gründlichen Rechtfertigung der biblischen Geschichte* (Naumburgh, by Klaffenbach, 1837).

* This *now* manifestly indicates the critical moment: After ye have filled, look at what ye will draw forth! So that by no means merely what was drawn became wine. Let the text be looked at, in which τὸ ὕδωρ in ver. 9, is parallel with ὕδατος of ver. 7. And why else the specification of the quantity?

† For we must insist that this ἀρχιτρίκλινος is by no means a table-server or kitchen-master (which for Cana is not to be thought of), but the συμποσιάρχης or *magister convivii*, chosen from among the guests to be president of the banquet, in order to regulate the quantity of the drinking, and to administer all the various usages of social festivity (Ecclus. xxxii. 1–3). How does this graceful mention and acknowledgment of the title of *such* an office put to shame all our pedants! This man, who is in no marvelling humor, and whose ignorance of the miracle warrants the goodness of the wine, even as the knowledge of the servants does the reality of the miracle (according to Richter's striking observation), makes a light remark upon it—half praising, and half in jocoso blame. From this, as well as from our Lord's disguising manner of speech, ver. 8, we observe, of course, that all the guests were not likely to be acquainted, and were not acquainted with the transaction.

nings and turning points, the buds and germs of development, should be made prominent with as much fidelity to their truth, as skill in their presentation; for instance as we see it realized in that perfect pattern—the Acts of the Apostles. But where beginnings and turning points occur in the earthly history of the Lord's life, we may expect that his words will have an especially outbeaming character. Accordingly we find in the gospels a preliminary series of first words, which the Spirit has selected as the most critical in their occurrence, and most distinctive in their expression.

These are together the critical moments of our Lord's development until he reached the time of his proper teaching and testimony before the people and his disciples: each one of them is indicated by a profound word which expresses the true nature of the crisis. The Lord did actually thus speak them, but his Spirit alone could with perfect fidelity reproduce them in the Scripture, and hand them over to the Church. What he spoke to his parents as their child when he ceased to be their child and entered into the developed consciousness of his being the Son of the Father; what he spoke to the forerunner as a man at his anointing to his office, and what to Satan in that first conflict which immediately followed; how he received the first disciples, and at his first miracle released himself once more from his mother according to the flesh, as he had before done in that word of his childhood, and gave himself entirely up to that eternal Spirit who ordered all things in him their time and hour; all this we have already seen. Now follows his first public official word spoken to the present *adversaries* of his life and teaching, to the desecrating occupants of the Temple, whom he is constrained by his zeal for God's house to chastise, and who therefore crucify him, by that very act paving the way for the resurrection of the new temple out of the old; another great turning-point in his life, in which we discern, through the light thrown upon it by the accompanying word, the infolded germ and symbol of a future glorious development.

How great is the contrast between the manifestation of his *loving kindness* before his mother and disciples at the humble Galilæan wedding-festival, and that of his *judicial severity* before the Jews and their rulers in the temple at Jerusalem. The glory that was full of grace was also full of truth. He who came to diffuse joy, is come also to fan the threshing-floor, and vigorously to correct all that is ungodly in God's people and house. Not here where the desecration reigns did he give the first of his signs; but before he begins in Jerusalem at the Passover to work miracles, he announces himself with all his holy severity in his Father's house, by an act of testimony *and authority*. And with that act, which is itself, equally with the miracles, a sign, he speaks a prophetic *miracle-word*, which till this beginning had reached its end in the building of the new temple of the new Church through his resurrection—points to that great miracle as the end and aim of all others.

The messenger sent before his face had prepared his way. Now came to his temple the Lord whom they had sought there in all their worship, the Angel of the Covenant whom they desired; but, they could not abide the day of his coming. He began his refining and purifying by an act of zeal which every true zealot in Israel, whether with or without office, would have been justified and indeed was bound to execute; but no man performed it, the traders and money-changers sat in the temple, palpable signs of its decline and perversion. Then is his spirit stirred by the holy indignation of chastising truth; he does not merely speak, for no simple *word* alone would have said enough duly to denounce this omission of duty; he begins himself *to act*, drives with the scourge the men and their cattle out of the temple,* pours out their mammon, overturns those unsanctified tables in the sanctuary, which exhibited to him at his very entrance the Jewish nation of traffickers; then in full self-possession, and by design he softens his utterance, and passes, after affectionately sparing the doves (in which he sees not mere sacrifices as in the sheep and oxen, but also the symbol of the Holy Ghost) to that word which illustrates and explains the deed: *Take these things hence; make not my Father's house a house of merchandise.*

In this first decisive command, beginning with three majestic words, he neither mentions the temple nor the objects which desecrate it, but merely accompanies the self-explaining act with—*These* things *hence!* He speaks the language of emotion and holy, divine-human anger, which must have excited within the minds of all who heard a response that would carry its own conviction—Belong *these* things *here?* Remove them hence! This indignation has gathered in his soul from one festival to another, as the disorder met his eyes: the time is now come, and it breaks out in an act, which may partly be regarded as long before projected and prepared for, partly, as the instantaneous product of a sudden internal resolve. This first severe word is followed (as in Cana, to his mother) by one more gentle, which gives ample explanation of his conduct. It is not without a silent remembrance of that word which his Father gave him on his first entering the temple eighteen years before, that he now publicly calls God his Father. He does not reveal himself before the world, however, with an independent and self-asserting testimony—

* He never drives *into* the temple with the scourge—as it is very thoughtfully remarked in the *Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, 1845, p. 93. That he moreover, did not merely drive out the cattle with the scourge is expressly stated in ver. 15.

I am his Son! He avoids every appearance of bearing loftily his own honor, and utters it as the unpremeditated and self-understood expression of his inner being; arising, as in the former instance when he was a youth of twelve years old, out of the circumstances of the present occasion. It was, indeed, and must ever have been to all who heard it, a word of new and mighty significance, that any son of man should call the Jehovah of Israel simply and distinctly *his* Father. It should have been for all the scribes, who, like Nathanael, had learned in prophetic Scripture concerning the *Son* who was to come, a full and distinct answer to the question—Who art thou, and by what authority dost thou thus act and command? But they who now first heard *this* word, the most important of all that he said, appear remarkably enough to have scarcely seized its significance, in the heat of their vexation and in the confusion of what was taking place. They stood, indeed, in silence, and listened to every word, when the Lord after his silent act began also to speak; but it was only afterwards that they found calmness rightly to reflect upon the word which they had heard. The Lord had withal referred to a passage of Scripture, to that rebuke which the Lord of Hosts had administered to His people in Jer. vii. 1–11: "Trust ye not in lying words, saying, the Temple of the Lord are these! Is *this house* which is called by my name, become a *den of robbers* in your eyes?" But it is only at the second temple-cleansing at the close of his ministry that he quotes this saying in all its severity; for the present he softens the expression, and says instead —Make not my Father's house a *house of merchandise!* Whether they detected therein the tone of that prophetic saying, must remain a question. We read that *the Jews* (as John always pointedly designates the rulers of the people in Jerusalem) do not as yet lift up their contradiction—How callest thou God thy own peculiar Father? *This* declaration they pass over for the moment; they must examine it again and again: it must first excite opposition in the reluctance of their rebellious hearts, before they can strengthen themselves to oppose it in words. We do not read, further, that they committed themselves to any justification of the commerce in the temple, for which subsequent reflection might have placed many arguments at their command. For the impression of his sudden act, and the irresistible conviction of the words which followed it—*Take these things hence!* have so entirely overpowered them, that they can find no words of defence. But how this man, rabbi, zealot, prophet, or what else, should have the power to assail the time-honored abuses which they themselves had tolerated and even established, and that so summarily, not merely in word but in act; *this*, although the most superficial part of the whole procedure, absorbs their thoughts, because it is an injury to themselves, an invasion of their official prerogative. Forgetting the word in the *act*, and in the act forgetting the right of the thing done in the right of the *person* doing it—as always happens in similar circumstances—they speak in pitiable folly while thinking themselves wise—*What sign showest thou unto us*, seeing that thou doest these things? Not: Is it then true that merchandise and money-changing become not the temple? but: Who art *thou*, who bearest such vigorous witness to this truth? (Acts vii. 35). Though he has already told them: I am the Son of God, whose house this is, they come as the official temple-police and rulers of Israel with their question: Wilt thou arrogate to thyself the *right of a prophet?* Not further than this, but so far at least, must the Lord's act have moved them, that they were constrained to bring back to their thoughts those long-gone times when men of God appeared before Israel, condemning even kings and priests, and vindicating their right to do so by signs from heaven. John the Baptist had already brought the times of the prophets near to them; but he did no miracle, and his word, as the voice of a preacher in the wilderness, had left their temple-trading undisturbed. If now this man (who had been with the Baptist, and many reports of singular incidents in connection with him were circulated) assumes the right to go so much further in reproof than he, his pretension must be justified in our presence, according to the law of Moses for the testing of prophets. Thus their question had the appearance of a prudent and righteous restraint within lawful bounds, when dealing with what was wrong; and yet it was full of folly and blindness. A right was conceded at that time to every zealot or earnest man for the removal of abuses and corruption in Israel, without any miraculous assertion on his part of prophetical dignity: but what the Lord had now done, spoke sufficiently for itself; his neglected word was with the act itself a mighty and miraculous sign of divine authority.

The Lord did not now, as he never afterwards did, *show* the Jews a sign at their demand: he *gives* them a sign instead, which, according to the word of Moses (Deut. xiii. 1, 2), should *come to pass* in its own time; and thus fulfills all legal righteousness, so far as their question was actually grounded upon that. He leaves unanswered the evil of their question, and yet says to them—*Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.* A second word of mystery, in which his enemies found much food for their speculation, even till under the cross, and at the stone of the sepulchre.*

* Pity that Hauff (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1849, i., p. 106) should spoil his beautiful and tolerably correct confirmation of the Johannean interpretation, by

That the comment of the Evangelist—"He spake of the temple of his body"—must through the Holy Ghost be the true one, admits of no doubt to a *believing* student of Scripture, however hard it may be to *understand* it. That the Lord when he said "this," should have *pointed* to his own body, is in itself a strange idea, and is refuted by the instant apprehension of the Jews: Forty and six years was *this* temple in building—rather, so long has it already been in building! They could not possibly have overlooked so manifest a finger-sign. It is equally certain, on the other hand, that the Lord must have spoken of that temple, of that desecrated house of his Father, about which the question then was: for he proceeds now as ever, from the present circumstance to the deeper truth which he attaches to it; he speaks to the understanding of his hearers, so that they might understand, even where they will not. But no man *could* have *immediately* thought of the temple of his body at that time, as even the disciples perceived that latent meaning only after the resurrection. How can the question be solved but thus, that the Lord speaks of *both at the same time?*

And so, indeed, it was. This mysterious wonder-word has not a misleading double sense; but the two sides of its deep meaning are in reality one. For what is the *new temple* built by Christ, after that old one, new-built by Herod, was destroyed, but *his church*, the new people of God, the house of the Father and the Son, the sanctuary of the Holy Ghost? And is not this church *his body*, raised up and nourished out of his *risen body?* Again, did not the Jews, in destroying his body upon the cross, cast down their typical temple, and effect and work out its destruction? For *this* temple on which they in hypocrisy rely, while they honor not its Lord and receive him not when he comes to it, is a *shadow and type* of the body and the church of the Lord. This is the plain key to the mystery which the Lord's saying, in its sublime and profoundly simple wisdom, gives to the foolishly wise in Israel to think upon. His word points impressively, and as it ever does, in strict harmony with the occasion, from the shadow to the substance, thus opening up the mystery of that substance. He prophesies in the beginning, while they are asking him for proof of his prophetic office, concerning the end; he unveils to them, if perchance they might apprehend it in subsequent reflection, the entire relation of his sanctified person to them and their temple-service; tells them, as the Searcher of hearts, how well he knows that they themselves, who should be the defenders of the temple, would be guilty of its destruction; and yet, that by the marvellous pre-arrangement of the counsel of God, the evil which they should do to the temple of his body would subserve at the same time the removal of all shadows, and the resurrection of the new and abiding, out of the death of the old:—I know what I have to expect from you, and whither things will tend, better than ye yourselves now know: my zeal will still irritate your anger till that takes place for which I came into the world; till through my death at your hands the veil is rent asunder, and in my resurrection through the hand and power of God, the foundation of the true and real temple is laid. For I am indeed not come merely to punish, but to renew; yea, to restore again what *ye* destroy.

As the obvious literal sense of the restoration of the destroyed temple in three days involved what was utterly inconceivable, and it was not possible that they could consciously and intelligently ascribe such a meaning to the Lord, as he now and henceforward manifested himself to them,—it was necessary that they should think out some solution, and for that very purpose was this word given to them. That they did so, is evidenced by their recollection and use of it at the cross and the sepulchre, where they show themselves to have finally approached very near to a right understanding of its meaning.* Yet there they distort it, and conceal the testimony of their conscience, by perverting the former part of his words in the testimony of the false accusers, as if it was himself that proposed to *destroy*, whereas he said "Destroy *ye!*" and in this conscious perversion they betrayed that they had marked whither the Lord's words had tended. Therefore do they clamor in bitter mockery that he be hurried to the cross, thus actually performing what he had predicted.

Destroy! This was spoken prophetically and permissively: I know that it will be in your hearts, and that ye will be permitted to do it—then be it so and let it be done! That their persisting in opposition to the truth of God might lead so far as to bring upon them yet another destruction of their temple, as the due punishment of their own act and guilt—so much at least must immediately have touched their *conscience*, and it was that which the Lord addressed. That this might take place as the consequence of their putting him to death, became more and more plain to them in the after time. But that his death would issue in a *resurrection*, and thereby in a demolition of the typical temple in order to

maintaining at the outset, that inspiration did not so far secure from error, as to make the meaning of the words of Jesus perfectly plain! To wish to be better instructed than the apostles, is now-a-days the incorrigible folly of the learned.

* What they affirm in Matt. xxvii. 63, the Lord had never uttered *in their hearing* in so many words; but it may be regarded as their right interpretation of the discourses concerning the building again in three days, and the sign of Jonas, taken together. Lange has well observed against Hase (ii. 3, 1625) how natural it was that *they* should understand earlier and better than the apostles the Lord's hint that they would put him to death, and how then *ex opposito* the saying concerning his resurrection would make itself plain to them.

the building of a new one, nay rather to the specific building again in its fulfilled design of that which had been abolished ("I will raise it up")—this is the great prophecy which the Lord utters to them here; this is already the self-same sign which he afterwards *gives* at their demand, the sign of the prophet Jonas, that one last sign which was chosen as appropriate to the wicked spirit that demanded it.

There now remains only the question whether the Jews then perceived a connection between *this temple* and the *temple of his body*, as the central idea of the entire saying; and thence were capable of understanding the double meaning of his word. We must here take into account the whole nature of the case, and the tone of feeling between the Lord and the rulers of the people must be pre-supposed. John had announced the Messiah's kingdom as nigh at hand; afterwards boldly proclaimed that he who was to come after him was already in the midst of the people; and at last had publicly pointed out Jesus of Nazareth. Even if the heads of the people in Jerusalem had received no intelligence of this last open indication of Jesus (which is improbable), yet must that which preceded it have been sufficient to raise in them such a degree of expectation, that if any one should follow the Baptist and strikingly announce himself with the authority of a divine call, this must be *the Messiah*. To such preparation rightly to hear and understand it, did the first word of Jesus—"*My Father's* house"—make its appeal; and yet that word is, in the unthinking excitement of their anger, and not without a wanton disregard, utterly overlooked. For it was most clearly and significantly spoken. But when their counter-question, losing sight of the "Son of God," only asks after his prophetical authority; such a reply as this was in the highest sense natural: I am more than a Prophet, as I have already told you, if ye had been willing to hear aright. This is the general tone of the second word, as it strikes their conscience in order to open their ears. It was not spoken to be understood at the moment precisely, but for their subsequent consideration, when calmness should return; yet the scribes in Israel might well understand how the Messiah should speak of the temple and his own person in connection, as if in a certain sense they both were the same. For it was a doctrine that was familiar in the more recent orthodox Biblical learning of the Jewish writings,* founded particularly upon Dan. ix. 24, as generally upon that deeper understanding of typical relations which was not altogether wanting—that the Messiah himself was, and should be called the Holy of Holies. Consequently our Lord speaks, however enigmatically for the present moment, yet plainly enough for after reflection; and admonishes the wicked guardians of the temple to think, in connection with the type and shadow—to which indeed its own honor is due—of that higher significance of meaning in them of which they were not altogether unaware. He deals with the *scribes* by their theology, with the *men* by their conscience. The process of thought, which would be excited by this striking and not-to-be-forgotten word, was somewhat as follows: "What meant this mighty one, who acted and spoke before our eyes and ears in so marvellous a manner, that we had no spirit to reply to him otherwise than by the demand of a sign—by that strange saying which he so undisguisedly and with such dignity spoke to us? Assuredly he spoke not as a builder, who could build anew the temple! That we should destroy the temple! Its ruin to be our guilt! Did he mean that it would be through our opposing him, and laying hands upon his holy person? What if he were truly the Messiah! For he spoke before indeed of his Father's house. But can then the Messiah be put to death, may his holy body—itself a temple of God—be destroyed? That second word, again, was so peaceful, so resigned to all that we might do to him and through him to the temple; he appeared not with all his anger and zeal, as if he would oppose us with force. Well, we understand it; it is that he himself is the archetype of the temple, and he signifies, that if we destroy the temple of his body, this that is made with hands will fall with him!" Had their thoughts proceeded so far, *then indeed* the remaining sentence would have intimated to them: Do this; *I shall nevertheless conquer*, and in a short time the destroyed temple will be erected anew! I *myself*, by my own authority will raise it up. But this was more than their theology of the person of the Messiah was wont to attribute to him.

In three days—is by no means a proverbial expression for a short time: but the Lord thus early declares, although like most other prophecy, it was only understood in his fulfillment, what he knew in its spirit from the Scripture; that he should rise again, in order to raise up the Church from his body, on *the third day* (1 Cor. xv. 4; Matt. xii. 40, xx. 19; Hos. vi. 2). How clearly did he see the future from the beginning! How deep a consciousness had he of the way and goal of his life and death, what an insight of consummate wisdom into the whole counsel and plan of his Father! He knows his relation to the masters of the present temple who opposed the truth, and with whom by this public signal he now begins the appointed warfare of his testimony; he knows, that he himself is the true temple of which that typical one prophesied in its time; that he must yield himself up to receive death at the hands of the Jews, in order that the true sanctuary, after the shadow has in natural consequence passed away, may rise up from his resurrection. He is, finally, prepared to yield himself up; for he knows that thus

* Here must be sought the historical ground of it—and not in those Gnostic reveries, to which *e. g.* Hilgenfeld amusingly refers this ναος, (*Klementin. Rekognitionen*, p. 111).

he shall bear the sins of those who slay him, and who thereby fulfill the design of the Old Testament in order to a new and everlasting covenant of grace, in which the essential truth of the old covenant comes forth to perfection. This still, calmly-sublime preparation for the dedication of himself to that warfare—through blood leading to victory—with the blind ministers of that divine counsel which indeed he only as yet penetrates; this clear all-comprehensive consciousness of the near approach of the end, and fulfillment, and glorification of the Old Testament economy, as also of the inner, essential relation of his own sanctified person to the whole; this is the central spirit of the word which he utters at this crisis of his life. He utters it, assuredly, rather for the hearing and understanding of the disciples who stood around him, and who afterwards, when the sign had come to pass, should think upon it, and should believe the *Scripture* and his words *drawn from the depths of Scripture;* than for his enemies, who neither would nor could understand him. But he utters it, at the same time, with the highest dignity, for the satisfaction of his own consciousness of what was just sufficient to that end. What the later teaching of the New Testament fully developes in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is already wrapped up as a germ in this early word of our Lord.

To prove them, whether they would understand, the Lord spoke this to the Jews; but they would not. They break out again in petulent, hasty, and vexatious objection—which only touches the surface of the matter; and treat the mysterious word, which had been spoken in such majestic calmness, as unworthy of their silent attention and subsequent thought. He therefore keeps silence, in order, if possible, to force them to reflection. They seem to desire no specific second reply; therefore he gives them none, and for this time they separate: he lets them remain, they let him go. Thereupon he actually performs, after their arrogant demand had been repelled, those miracles in his humility which might bring many to believe on his name, although he knows that the faith which hangs upon miracles is not the true one. Thereupon one comes out from among the rulers, who has ingenuously pondered what he had heard and seen; gives his confession instead of all the rest of his colleagues, who had suppressed it as it was rising in their consciences: and receives as the gracious recompense of his coming in the night, that new and impressive word of the Light of the world. Then the Lord retreats with his disciples from the capital into the land of Judea, and baptizes them, as John had done, with a transitional baptism. When the enmity of the Pharasees begins to be excited, he returns back again to Galilee the second time since his appearance to Israel. He speaks in the way with the Samaritan woman, performs in Cana that other miracle, and begins at last *publicly to teach and preach in Galilee*, having his abode in Capernaum after his own Nazareth had evil entreated him, and thence making the circuit of the land and the synagogues. So that the strict chronological order would require the contents of the third and fourth chapters of John, and even of Luke (iv. 16–30), to be inserted before we return to the Gospel of Matthew. But we are disposed to leave the order of time, which soon becomes indistinct in the details, and is seldom of much importance for the understanding of our Lord's discourses; and for the present to follow each Evangelist singly, with references merely to the parallel places in the others, in order to anticipate in their connection the whole of these profoundedly significant *first words*. The Lord had already taught in their synagogues all round before his rejection at Nazareth (Luke iv. 15); after that, he went forth still verging towards Capernaum. Matthew briefly indicates this (iv. 13); and condenses the whole Galilean preaching into one general expression, as what Jesus *from that time began* to preach and to teach.

THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

THE SUBSTANCE OF THE FIRST PREACHING TO THE PEOPLE.

(Matt. iv.17; Mark i. 15.)

Again therefore another *first word*—the *seventh* so far as it may be connected with the sixth already touched upon—the first public word of *preaching to the people*. There intervene, however, occasional testimonies to individual men, recorded by John; and the first preaching in Nazareth, which Luke gives us, runs nearly parallel with it. It is not, further, so much a single utterance, once spoken on a specific occasion, as a compendious summary of his first preaching, which were repeated in words of which these are a type. Thus it may be regarded as an introduction of that connected series of discourses, which Matthew gives us first of all, and with him Mark and Luke.

The Lord commences his preaching with the same words which the forerunner had already uttered (Matt. iii. 2); in order that he may prepare the way for himself and his announcement of the kingdom of God which had now appeared—the Glad-tidings revealed to faith. For he is ever and throughout his whole preaching and prophetic office his own peculiar forerunner; the preparer of his own mediatorial and kingly office. This is the first thing which Matthew records, in order to indicate that same transition from John to Jesus, which we discern also in John's history of the baptism (iii. 26; iv. 1). It is not immediately said—I, the King of this kingdom, am come; nor is it, *My* kingdom: the Lord preserves the first utterance of this lofty expression for his disciples, in his humiliation (Luke xxii. 30), and before Pilate; leading the way to it by the expression—The Son of Man and *his* kingdom (Matt. xiii. 41; xvi. 28; comp. xx. 21). The *kingdom of heaven*—an expression which was then hardly extant among the Jews, but probably originated in the Baptist's words as a most decisive protest against false notions of an earthly kingdom, and thence passed over into the *later* Rabbinical doctrine to denote the idea of the Messianic kingdom, which had indeed existed from the beginning. This expression does not occur in all the Old Testament, but is prepared for in such passages as Dan. ii. 44. The word of expectation which had been hitherto familiar—*the kingdom of God*—was taken from the prophets, and indeed transitionally developed in the Apochrypha (Ecclus. x. 10). This continues to be the expression in the Gospels of Mark, Luke, and John (only John iii. 3, 5), and throughout the New Testament, with the exception of Matthew, who, bringing into prominence the opposition between the true fulfillment and the Jewish expectation, joins with "the kingdom of God" the *kingdom of heaven*, in his record of our Lord's discourses. But the apostles use this word no more, as the prophets have it not at all.*

It is *at hand*, says the Lord again, as the Baptist had said, and as his messengers were to say at their first mission in Israel, ch. x. 7. It is exhibited as just descending from heaven to earth, where a state of imperfection exists as well as the dominion of sin; afterwards it is said more decisively—The kingdom of God is *come* to you (ἔφθασεν, ch. xii. 28.), is in your midst, present within you (Luke xvii. 21). But where the expression *kingdom of heaven* is used, the word always includes a reference to the future of its true consummation, in connection with the secret preparations for that future, as will be more fully seen in Matt. v. 3, 10, 20.

It comes otherwise than Israel has supposed; therefore is the necessary condition of *repentance* prefixed. It demands a new and heavenly mind, with the rejection of the old spirit; it requires and brings with it, a new heart and a new spirit (Ezek. xviii. 31). That was the impressive, unexpected preaching of the Baptist; but only unexpected, because Israel had forgotten what was the substance and result, the tenor and conclusion of all the prophecy and preaching of the prophets. The last and greatest prophet before Christ utters at the close of the Old Testament this great and comprehensive word; and Christ himself as the prophet of his new kingdom of grace, takes it up again, for it is the essential word of connection between the Old and the New Testaments. It remains also the ever-recur-

* For 2 Tim. iv. 18 is a quite different form of expression.

ring word of preparation for faith, and the reception of grace; for the kingdom of heaven belongs only to the spiritually poor and mourners in heart. All the apostles preach repentance and faith; purification from all former sins may never be dispensed with till the final entrance into the everlasting kingdom (2 Pet. i. 9–11): and even from heaven the Lord cries to his church below—Repent! (Rev. ii. 5–16; iii. 3, 19).

Mark further this "*for*" between the two phrases, which is the true link between the preaching that demands, and the promise that bestows: "The desire for the kingdom of heaven should be the motive of repentance."* No true and perfect repentance can spring merely from the terror of the law; the law preaches no distinctive repentance, but life for the righteous and death to all sinners. But all the prophets and John had, on the ground of promised grace, exhorted to repentance; thereby, as in a word of mercy, offering also the gift of repentance unto life, even as the Lord and his apostles do (Acts, v. 31; xi. 18). Thus is folded up in this introductory word of the Lord the whole substance, the essential principles of all the exhortations of God to sinners. It binds in indissoluble and inscrutable connection the divine gift and the free acceptance of man: *Will ye* and *Grace!* That is here foreshadowed which the Sermon on the Mount only further develops. But he who hears not and does not this, who is not made willing to repent in sincere poverty of spirit for the sake of the kingdom of heaven—to him the kingdom of heaven comes only *near*, alas! without being his portion and consolation (Luke x. 11).

Mark gives us another compend of this first preaching of our Lord; and announces more fully what the Lord had said on another occasion, when he had advanced a step further into *his own* more distinctive preaching. The publican Matthew stops at the preaching of repentance, which the Baptist had made so emphatic to himself. He would now lay stress upon it for the people of Israel as the Messiah's preaching *also*. Mark, on the other hand, takes up that addition which he had received from Peter, the man of faith, and represents the Lord as saying: Repent, and *believe the Gospel*. In that first brief exhortation, indeed, in which Christ and John hold the same language, *faith* was understood as the unexpressed middle-term; just as in the *believe* of the later purely evangelical preaching *repentance* is always pre-supposed without being mentioned, as preceding, accompanying, and following faith. Both are inseparably and essentially joined in the true μετανοεῖν, *repentance*, which in the very abandonment of sin presses on to lay hold upon mercy.* Yet Christ's ministry of grace more manifestly exhibits itself in this advancement in the expression, for the announcement of the kingdom of heaven comes forward into the *foreground* by this addition, especially, Believe *the Gospel*. This is a new, fundamental, and principal idea. The *word* which denotes it is found in the Old Testament in a general human sense (2 Sam. xviii. 25); and in a prophetic prefaratory allusion (Psa. xl. 10, בִּשַּׂרְתִּי צֶדֶק— Isa. xl. 9, lii. 7, lxi. 1; Luke iv. 18); but as the most distinctive designation of the last and finished tidings of grace to human faith it is first found in the lips of *Christ*. That was also glad tidings which the Baptist announced (Luke iii. 18 εὐηγγελίζατο): but it is the Lord who first preaches the Gospel of the kingdom, by proclaiming its actual existence (Mark i. 1; Matt. iv. 23, xi. 5; Luke, iv. 43; xvi. 16). For it was *his* alone to say: *The fulness of the time is come* (Gal. iv. 4). The design of the old covenant is accomplished; the set time of waiting and preparation, which, according to the hidden counsel of God, was necessary for the sake of humanity at large, has expired. The Son is born, has grown to maturity, has been anointed and tempted. The testimony of him who was to bear him witness has been uttered, and now he bears witness to himself. Now begins that last speaking of God by His Son (Heb. i. 2), *the Gospel*, which henceforth is to be preached in all the world till the end cometh (Matt. xxiv. 14). What a glance into the past and the future is this! What an announcement is this, wrapping up in mystery the deep things of the counsel of God (casting down every unlawful question—Why not before?), and yet revealing to the penitent sinner all that is necessary for his faith! The time is fulfilled, the hour is come. I am come—come, then, all to me and see; but come with repentance, taste and see in faith! He does not, indeed, say openly at this beginning, Believe in *me!* but that this is his meaning was plainly to be understood. For what else could be faith in the coming *fulfillment* of all that had been promised?

THE CALLING OF THE FISHERS OF MEN.

(Matt. iv. 19; Mark i. 27; Luke v. 4, 10.)

The Evangelists, according to the wisdom of the Holy Ghost, whose influence and direction they only unconsciously felt, were under the necessity of distributing in portions what

* Synod of Bern: "Orders for the regulation of the doctrine and the life of ministers and preachers in the town and canton of Bern," etc., 1682. A most weighty encyclical!

* It is not a proper use of the Lord's word, though otherwise applicable enough to a memorial of Luther, and only too significant for our own age, that upon the monument at Wittenberg the inscription is curtailed: *Glaubet an das Evangelium* (Believe the Gospel)—without the little word that precedes —Repent!

was allotted to them to record. So here in the calling of the two pairs of brothers from their fishing-nets to the permanent following of the Lord. That their release from their earthly toil and calling was gradual and progressive, as we gather from John, Matthew, and Luke together, might have been pre-supposed as more natural and likely; although Matthew's call afterwards appears to present an example of an almost instantaneous enlightenment and separation from all. Matthew, when he mentions Simon with the addition, "who was called Peter," pre-supposes the giving of the new name at his former confession, of which he could scarcely have been ignorant; but Luke's account (ch. v. 3–5), requires no more than that some such earlier relations between the Lord and these fishermen should be understood by his readers.

That Peter, especially, was designed for a distinctive personal position in this approaching kingdom of God—that the Lord purposed to form him into something especial, his new name, according to the analogy of such namings in the Old Testament, had sufficiently foretold. The preparation for this was indicated in the early beginning of the formation of a circle of apostles and disciples around the Lord in such a manner, that the command—*Follow me!* now developed a still more comprehensive meaning. Yet those, who already surrounded the Lord as "his disciples" at Cana, went back in the interim to their fishing again; and it is at a subsequent critical moment that the Lord clearly reveals to them, that the time is come when they must leave their ships and their nets as an ordinary occupation. Then they *followed him* altogether, remained wholly in his company; as in past times the servants and disciples of the prophets had done according to custom and propriety, and in a later age the scholars of those who were called Rabbi among the Israelites (*Δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου*, אַחֲרַי לְכוּ, *Come after me;* 1 Kings xix. 20, 21). This Matthew significantly records, without relating more concerning the external occasion of it, than simply that Jesus walking by the sea *saw them* casting their net into the sea, and afterwards the two others mending their nets. Had anything more occurred at the time (as in Luke v.), his account, as we now read it, would bear upon it the mark of actual untruthfulness. Thus the distinctive significance of this critical turning-point lies altogether and only in that internal glance of our Lord, which, regarding them as fishermen, contemplates in this lower calling which is revoked, that higher one, which he now for the first time clearly unfolds to them: From henceforth leave this net; ye shall in my discipleship be prepared to cast the net of the kingdom of heaven into the sea of the nations (ch. xiii. 47); remain fishermen still, but in a higher style—henceforth ye shall catch men!

Two things claim our attention here: how the Lord's profound wisdom lays hold of every thing lower and external to become the *image* of things and relations in the kingdom of heaven; and also how familiarly his thought and language attach themselves to those *Old Testament typical expressions* in which the Spirit had already prophetically exhibited all the germs of the New Testament consummation. There is in the discourses of Jesus much more of such reference to the language of the Old Testament than is discerned by ordinary exposition; so much, indeed, that we have never finished tracing it. It is not a casual matter, but a real though secret prelude of the Holy Ghost, that the Lord named, in Jeremiah (xvi. 16), those who were sent forth for the restoration of Israel *fishermen;* and again in Ezekiel (xlvii. 10) spoke of the fishers who should gather exceeding many fishes into the new waters of the living. That which there pointed into the most remote futurity of the kingdom of God, is here beginning to be manifest; and the previous fisher-condition of the first apostles was itself a pre-intimation; just as it has pleased divine Providence in the case of *many other* important persons to shadow out their future calling in their earlier relations in life; in David's sheepfold, for instance, his own kingdom and that of his greater Archetype.

Finally: I will make you fishers of men This signifies not merely, I now by my prerogative appoint and call you to this; nor simply, I will from this time forwards, as your new master, train you for this; not merely even, I will qualify you for it, by creating you into some new thing, which I only can do. But there is included the promise: Ye shall, with success and blessing, labor in the ministry of my word, which shall catch men, even as your nets the fish. This latter meaning comes out with especial prominence in the two prophetic draughts of fishes; at the outset in Luke v. more remotely, but with perfect clearness; and in the latter after the resurrection, the symbolical import of which John points out in his own manner, in all its full significance (ch. xxi. 6–11). I will make you into fishers of *men*, thou shalt catch *men*—these words are uttered by the Saviour of mankind with the same emphasis of love, with which he afterwards testified, "I am not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them" (Luke ix. 56). How infinitely more excellent and lofty a calling! Whatever else his grace made of these Galilean fishermen, themselves sinful men who had just been by him gathered and saved, even up to their thrones and crowns of apostolical dignity in the regeneration of the world; *this one thing* remains the climax and the crown of their honor and dignity, that they were made ministers and helpers of the grace which saved mankind.

Now they who would regard Luke v. 1–11 as merely a more specific account of the same circumstance which Matthew has more generally narrated, do it at the peril of dealing with

the Scripture as if it were not the holy word of God. This we cannot do. The positive expressions of the latter Evangelist (Matt. v. 18, 19), mark out definitely a situation which cannot be made identical with the account of Luke, without imputing to a fellow apostle actual ignorance of these special circumstances; or actual incorrectness, and not merely concealment, to the Spirit who inspired the Gospels, exercising a divine supervision and moulding the human element in them. The latter to us is still less conceivable even than the former. Peter continues to hold his house at Capernaum (viii. 14), and thereby his connection with his property. He must not be supposed to have sold and given this to the poor, but only given up his ordinary occupation. Jesus many times afterwards sailed in his ship, sent him away as a fisherman with his hook, when there arose a necessity (Matt. xvii. 27); even after the resurrection Peter still speaks quite naturally of going a fishing (John xxi. 3)—though nearer indeed than he then thought to the final call which released him from it for ever. All this makes Luke's account sufficiently plain.

The Lord *prayed* Simon* (ἠρώτησεν, as in Luke iv. 38, vii. 3–36), an interesting indication of the human lowliness with which the Master was wont to speak to his disciples on even such matters. His language only becomes imperative—though it would always befit it to be so—when he is about, in his wonderful promise, to bless and reward the service which he asked: Launch out into the deep, yet further from the land, cast your nets down εἰς ἄγραν, *for a draught, i.e.* not as on ordinary occasions, with the design to catch; but it is a promise as in John xxi. 6: καὶ εὑρήσετε, *and ye shall find* (comp. Luke v. 9). Simon was already a disciple of Jesus, and calls him *Master:* now whether the Master better understands fishing, too, he can scarcely determine; but he soon turns away from all natural considerations, to simple faith in the word of him who had just been speaking the word of God from his ship. The great multitude of fishes, since the whole night before they had taken nothing, rightly appears to him a miraculous sign; he feels his sinfulness, and shrinks before the power of God; calls his Master now also his *Lord;* and would as simply as foolishly remove himself in fear from his fellowship.† Yet is his meaning better than his language; he utters "the noblest feeling in the most unskillful words."* It pleases the Spirit of God to give him just at this instant such a deep consciousness of sin as for the time he could not control; and that is the characteristic moment which the Lord seizes for repeating, in order to its further and decisive confirmation, what he had once before said to him: *From henceforth thou shall catch men!* Now is the *promise* contained in the word that called them first, made more plain by the miraculous sign; which, occurring at the end of the Lord's sermon, was a fit type of that preaching itself. Now also is Simon's unworthiness and unfitness for what the Lord designed to make him, revealed out of the depth of his heart; and therefore further is that sublimely gracious word added, which the Lord has since then spoken to so many besides the first apostle, which indeed he speaks to us all; that pecaliar word of New Testament mercy, with which the angels in the time of consummation begin anew: *Fear not!* This word in his lips raises to its highest fulfillment of force and meaning, what had from the very beginning begun to be uttered in the old covenant, where the angels thus speak to terrified and sinful men (Dan. x. 12–19); and the revealing and witnessing Lord himself, from the calling of Abraham down to the latest encouragement sent by the prophets (Gen. xv. 1, xxvi. 24, xlvi. 3; Deut. i. 21; Josh i. 9, viii. 1; Judges. vi. 23; 2 Kings i. 15; Isa. vii. 4, x. 24, xli 10, 13, 14, &c., down to Hagg. ii. 5; Zech. viii. 13, 15). Thus then is this word now uttered by Jesus, *at once* a word of *divine majesty* to the "sinful man" Peter (Fear not, Peter! as before, Fear not, Abram!); and a word of kindness from the *Son of Man*, the *Sinner's Saviour*, as if there had been already added, Be not afraid, *only believe!* (Mark v. 36; John xiv. 1).

But when the Evangelist Luke, further removed from the event, closes the history with —They forsook all and followed him; he may be well supposed to have designed to record their special and distinctive call, without a clear knowledge of that earlier one; although his history itself obviously implies relations between the Master and these fishermen which must previously have begun.

* This does not indicate, as Roos supposes, a slight alienation from Peter; for the Lord had certainly many times made requests of his disciples.

† The incident in Luke iv. 33–41, had *not* taken place just before in order of time, though in Luke's Gospel it occurs just before. *Then* would Simon's conduct have been strange indeed, as Schleirmacher says quite correctly.

* So far rightly Lange. But that Peter only feared for himself the continued oppressive enjoyment of this present blessing, does not appear. There is rather an actual putting away of the Lord's society.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

(Matt. v.—vii.; Luke vi. 20–49.)

We* deem it our duty conscientiously to abstain from bewildering ourselves in the strife of the critics, as to whether these sayings of our Lord uttered, according to Matthew's testimony, when he was set upon the Mount, were indeed spoken as one connected discourse. We may not unite with those, who, losing the simplicity of their attention to the one only Teacher in their oblique regard to this doctor on one side and that rabbi on the other, and sacrificing more or less the humility of discipleship to their overmuch learning; yet are skillful and sharp-sighted enough in their own eyes to come forward with their decisions upon what the Holy Spirit has written for the Church, and to decree—"Here there is connection, and here none"—This or that cannot be accepted because inconsistent with the Lord's own style of thought."† We, for our own part, judge not those of our faithful brethren and friends who suffer themselves to be led by an unfaithful system of interpretation, so far from the firm foundation; but to us it must ever be matter of conscience and honor before the supreme judicial throne of the highest criticism, to abstain from putting our own self-willed construction upon that word which we read in common *with* the Church, and which should be jealously kept inviolate as the holy text of our preaching *to* the Church. Had not the chair and the pulpit in the present day been so unhappily sundered, the perception of theologians otherwise faithful could not have become so blunted as to allow them to rise from Matt. v. 1, 2, vii. 28, 29, viii. 1, without asking themselves: "Can I expect the simple laity, the believing congregation, to believe me when I tell them,—*This is not true in its seeming sense!* Will they be either willing or able to conceive, that Matthew or any other could deliberately collect together into one, various discourses uttered by our Lord at various times, and then inventing an imaginary frame to the picture, report it in so many words, as one discourse uttered in one place and at the same time?" Let him believe this who may; to us the thought is incredible; and that as we are persuaded, not through wilful opposition to the light of the truth which would enter, but through a true perception in our inmost minds of the self-evidencing truth of the holy word; not through our dulness which cannot understand the grounds of critical evidence, but from that clearness of discernment which sees into their groundlessness.

Yes, the Lord's Spirit so brought the Lord's words to the Evangelists' remembrance, that though they might not write them down always according to the strict letter and word, yet they were enabled to give us their substance and contents with perfect truth: but the Spirit of truth could never have permitted the slightest untruthfulness to have occurred in their record. Matthew and John had the Spirit in apostolical measure, Mark and Luke, ministers to the word, stand indeed at one remove from them. But even they, although liable occasionally (by way of distinction) to transfer or confuse things of no importance, have never—especially in reference to the time, place, and connection of the longer discourses—in the very slightest degree possible fallen under any such imputation. This every one must be constrained to admit. Much less can Matthew and John be thought to have presumed to treat in any such way the words of the Word, whose eye-witnesses and ministers they were—arranging, adjusting and working them up, contrary to actual and absolute fact.* The deeper we penetrate into the relation which here subsists between the human and he divine, the clearer we discern, having any measure of faith in our interpretation of Scripture, the miracle which must have been wrought by the Spirit in the furnishing of the Evangelists for the task of handing down the discourses and the acts of our Lord; so much the further must we recede from the unseemly thought that this or that was put in

* Not a formula merely; for we speak indeed in the name of many like-minded with ourselves.

† On revision we retract not one iota of this. Wieseler, indeed, very summarily decides, that the *first glance of the eye* gives authentic evidence of its having been collected from many several discourses; but the glance of *our* eye beholds it very differently. Let the incorrigible sophistry of such, alas! as Lange persist in asserting—"This or that would be in this way or the other more appropriate—the Evangelist intended or wished, &c., &c.": I know by the testimony of my life-long reading, that every thing is there alone appropriate, where the Holy Spirit, who well understood and truly glorified the words of Jesus, has written and placed it. [The author, however, seems to overlook the fact that at least one of the inspired Evangelists, namely, Luke, himself omits precisely the apparently irrelevant matter here, and gives the most of it in other connections. The difference in point of authority which he intimates as obtaining between the Gospels is a hazardous doctrine. His argument as to the arrangement of the words of Christ in Matthew is untenable, because equally applicable to that of Christ's *acts*.—*Am. Ed.*]

*Even though the nun of Dülmen affirms it (Sepp, ii. 261), it is not true! and though men of the highest repute have for a long time past (*e. g.* Kleuker, *Menschlicher Versuch*, &c., p. 223) maintained it—I will protest from the deepest conviction!

order simply by man; or rather shifted and deranged, in order that we, learned investigators of later times, might be needed to set it right again.

We cannot conceive that Matthew could have wrought up sayings of our Lord uttered at various times into one connected whole, as if they had been spoken at one time; for as the apostolical humility of his own spirit was incapable of such an impropriety, so neither was it possible that the Holy Ghost should guide and instruct him to record any untruth whatsoever for the Church. That which Luke, ch. vi. 20–49, gives us as the Lord's discourse, with essentially similar notification of *place*, vi. 17, and concluding asseveration, vii. 1, as Matthew's, is manifestly the same Sermon on the Mount in another epitome: whence we should gather that we have only in Matthew also an *abstract*, though his is more complete. The passages of the Sermon on the Mount which we find repeated elsewhere in *Luke* are simply *repetitions:* the Lord did indeed re-utter them at the time and place which Luke mentions; and a sound exposition will prove that their mention *there* is quite consistent with the connection. That the Lord should have uttered more than once, not simply his briefer moral sentences, but also his longer discourses, is not unworthy of the great Teacher in any point of view; is conformable both to his human condescension and his divine wisdown, and puts to shame the vanity of many a poor preacher who is ever striving to bring forth what, at least in words, will take a novel form. Within the individual Evangelists such recurrence is incontestible. For instance, Matthew repeats what was already in the Sermon on the Mount in ch. xii. 33, xv. 14 (comp. Luke vi. 39), xviii. 8, 9, (Mark ix. 43–47), xix. 9 (yet again in another place, Luke xvi. 18), xxii. 5. Further repetitions are to be found in Luke: xi. 2–4, the prayer given in the same words, but with a more impressive design and meaning; xii. 22–34, the longer discourse against care; similarly ch. viii. 16 (Mark iv. 21), xi. 33, xi. 9–13, 34–36, xii. 58, 59, xiii. 24–27, xiv. 34, 35 (Mark ix. 50), xvi. 13–17: finally, in Mark ix. 24, xi. 25, 26. These very repetitions, which the expositor must first read in the place where they are found, and then refer to their connection in the original discourse, serve to indicate to us the Lord's Sermon on the Mount as what it really is, the preliminary abstract of his doctrine: and he himself, in repeating them, points out to us the especial significance of this his first sermon for the instruction of all people.

The Lord spoke from a mountain—upon one of the level platforms of which he stood surrounded by his disciples—to his disciples and to all the people from among whom he would call his disciples. The choice of a mountain had reference to something more than merely a fitting pulpit; as the mind of the church has testified in the fidelity with which this circumstance has been retained to designate the sermon itself. As the Mediator of the new covenant bringing grace for the fulfillment of the law, opens here his mouth to preach to us for the first time *salvation* (Heb. ii. 3); we involuntarily and naturally think of that mountain of the law, which preached condemnation. The Old Testament placed foremost the curse; the New, being glad-tidings, begins with blessing. It is not a "second law" which proceeds now from the Lord—who as he then gave his testimonies amid the tempest and darkness of Sinai, now in his love to man, sits down among them that they may sit at his feet and learn his words (Deut. xxxiii. 2, 3)—but is the fulfilling of that one unrepealed law which is here offered by *grace*, and which is now *required* through the acceptance of that offered grace (ch. v. 17, 18). Thus the fundamental principles of this compendious first sermon are found in that mysterious word, "the fulfilling of all righteousness," as also in that first public requirement —"*Repent ye!*" We may further say that the Sermon on the Mount teaches us wherein that *repentance* consists, whereby alone we enter the *kingdom of heaven*. It preaches it, however, as *a Gospel*, since it commences with most gracious *promises*, with blessings pronounced upon the poor, and those who hunger after righteousness; but it deepens into a *spiritual and strict interpretation of the letter of the law* (its only true interpretation as authoritatively established by the Lawgiver, the time being now fully come); and *requires*, on the ground of the promised grace, the righteousness of God for the kingdom of God: yea, it closes with warning and threatening announcement of a future *judgment* before him who here speaks, and who thus already bears sublime witness to himself as Lord; before him who comes to the meek and miserable with grace as their Saviour, and the power of grace as their Sanctifier, but will then as judge receive such only into his kingdom as have been restored by his grace to the *performance of the will of God*. This general view suffices to show us that the Sermon on the Mount embraces in its summary one connected design from its beginning to its end; and teaches us to perceive, between its most attractive commencement, where the kingdom of heaven is opened wide to all the meek, and its fearfully threatening close, where the strait gate is shut for ever against all evil-doers, the progressive advancement of a deeply significant development. The gradation of all preaching is here reflected—from promise through requirement to warning; to which corresponds the progress of the life of the disciples of Christ, the children of God. All apostolical preaching of the Gospel must begin with the gracious commencement of this sermon, the conclusion of all apostolical warning and announcement of judgment must coincide with its awful conclusion; but intermediate lies all that progressive teaching and exhortation, which through faith in its fulfiller establishes the law in the believer. *This* ar-

rangement of the Sermon on the Mount has been seized and reproduced to us with such simplicity and clearness by Matthew—through the Spirit who, besides bringing to his remembrance what he had heard, now gave him to understand it likewise—that we can only ascribe the anixety of expositors to find another connection, or their inability to find any, to a lack of simplicity in reading and apprehending him. We may suppose that the Lord did not utter the individual weighty sayings in a manner quite so detached, but, as was necessary to the hearers of an oral discourse, that he assisted their comprehension by adding many explanatory and connecting remarks; and probably not without pauses at the turning points which would leave time for impression. But the Spirit has taken an exact epitome of its essential contents, and constructed it for the Holy Scripture into one new, and, as it were, glorified word; so that we have, after all, through the intervention of the Holy Ghost, the entire actual Sermon on the Mount, which we may hear and understand even as it was spoken by the Lord himself.

The whole contents of the three chapters of Matthew fall, as we have said, into three sections. *The fulfilling of the law*—that perfect righteousness of those who, in becoming the disciples of Christ, may and shall become again the children of their heavenly Father (ch. v. 48), and only through such righteousness shall enter the kingdom of heaven—is alike *promised* by him who announced himself as *come for its fulfillment* (ch. v. 17), and demanded by him who will only have such disciples, and only bring such children to glory, as receive and retain what he brings and imparts, even to the consummation and perfection of all. But both to the inner, gradual development, and the external patient progress of the disciples, there corresponds a progression in the teaching of the sermon—according to its three main gradations. First of all, there is the general *attracting promise*, then *law with its specific demands* (now indeed the law of the Spirit, through the life of grace which has been received), and finally the *warning*, which in its stern restrictions, rejects the impure and the disobedient. Thus the discourse proceeds from the *foundation* of sanctification offered as a gift at the outset, through its *outward manifestation* in the life, demanded as the acknowledgment and evidence of that gift, to the *test and proof* at the close of the disciples' course, which is exhibited as the most pressing of all motives.

The first division embraces ch. v. 3–20; in which the same three-fold progression already reveals itself as an undertone running through the general promise. Hence we have absolute and special promise, as the origin and foundation of all, in the benedictions (v. 3–12); then, on the ground of their assurance (ye are! ye have!), the evidence and manifestation of that new life and light are demanded (v. 13–16); finally, there is here also a warning, which in its emphatic restriction and rejection, points forward even now to the test at the end of all (v. 17–20). Even this last rigorous test indeed is still under the high note of promise: I *am come* to fulfill!

At this point, viz., in v. 20, is the transition to the second division, which now proceeds to trace out, in the form of a spiritual law, the *outward manifestation* of that righteousness, the foundation of which is the gift of grace, ch. v. 21, vii. 14. This is pre-eminently the *main body* of the Sermon on the Mount. Here the Lord sets forth the righteousness of his disciples through *three great contrasts*, as they exhibit themselves in their inward organic progress. The *first* and most obvious contrast, which at the same time is a representation of the spiritual fulfillment of the law: *Not as the Pharisees*, the men of the letter of the law, and of external appearances—which are, nevertheless, hypocritical. This is, in accordance with the fundamental principle with which the Sermon on the Mount set out, most strictly impressed and most amply illustrated from ch. v. 21 to vi. 18. This is the *basis* of a spiritual, correct, and cordial understanding of the law. The *second* contrast springs with still sharper severity of truth out of the former; just as John the Baptist had placed Pharisaic Judaism on a par with heathenism: *Not like the Gentiles*, the self-seeking men of the flesh and of that good which is earthly and therefore perishable. In the former it had been already premised that the Pharisees were like the publicans, yea, like the heathen (ch. v. 46, vi. 7); this is now more fully established, and in such a way that we can only understand *heathen* in a spiritual sense as the opposite of the new, true Israel of the Messiah, ch. vi. 19–34. This is the *procedure* of an obedient, undivided and heartily believing endeavor after the kingdom of God and his righteousness. Finally, what can the *third* contrast to true discipleship be, but its opposition to the imperfect, insincere disciples themselves, who even in the following of Christ bring with them their Pharisaism: *Not as the half disciples and mere professors*, the censorious ones who shamefully desecrate that which is holy, ch. vii. 1–14. This is the *perfection* of pure love, as humble as it is wise; it is obviously, at the same time, the most stringent and severe utterance of Christ's law for his own people, and thus forms a fit transition to the third division which is wholly *admonitory*.

The spiritual fulfilling of the law, the perfect righteousness, has at length found its simplest expression (ch. vii. 12) in a principle most easy to be apprehended, and which indeed our conscience confirms from our natural love of self; yet is this self-renunciation but the turning of nature to the *strait gate* in order *to do*, and to the narrow way for continuance in doing. This leads, by a connection not very manifest, but very express and emphatic, to the third main division of the whole sermon, in which the solemn *warning* against every bye path, and the threatening of judgment upon all who at the end shall be found not to

have been doers of the words of spirit and of grace, reach their highest severity.

Here is shown the test of true or false profession and life, and *not all* who have said, Lord, Lord, and done many wonderful things, stand in the judgment. The fruits of the grace so freely and graciously offered in the beginning, are inexorably demanded; the one Lawgiver, who wills that every man should submit to judgment and judge himself in order to salvation, appears also as the condemner of all to whom he has not become a Saviour (James iv. 12). But here also, although all has the sound of solemn warning and severe threatening, there is yet heard once more a note of the fundamental promise in the planting of the good tree for good fruit (v. 15–20). Then once more is the law of the divine will stamped as a requirement (v. 21–23). The exhibition of the certainly impending trial, awful in its simplicity, closes the whole; and the fearful fall of the house built on the sand forms a striking contrast with the invitation at the beginning. For the fundamental threefold progression evolved in the organism of life as of doctrine, is repeated at every stage, as will be more manifestly shown in a closer investigation of the particulars from the beginning.

The seven benedictions with an eighth (ch. v. 3–12), which contains the entire original foundation and beginning of *promise*, are also arranged in their order so as to advance from the first fundamental principle, through a progressive path marked out, to the full assurance at the end. The Lord lifts up his eyes on his disciples (Luke vi. 20)—beholding in these immediately around him, the type and earnest of all those future disciples whom he would call out from the mass of the people—and proclaims what kind of men they must be whom he will receive, and by his further directions prepare for himself; or what they must become who shall enter the kingdom of heaven. Thus *first of all* there is the *internal state of mind*, which is the only, the indispensable condition of the regeneration that grace provides, and therefore the basis of discipleship. The promises, with all their perfect fulness of promise, are presented as the *objective supply* of a felt *necessity*, the sincere acknowledgment of which, together with the outgoing after help, gives already the certain right to *receive* them: the kingdom of heaven comes to the poor as a *free gift*. The *susceptibility* for this reception consists in the *knowledge of need*, in the mere knowledge and discernment of it first of all—a conscious poverty of spirit; to which must be added the grievous *feeling* of that knowledge quickened into life, and the instant and urgent outgoing of the *will* for help, this again being viewed as the mere *willingness* of a negative resignation (v. 5), and as raised into positive *longing*, the hunger and thirst after *righteousness*.*

Hence in the *second place*, inasmuch as they who thus earnestly desire it are invested with righteousness, the *outward and inward deportment* follows, which when that righteousness has been imparted, may be demanded as the *witness* and proof of our discipleship in our after course. In the former series we have the strait *gate* of the kingdom of heaven, in the latter the narrow *way;* as Von Gerlach has so far well said. In this second series the promises become more definite as *conformable* to a corresponding *condition of mind*, the actual attainment of which, with its manifestation in *acts*, alone makes good the claim to keep, increase, and receive in all its fulness, that promised grace. The kingdom of heaven establishes itself in the heart as the *likeness to God* of those who seek that kingdom and exercise themselves unto it. The outward and inward quality of this advancing righteousness of life consists, first, in this *holiness of deportment* itself,—as well as in its *acts*, rendering to others, *without* the mercy which has been received; that laborious love which resembles God's, and is the beginning and end of all fulfillment of the law;—as also in that *purity of heart*, which alone from the very beginning gives truth and value to every action, and in the deeds of mercy re-acts *within* upon itself, to its own perfection;† and then, secondly, as its result, in the *efficiency* of such a holy deportment (concerning which it is both promised that it shall never be wanting, and *commanded* that it should be diligently sought), namely, in their diffusing peace as God diffuses it, when his children love as he loves, and are pure as he is pure. Thus have the spiritually poor become so rich in the possession of the kingdom of heaven that they are qualified to bring its peace, or at least to offer it, to the world! (2 Cor. vi. 10). Can it be true, as it has been maintained, that there is no *progression* to be detected here?

Such are the *seven* benedictions, which embrace the entire Christian discipleship, regeneration in its development from poverty of spirit into all that is contained in the true and essential filial relation to God. But in this peace-making there was already pre-supposed a transition, finally, to the conflict and opposition of an evil world. There is added, there-

* The transposition of the fourth and fifth verses in Lachmann's text, which Neander accepts as "logical" and "suitable to their aim as instruction," and which Von Gerlach and others have approved, we hold to be altogether incorrect. For the meekness here signified follows upon a mourning that has received consolation; and the poverty passes naturally into such mourning.

† Here so soon, as afterwards in his exposition Kienlen's hardihood contradicts itself, in transposing to suit *his own* scheme, the seventh and eighth verses. The fault of "slight failures of memory" imputed to the evangelists may be exchanged rather in this case, for great failure of understanding in their expositor.

fore, in conclusion, *thirdly*, in the form of an eighth benediction extending beyond its immediate object, a declaration of the heavenly reward of God's children presented on earth, which is *admonitory*, testing, and points forward to the final ratification of blessing at the end of all. The *promise* which here also is the predominant note, refers only to the *confirmed assurance* of that first one—The kingdom of heaven is and ever shall be yours: it is at the same time the *contrast* of victory with warfare, a *reward conformable* to a worthy qualification for it. Indeed the persecution of the righteous by the unrighteous is the due and the authentic way by which the goal of persevering love is attained. This is further exhibited in the first transition to an application to the disciples—*Happy* are *ye*—persecution injures you not, but is rather the proof that ye are true peace-makers, and not false prophets crying, Peace, peace (Luke vi. 26): yet here also we cannot fail to hear the undertone of *warning*—So they do it all *falsely!* Finally, the encouragement: Your *reward* is sure; then be ye, like the prophets before you, and now much more, the salt of the earth and the light of the world! (The transition to what follows.) Thus have we exhibited our view of the order of the benedictions: the reader himself must test it, and prefer, if he will, any other of the multitude of arrangements which have been essayed.* We think, however, that enough has been said to show that it is not our "preconceived determination, that the *seven-number* shall play their part here" (Kienlen), but that the eighth is really only supplementary to the seven.

We have already begun in these observations to pursue the whole into its parts, to point out the true position and the profound meaning of every single saying. In the light now thrown upon them the holy words will, even to their minutest detail, clearly and transparently unfold their meaning.

He *opened his mouth*.†—Disciples and people solemnly waited for the first word which, under God's heaven, with his eye upon the holy land upon earth, and after such a preparation for such preaching as had never before been heard among men, he would proceed to utter. And they were *gracious* words which here also at the first proceeded out of his mouth (Luke iv. 22), although followed by those solemn and impressive utterances which brought the power and authority of God more plainly home to the sensual man for his conviction. The *first* word of his mouth is, *Blessed!*—and again and again he cries, Blessed, before he could proceed to speak in that other style to which sinners and the ungodly constrained him. For who is this that here speaks? He who is come to give *blessedness*. But he also, who in speaking and dispensing blessedness from stage to stage, at the same time and by that means *sanctifies*. How shall we poor sinners be made happy unto holiness at the beginning, and holy unto happiness at the end? Here is the answer, here is the *doctrine* of all teaching for all people upon earth. The blessedness goes ever progressively increasing along that way, which the Saviour here points out to his disciples, if they continue by walking in it to become more and more *capable of that blessedness*.

Verse 3. This first word of the Sermon on the Mount is, again, pre-eminently the "fundamental formula of the Gospel:" it demands *faith* in so joyful a message, without mentioning the word; it *awakens*, rather, and *attracts* that faith through its confident and encouraging assurance. And how can any one who is truly poor in spirit fail to apprehend and believe this message of mercy concerning the kingdom of heaven, as soon as it resounds in in his ears? If the poor are altogether unable to believe in their being made blessed through grace, it is proof that, in spite of all appearances, they are not yet fundamentally poor enough. On the contrary, it may sometimes appear as if a man could not believe, while there is actually, in his complaining before God, in the seeking and longing after faith of his wretched heart, a secret faith already present: such mourners, indeed, have pressed forwards already into the second benediction. In the first nothing more is as yet spoken of than perfect poverty of spirit, which may be so poor as not to have even a feeling of need, not even a becoming sorrow for sin. And this is indeed *that one thing* which the Lord at the beginning of his dispensation of blessedness may and must *pre-suppose;* nothing can the sinner bring with him when he is called by grace, but a *sincere consciousness* of his wanting before God every thing that avails in His sight, of having no righteousness in himself, no life of the Spirit. Simple and easy is this one condition and requirement; but hard enough, alas! to the pride of nature. All the further requirements and conditions, which now follow as the objects of gracious benediction, are already fulfilled out of that first gift of grace to the poor—one after, and arising out of, the other. The quickening of the feelings into a deep and sorrowful penitence comes not from mere nature: he who can pour forth the tears of his eyes or of his heart, that is, the tears of sincere contrition for his *sin*, and not only for its shame and punishment, has previously received, though himself might not as yet be conscious of it, as one who has become poor, the spirit of grace and supplication for that purpose. And so further through the whole progressive series every succeeding condition is

* See *e. g.* Zeller in the *Monatsblatt von Beuggen*, 1847, No. 6. as before. 1839, Nos. 9, 10. Compare therewith Kienlen (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1848. 3)—who indeed prefers quoting Lisco to Stier—where much is to the same effect and equally strange.

† Whereupon Lange says beautifully in his own way, "Man is the mouth of the creation, Christ is the mouth of humanity."

only required, because the preceding consolation has brought it. But no one step may be overleaped. We cannot begin in the middle; we can neither enforce a godly sorrow by any efforts of our own in order to bring this first to the Giver of blessedness, nor before the contrite surrender of sin attain unto the fervent hunger and thirst after righteousness; we can neither become pure in heart without the practice of mercy, nor again can we exercise mercy before we have received the comfort of mercy ourselves. The new life of the sinner derived from grace is indeed a living plant, which contains folded in itself at every stage of developement all that is to follow; and as soon as the kingdom of heaven begins to sink into the needy soul, awakened to a sincere consciousness of its poverty, and aroused by the Spirit's influence in it, the germ of the peace of God for the making of peace among men enters with it.* But that one follows the other, as the Lord here speaks, even to the full unfolding and formation of the whole, takes place through the growth of time; and the field of man's heart, in which all such fruits by degrees through grace may grow up to maturity, is ever in itself nothing but *poverty*.

The *μακάριοι*, *blessed*, which with such gracious emphasis stands first, has not, down to ver. 11, either *εἰσί*, *are*, or *ἔσονται*, *shall be*, connected with it, although the translation gives it correctly enough for the obvious sense —*Blessed are!* In the sacred text it is a simple *proclamation* (like the Heb. אַשְׁרֵי), and contains as such the whole fulness of what mercy offers for the acceptance of faith, without any further definite announcement or qualification. It embraces *alike*, they *are* now immediately blessed, and *shall be so* ever more and unto perfection. Then as the promises attached look forward to the future from the second saying onwards, so does it also in the first: The kingdom of heaven is yours; it shall be, and will be ever more perfectly your own. The *kingdom of heaven and blessedness* are but one, so that the first *for* is a sublime assurance which bears its own witness to itself. *Poor in Spirit*, *Πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι*, עֲנִיֵּי רוּחַ, Isa. xli. 17; lxvi. 2; especially lxi. 1, to which Scripture the Lord here refers, as again at his first preaching in Nazareth (Luke iv. 18); yet *πτωχοί*, *poor*, answers rather to the Old Testament אֶבְיוֹנִים, *needy*, (Isa. xxix. 19), so that *outward* poverty is actually included in it, as is manifest in the not incorrect version of Luke. Yet it is not merely the externally poor and wretched who are referred to, as the *τῷ πνεύματι*, *in spirit*, which is added emphatically shows; by consequence the rich and the exalted also, if they are only poor in spirit. But it must be observed, that the persons pronounced blessed are not the subject of the promising proposition; it is not they (as afterwards in ver. 20) who enter and attain to the kingdom of heaven, but the *kingdom of heaven* comes to them, and enters into them!—its whole fulness into every one, whose poverty opens to receive it. Yes truly, here is it come *near*, quite near to those who have it not. The first, bare commencement of *μετάνοια*, or *repentance*, may dare already to appropriate all to itself, in order to receive all; and thus through the shining of the beams of mercy into the soul, for the first time, and immediately, it becomes awakened to a more lively perception and feeling its own darkness.

Verse 4. The Lord has further in view Isa. lxi. 2, 3, and proclaims the great year of freedom and of grace—*to comfort all that mourn*. Were the *poor* (Matt. xi. 5) to whom he preaches the Gospel, actually in the most comprehensive sense of the general invitation all the miserable and the unfortunate, the toilworn and the heavy laden under the burden and need of life; so has this announcement of a general consolation a like unrestricted and extensive introduction: Come unto me, all who suffer affliction; ye may and ye shall find help. But in drawing nearer to receive this comfort, it becomes evident that there must be added—But be ye *truly* mourners, sorrow on account of the inner-ground and first cause of all evil, sin! The outwardly poor are far from being always and in their inner spirit so *poor*, as to allow the heavenly gift of God room to enter into empty and destitute hearts: therefore is the impressive *τῷ πνεύματι*, *in spirit*, added, which, like the *kingdom of heaven*, manifestly casts down all Jewish expectation of the Messiah and *points within*. The same—as a kind of superscription to the whole discourse—is naturally to be understood also of the mourning (or something similar, as "godly," *κατὰ θεόν*, 2 Cor. vii. 10); it is not, however, repeated, partly because what preceded has made it sufficiently plain, partly because every mourner, in the pure sense of the word, as one humbled beneath the mighty hand of God, necessarily retreats within himself, and is very near at least to the susceptibility of receiving the true consolation. Seest thou one weeping, thou mayest securely address to him the heavenly message of a merciful salvation, in the sure hope and confidence of a hearing for your message. For "mourning and sorrow are in reality the acknowledged and felt contradiction of the nature that is in us, to the *divine* life which will be revealed in us" (Nitzsch, *Predigten*, v. Selection). The mourners *shall* be comforted, (which well expresses the future *παρακληθήσονται*,) if they only will, if the consolation that comes only finds them true mourners, who will suffer themselves to hear comfortable words. Yea, as surely as the high and lofty One, who declares himself, in his loving condescension to all misery and need, to be the *Holy One*, dwelleth with those who are of a contrite

* Lange says further, "And in the blessed peacemaking is still poverty of spirit, in its essential excellence, transformed into the most blessed humility."

and humble spirit (Isa. lvii. 15), so surely is the merciful comfort of God immediately nigh to every troubled one in his affliction. It is but a commencement of *blessedness*, a specific beginning of consolation in the very sorrow itself, as even the world seems to suspect when it sings about the "sweetness of grief," and in its own way pronounces happy those who can weep. But this is only the shadow and slender beginning of that comfort which the Lord intends, and brings with him. And if *his* unfading and true spiritual consolation is brought to those who sorrow in the world, it, alas! soon becomes manifest that those are very far from being willing to turn in sincere sorrow to the right consolation, they are not found to be *meek* mourners, who have [not] broken down and given up their self-will, pride, and opposition. It is quite true as Nitzsch says, "I cannot be man, and not have the beginning of sorrow within me"; but the beginning follows, alas! very evil courses in degenerate humanity. There is a sorrow which is very lightly comforted with nothing; there is, on the other hand, a superstitious and proud sorrow, which *refuses to take comfort* with the consolation of God. To all such mourning as springs not from poverty of spirit, this promise is assuredly not given. For the Gospel which the Lord here preaches pre-supposes the work of the law and the discipline of preparatory grace upon the soul.

Verse 5. Our previous general view and the immediate connection have already shown how πραεῖς, *meek*, which is commonly interpreted falsely or a least superficially, is here to be understood. The mere external exhibition of a passive, unresisting mind is not spoken of here; it is to be understood (as Neander this time sees) only of the *internal disposition of heart*, into which the Lord's word penetrates deeper and deeper. Still less may we think of an anticipation of the entire and complete virtue of Christian *meekness;* for the gradual process of the inner preparation of mind is marked out here from ver. 3–6, before the conduct to which it leads is described ver. 7–9. The "patient endurance of earthly affliction" is not, as Kienlen supposes, immediately spoken of here; but passiveness, and the breaking down of natural opposition, regarded strictly as an internal condition of mind. As the poor become mourners, when the consciousness of their need passes from *conviction* into *feeling*, so now is it, further, of still more importance, that they in their misery bend and incline their *will* to the coming consolation. The willingness to be comforted and helped, is indeed better than all outcry on account of necessity, if that go no further. It is, in a certain sense, as we have seen, the test of true mourning, which without it cannot be genuine; but then this *resignation* is more distinctively developed, when the Spirit Comforter, in order to make the mourner entirely submissive begins at the very commencement of his consolation thoroughly to *correct* and chastise him. Πραεῖς, *meek*, is found in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, for the עֲנָוִים, *poor*, of the Psalms and Prophets; and in the New Testament, πρᾶος, πραΰς, πραότης, indicates mostly (as besides in the Greek πραύθυμος, πραύνοος) an inner quality of mind. Observe carefully 1 Cor. iv. 21: Gal. vi. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 4; and especially Eph. iv. 2.* Thus is it a willingness and plasticity of spirit, in opposition to the proud, opposing obstinacy of the natural self-will. If those who are poor in spirit, and mourners, are found humbled and broken with the beginning of such a disposition, then shall they, when comforted by their *reception* of consolation, advance yet farther in this meekness of soul. For he who has experienced kindness is by it made gentle, so that he has become willing to be content with every thing, as Braune excellently says. Here Rambach† hits the right sense, much better than many later expositors: "This is a fruit of the Spirit which is found upon the soil of spiritual poverty, contrition and mourning; a noble flower, which grows out of the ashes of self-love, upon the grave of pride. On the one hand a man sees his own utter ruin, his unworthiness and misery, on the other he contemplates the kindness and benignity of God in Christ Jesus (Titus iii. 2–4). The internal characteristic is a disposition of heart, which, through the keen perception of its own misery, and of the abounding mercy of God, has become so pliant, gentle, mild, flexible and tractable that no traces of its original ruggedness, of its wild and untamed nature remain." Such meekness,‡ taking to itself the word of grace which dispenses blessedness unto holiness, in its correction as well as in its comfort, does James also require (ch. i. 21); but only of those who are already newborn, in whom this word is already engrafted. With the requirements of this the Saviour could by no means have commenced; that would not have have been the right message for poor sinners which should *begin* with—Blessed are the merciful, or the pure in heart; so neither could this willing resignation be demanded from the natural man, before he has advanced to that point out of his poverty, which is all he has, through mourning and consolation.

With inconceivable grandeur does the promise which corresponds come forward, in order to allure our proud and stubborn natural mind to submit to that death from which it shrinks:

---

* Where to *walk* worthy of our vocation in long-suffering, forbearance, love and peace, is indicated as its end, but the internal fundamental state of mind by which it is aimed at is ταπεινοφροσύνη and πραότης just in the same sense as Matt. v. 3, 5. Μακροθυμία and ἀγάπη are then the passive and active expression of such a disposition of mind.

† *Betrachtungen über die acht Seligheiten.*

‡ Not merely (according to Lange) "before men" as the result of mourning before God, but also and especially meekness before God. For are they not the "mourners" of the Psalter

For they shall, they will, *possess or inherit the land, the earth!* Is not this worth the sacrifice of self, to be enriched with the free gift of such a possession, of such riches? It is an Old Testament promise, which, while it there clings to the typical land of Canaan, extends much further in the design of the Holy Ghost, (see Psa. xxxvii. 11; xxv. 13; Isa. lvii. 13; lx. 21;) even to the new earth which, with the new heavens, God declares that he will make (Isa. lxvi. 22). It is the ultimate and full meaning of the promise to Abraham—to be the heir of the *world* (Rom. iv. 13). With reference to the hope of their faith, to the dominion of their spirit, it is already said of God's children—All things are yours (1 Cor. iii. 22). But what will it be in the full fulfillment! The first promise was altogether for the present, the second already points to the ever-following consolation, the third stretches far away into the most distant futurity. The kingdom of *heaven*, ver. 3, which appears not at first in eartly power and glory, but comes into the hearts of the wretched for their consolation and righteousness, is nevertheless in its future, as it here at once openly proclaims, a kingdom of the *earth*. Thus does the great Fulfiller teach his docile hearers in his very first discourse, how the promises of the prophets, which cannot be broken, are to be understood; and at the same time teaches what it was the design of the law to create in their hearts, and that it is only given to drive the needy to divine grace, in order that their hunger and thirst after righteousness should find its satisfaction. For already in these seven sayings of blessedness the *Law and the Prophets* are compendiously unfolded.

How manifestly are all these utterances of divine truth, which bears its simple and majestic testimony to itself, opposed at once to the Pharisaic delusion and pride of self-righteousness, to the Sadducee contentment with the present, sensual delight of this world, and to the perverted thoughts of the world and the natural man! Verses 3–5 are three paradoxes, which with all their gracious invitation and promise, are nevertheless to carnal Israel, to the earthly, self-seeking and sensual man, a stone of stumbling thrown in the way. For grace can only bear the testimony of truth to itself, and the Saviour conceals not, from the beginning, what kind of salvation it is that he brings. Happy the unhappy! Well for the mourners! This does violence to the world's sentiments, and constrains it, either to *press into* the true experience of so wonderful a doctrine, or even at this early point to pass it by for the broad gate, because this door is too strait. "Thou must assuredly be *converted* unto the *blessedness* which the Lord pronounces, as much as unto the righteousness"—so preaches Nitzsch. The very first word teaches us that there is a blessedness which consists not in *pleasant* sensations, or joyful emotions, but that which is to *nature most displeasing*. The Lord points impressively from without to within from the present time to the future, from the self of man to the gift and grace of God. O that the *richly endowed* and *worldly blessed* of our day, to whom the beginning of the Sermon on the Mount must come with the full force of most direct contrast and contradiction, would but meekly hear it, and give up their hold upon "this side" for the sake of that which is on "the other side," that kingdom of heaven which, in its time, shall also be upon earth, the inheritance of the despised, quiet and patient ones of the land, the humble and meek of the "Preacher upon the Mount!" *Self-renunciation* is the way to *world dominion*. Give thyself up in passive obedience to divine grace, and it will present thee one day with a crown of glory, after having previously forgiven thee all thy sin, and healed all thy infirmity. But not otherwise! Thinkest thou in thine heart to rule and possess, to sway and enjoy, all things upon earth, at thine own will and in thy unrighteousness, under the eye of the God of heaven and earth? Thou wilt be put to confusion, and bearest about thee already the silent witness thereof. The *vir fortis ac strenuus*, the hero or genius, the worldling or conqueror may strut in lordly pride with his evil conscience for a while upon earth, until he is doomed to go down into Sheol to all the other uncircumcised; but the meek in the school of Jesus have *a title of heirship* upon this earth, which no slanderer or persecutor will be able to cancel in the book of their Father and their King: and the day shall come when the *lambs* shall feed after their manner in *their* pastures and waste places (Isa. v. 17). The kingdom of heaven is a free gift for the poor, but only for the poor in spirit; a comfort for the mourners, but only for those who sorrow with the right sorrow: it must ever be, and *will prove* itself also as a *kingdom*, a *dominion*, but only for the meek.

Verse 6. Out of *humbleness*, *sadness*, *meekness* (to use the words of Nitzsch once more), grows, finally, *greatness of soul*, the sanctified and right loftiness of desire which aspires earnestly towards that which alone is *right*. The future possessors of the earth, and its now rightfully installed heirs, whose is even now the kingdom of heaven with all its reversion, including the ruling upon earth, these *hunger and thirst* throughout their whole course, even as they did at the beginning; just as the poor to whom the kingdom of heaven is imparted, mourn in the first repentance unto life which they receive as a bestowment of grace, and oftentimes after. But the Lord more and more comforts the mourners, more and more fills the hungry and thirsty soul with the good things of his *righteousness* (Psa. cvii. 9, cxlvi. 7, lxv. 5, xxii. 27; Isa. xli. 17 [Bar. ii. 18]). He who created this hunger, shows by creating it that its appropriate food is also provided. There is a hunger and thirst in man which God did not create in him, and for that there shall be, after the brief semblance of gratification, the pain of an eternal famishing. But there still is deep, deep in fallen man, a little spark of longing

and desire after righteousness; this faintly-glimmering flax, grace kindles into a clear flame, and that is the hunger and thirst which bears in itself the certain assurance that its supply will not be wanting. It is not, indeed, the *being made blessed* in itself and first of all, or "felicity" as man's doctrine runs, after which the souls that have been shown the way to happiness through self-denial, the strait gate of the doing of God's will, should seek and struggle; but *righteousness*, the victory of the eternal and just and good will of God upon earth and in humanity, especially, however, in themselves. Deliver *us* from evil! comes not till the last petition; but the first again and again cries out in longing, Hallowed be thy name! *thy* kingdom come! and utters in meekness, *Thy* will be done! They who thus pray receive the daily bread of their souls, and as much as they require it, of their bodies too. No willing and running, no laboring chase after it in our own strength and in our own way, attains unto righteousness: ours is to desire it; it is for God to give it. Yet observe, that as far as the kingdom of heaven is already set up in these poor, they in their new and inner man naturally, regularly, daily —"with the full force of the instinct of the sustenation of life"—hunger after righteousness, just as the old and outward man hungers after that bread, of which the *man*, however, does not essentially *live*. This hungering and thirsting is the sign of life of the new-born inner man, quickened from the sleep of death: hence it is the last thing by which the Lord can indicate the internal spirit and disposition of the children of God. The discourse now passes over* to the evidencing of that righteousness, which has been given to those that have desired it, and shall be more and more fully given even till their full and complete satisfaction, till the purifying of their hearts in love, till that is fulfilled which is written: As for me, I will *behold thy face* in righteousness, I *shall be satisfied* when I awake with thy likeness (Psa. xvii. 15). In the new earth dwelleth righteousness (2 Pet. iii. 13), and they who one day inherit it, shall then hunger and thirst no more. He who now as a pilgrim citizen of the city to come, earnestly prays over the table of his house and his heart: Make us partakers of thine eternal, heavenly table, which thou hast graciously promised to us in the kingdom,—he shall be satisfied with the kingdom of God and his righteousness, even until the great feast with all the fathers made righteous in faith; nay, he shall be filled here with the supply of both soul and body from day to day: for whatever the necessity of his body requires shall also be given him, just as the soul's necessity, the special plague of every day, is provided for. Thus the hunger for the bread of the soul shall never cease, until the perfect righteousness has come.

Verses 7—9. Up to this point the promises have corresponded to conditions; but these conditions have been no other than the same *need* developing itself from step to step in increasing urgency, and outgoing fervor of desire: in each case, therefore, that which is promised is most essentially a *gift*. Be poor, and the kingdom of heaven shall be thine! Mourn, and thou shalt be comforted! Give up thy will, thou shalt dwell in, and inherit, the everlasting sufficiency! Only hunger and thirst, thou shalt be filled! But now begins the unfolding of a new series. The beginning of this does not simply pre-suppose the end of the former and carry it on, but the outward expression and evidence of the inner principles, the fruits of these hidden feelings manifest themselves already simultaneously in the life; so that they who in their poverty acknowledge their need of mercy, and taste the first-fruits of the divine compassion, begin already to exercise mercy; the mourners begin, while they mourn, to wash their hearts clean; the meek also spontaneously to make peace, the hungerers after righteousness to give themselves up to persecution, on account of that righteousness which they as yet only long for. Inasmuch, however, as all cannot be *spoken* in one word, which pertains to the many-formed unity of the development of the increasing life from its germ to its maturity, it is right to take the ascending order in which the discourse describes it. The eight benedictions, with their conditions, are in a certain sense found united in every child of God, and no member of this wonderful series may be altogether wanting from the time that the first poverty of spirit has received the gift of grace; yet there is an actual and gradual growth of one out of the other. And here the law applies in all its significance, that the gift received must be preserved, exercised, and increased; and that to him only who has, shall more be given in order to his having all, while from him who guards it not, and does not exercise and increase it, shall be taken away that which he has. Consequently the promises of the second series take now the form of *reward*, the recompense of grace to those who are faithful to what they have received. Be merciful, and thou shalt have mercy shown to thee!* Be pure, so shalt thou behold the pure One! Make peace, so shalt thou be the manifest child of the God of peace! Such *requital*, such *recompense* is no less itself mere mercy and the reward of free grace, the divine gift is only in it going on to its superabundant fulfillment; and the qualities, which are the object of recompense, were previously bestowed

* As in the seven petitions of the Lord's prayer the middle one concerning daily bread effects the transition between the first and second table, between God's good and man's need; even so here the fourth of the benedictions mediates between their two parts, and is the transition, inversely, from the need of the poor to the grace, which transforms and glorifies itself in them as righteousness.

* As Luke in another, briefer epitome of the whole Sermon on the Mount, in its few fundamental ideas, exhibits to us, blended with other sayings, ch. vi. 36–39 (Matt. v. 48, vii. 1, 2).

as a gift. For who can show mercy, without having first received mercy? who can be pure in heart, without having contemplated the purity of God? who can diffuse peace, except through that peace of God unto which he has entered?

But—and this is most important—there is here a possibility of the *withdrawal* of grace, from those who have received it, but are not faithful to its corresponding exercises; just as the parables, Matt. xviii. 23–35, xxv. 14–30, also teach. Therefore do the promises even now begin to *sink*, secretly warning against such a loss, while the conditions *rise*.* To the merciful, God has been, indeed, at the outset, merciful; but only they who thereafter forgive also as they have been forgiven, and love as God has loved them, *shall obtain mercy*, that is, at the final testing of their fidelity, finally and securely retain it. The pure in heart have purified themselves in the sight of God, have drawn nigh to him in living acquaintance with his name; but only if they preserve and increase that knowledge unto the end, shall they who have come to God finally and fully come nigh to him. Only they who as peacemakers have proved themselves to the end God's children, shall in the coming "*manifestation* of the sons of God," in the separation between the persevering and the apostates, actually *be called* the children of God, *be acknowledged* as such (which pre-signifies, ch. vii. 23). Thus does the gate become straiter and straiter, as afterwards throughout the whole discourse. He who sets out, may in poverty of spirit confidently believe—I have it! but the nearer he approaches the goal, the more will he utter another cry—Not that I have already attained!

Not a word is needed to prove that ἐλεήμονες, *merciful*, in its compendious sense indicates the practical love of our neighbor, all that is done to our brethren from the inward principle of a communicating and helping charity. It is necessary, however, to observe that such rudiments of regeneration, as were to be found even among the heathen—who, though they knew not Christ, yet through the pure impulse of a latent grace, exercised towards others what they sought for themselves—must be included here; in opposition to that narrow dogmatic limitation, which would despise the good works of such as Cornelius, though God nevertheless esteemed them. Mercy rejoiceth against judgment (James ii. 13): this impartial and holy law of eternal love graciously throws open the kingdom of heaven to many coming from the east and the west; even as it rigidly closes it against those children of the kingdom who, with all their vaunted faith, have never learned or retained love. This mercy, however (as Nitzsch excellently preaches), is not that weak and sickly sympathy which ungodly selfishness cannot but feel, and is too willing to plead in evasion as the true Christianity, not that false kindness to one's neighbor which goes hand in hand with the most unbridled indulgence of one's own flesh. *Therefore* is purity of heart next spoken of as the test of true mercy; not the reverse, as if this presumptive mercy were the guarantee of purity in heart. *Pure in heart*, Καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, בָּרֵי לֵבָב (Psa. lxxiii. 1, comp. Psa. li. 12, xviv. 4–6)—not merely pure in the Levitical typical sense, not merely of clean hands in a Pharisaical or carnally moral sense, but in the inner being before God, who desireth truth in the inward parts (Psa. li. 8). In the position where we find this here, it cannot be a disposition of mind that desires and seeks it, not even the struggle after it out of a deep sense of need, but an actual inner quality, a condition of the inner man that is ever advancing to perfection. The heart is purified through faith (Acts xv. 9); and in love out of a pure heart (1 Tim. i. 5), in faith working by love—to the perfection of which faith works co-operate (James ii. 22)—the purified heart goes on to the consummation of purity. The stimulant and impulse of practical mercy is the mercy of the pure One towards my yet impure heart: the more diligently I now wash my heart in this mercy of God, and my hands by exercising it in return towards my neighbor, the more fully the sentiment of love within me is confirmed by the acts of love; so much the nearer do I come, in the way of a priestly entrance into the holiest (which is, in its degree, an appearing before God already, a beholding of his face), unto the final and consummate fulfillment of that type—*To see God*, as it is expressed in 1 John iii. 2, 3. Just in the degree that we are inwardly and essentially purified as God is pure, are we capable of a living perception of him. But that perception, when perfect in the glorified, shall be also the actual *vision* of God; that is, be it understood, of the face of God *in the Son*, who has ever been from the beginning the face of God turned towards the creature (1 Tim. vi. 16).* *Peacemakers*, Εἰρηνοποιοί, βουλόμενοι εἰρήνην, עֹצֵי שָׁלוֹם (Prov. xii. 20)—and more than that, for it is the last description of the high aim of discipleship, beyond which there is no higher step to be taken, since this makes the disciple as his Lord. Not merely are they contrasted with those who are contentious, ἐξ ἐριθείας (Rom. ii. 8), not merely do they keep and preserve peace, as much as in them lies, with every man (εἰρηνεύοντες, Rom. xii. 18; Heb. xii. 14), but they make, they mediate peace, they bring and offer to the world out of the treasure of a pure heart, the peace of God. Thus, finally, every disciple of our Lord is in his place, in design if not in in effect, a messenger

* Let a glance be taken *backwards* through the benedictions in order fully to observe their organic connection.

* So that we may not limit the meaning of the promise to the manifestation of Christ only in this world: "The pure, the upright, perceive in Christ a manifestation of God" (Lutz, *Bibl. Dogmatik*, p. 48). Quite true, but not enough.

of grace, in word, in work, and in life, to all intents and purposes a bringer of peace in the ministry of the great reconciliation. *Such shall*, in the final separation and demarcation, *be called* the children of God, for they have been such in truth and worthy of the name; but *not* they who have proudly and unlovingly gloried in the testimony of truth against a miserable and sinful world, and just as little they who have, contrary to truth and righteousness, spoken peace where there has been no peace in God's sight.

Verse 10. To the *seven* benedictions, perfect in themselves, there is significantly added yet another supernumerary *eighth*, which proceeds no further with the development, but *confirms* and seals their seven-fold blessedness to the *righteous*, whose character is perfected through their peace-making in this evil world, against all the never-failing enmity and scorn of the unrighteous. And though ye also suffer for righteousness' sake, yet are ye, and shall ye be, blessed *notwithstanding* (1 Peter iii. 14). Here is wonderfully blended the fundamental tone of promise and consolation, Fear ye not, rather rejoice! with the earnest note of requirement, that they remain faithful under so severe a test, yea, even of warning against hypocrisy and apostasy: For that *righteousness'* sake which has now been attained—by retrospect to ver. 6; and there is also a connection with ver. 7–9—Mercy *out* of a pure heart *unto* peace. The world will for the most part requite that love with hatred, will thrust this peace from them; and the Lord would by no means conceal this from his disciples in this most gracious first sermon to them The essential idea of *persecute*, here, is to persist malevolently in seeking to withstand them; to transfer and carry on enmity against God's righteousness, to its possessors and witnesses and ambassadors also. Thus is δεδιωγμένοι, "*the persecuted*," not only the highest honor of the children of God who are so conformed to Christ, but also a condition of entrance into the kingdom of heaven not less absolute than the preceding (1 Peter. iv. 13, 14; 2 Tim. iii. 12). It is the last and surest *token* of discipleship; and the tribulation of time becomes to those who persevere, a confirmation of their title to eternal joy. Hereby discern the peace of God in thyself and in others, that the world as such is opposed to it; yea, even rejoice in this, for as it is the natural consequence of thy charitable and peaceful walk, so it is also the testing proof which is needful to its consummation (John xiv. 27; xv. 18–21). According to Luke vi. 26, the Lord further made this plain by a warning contrast. Thus does the Lord set the seal to this discourse, binding together its beginning and its end: The kingdom of heaven *is* (and abides) yours, even as it was yours at the commencement in poverty of spirit. The ἐστίν, *is*, presents a contrast with the *outward* and passing show of persecution, which indeed is more easily apprehended by faith than that first contrariety between the strong assurance and the *inward* poverty to which it was given. The *kingdom of heaven* is transcendantly elevated above all the transitory circumstances of this lower world.

Verses 11, 12.—The sentences which proclaim blessedness, are ended. There is now, through a final "Blessed *are* ye," a transision made to their *appropriation;* and the *address* to the disciples begins, which continues down to ch. vii. 20. That this direct address was not used before, resulted from the tone of general invitation which marked the commencement of the discourse. The disciples of Jesus must not be supposed to be separated or distinguished from the other hearers; but the discourse, in a manner, saw in them all, from the beginning, future disciples—graciously taking this for granted. Whoever, among the people that heard the first sentences, is able and willing to appropriate them to himself, is referred to throughout what follows in the general Ye, my disciples! All other men, in sharp distinction from the children of God and messengers of peace who have been described, are included in the unexpressed subject of ὀνειδίσωσιν, *shall revile*, etc. Quite correctly, therefore, though needlessly, does Luther insert, on revision, *men* (comp. ver. 16 with ch. x. 17). The children of God are in contrast with men, just as Israel, God's people, with the nations. For *my sake;* this is, likewise, the first coming forth of the personality of Jesus, the Master and Lord, which corresponds to that first *ye;* and its identity with "For righteousness' sake," is, at the same time, very significant. The persecution before referred to, is now more clearly traced in three stages: first, reviling with bitter and hateful words generally, then more specific persecution in acts, and finally the pouring out upon the objects of their hate, in wanton *falsehood* and slander, πᾶν πονηρὸν ῥῆμα, whatever their wicked malice can invent.* The Lord manifestly refers to Isa. li. 7, 8; in which chapter we find ver. 1, beginning with —"Ye that follow after *righteousness;*" and immediately after in vers. 4–8, this is changed into "*My* people, my nation, my judgment, my salvation, my righteousness." Consequently, our Lord here already in this lofty "For my sake" speaks in the person of Jehovah, just as at the end of the sermon he reveals himself as the future Judge of mankind. The ψευδόμενοι, *falsely*, about which there has been so much needless dispute, must not be connected *merely* with ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, *for my sake*, (as Tholuck thinks); but indicates in itself that most wanton wickedness and unrighteousness which has just been spoken of; though at the same time it contains, in order to obviate the too hasty confidence which this might produce, an undertone of *test* (as we observed above in the analysis), sounding thus—But

* The daring disregard of truth with which the world is wont *calumniari audaciter* the children of God, the Satanic cunning with which its lies are woven, would be altogether incredible, if it were not matter of fact.

look well to it in every case, that they *do* speak falsely! This expression, to return, exhibits the fundamental principles of all their hatred; which has its origin in the *lie* that ever opposes the truth of God, though the adversaries may not always be conscious of this. *Ye* must know it, however, and be firmly assured, that they speak falsely; or the benediction can avail you nothing. For, alas! all the way up to the high elevation of the reproach of Christ, a man may deceive himself, and too readily reckon that as slander, redounding to his own honor, which is but deserved blame. But if ye are surely convinced in your heart and conscience, that the reproaches of those who hate the righteousness of God, are falling upon you for its sake, then *rejoice and be exceeding* glad! (In Luke, "*leap for joy*," spring upward in joyful hope toward your reward in heaven!) There is in this, as it were, a most emphatic command, *Be* happy! for which "Blessed *are* ye," in the previous verse, prepared the way. It is befitting that the Lord, in his gentle condescension, should speak of recompense and reward (excluding, be it understood, all idea of merit from those words), oftener and more strongly than his apostles might afterwards do.* For *your reward:* that is, not merely the general reward of grace which in the kingdom of heaven awaits you; but in addition there shall be, for every affliction and for every wicked word which you have to endure as expedient for the confirmation of your faith to yourselves, a distinct, and precisely apportioned requital and compensation—the *more* ye suffer, the *more* the reward. For thus royally will one day that righteous Lord and Judge requite his own, who on the other hand will not forget a cup of cold water that has ever been given to one of them! Finally, there is here graciously given to our weak faith another ground of joy in persecution, in that we perceive ourselves by this practical token to be companions of the prophets, the witnesses of God who have been before us; and thus become more and more assured of our citizenship in the kingdom of heaven, in contrast with the prevailing decay and destruction of all things. Christ gives, indeed, in these words an early explanation, that the kingdom of God was not among the people of Israel, as a whole, in the state in which it then was; that it was not what they thought it, after their way and manner; but that it was with the persecuted prophets, and as as they taught it, in the misunderstood former revelation. The reward is reserved *in the heavens*, ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, which is not quite the same with "in the kingdom of heaven;" but rather signifies the *interval* from the gathering of the righteous to the former prophets, till the inheriting of the *earth*, ver. 5. Him whom they tolerate no longer under the heaven, heaven will receive *into* itself! *Heavens*, in the plural, refers to the many mansions of John xiv. 2, and helps our anticipation of the greatness and glory of the reward.

Verses 13—16. The promise here already in the first part, as we have seen, advances into a demand, that the gifts of grace which have been received should exhibit and approve themselves. The danger of not persevering in persecution has been just before pointed out; but now the discourse strengthens its tone, and insists upon an indispensable continuance of *active influence* and *testimony* in the midst of an evil world. *Ye*—who have been described in vers. 3–10, who in your poverty have hungered for and have obtained righteousness, in order to the exercise of charity and peacemaking; *ye*—who have been addressed in vers. 11, 12, as having to expect, like the prophets before you, the ingratitude, scorn and persecution of this world as your earthly reward, but an everlasting compensation for all this, as your reward in heaven; *ye are*, what grace has made you—*be*, and in joyful confidence continue to be, *all that your new nature requires!* Let no hindrance prevent this; look well to yourselves, that ye become not again incapable and unfit! In these verses the three main ideas, with reference to which the whole sermon moves on in regular gradation (promise, requirement and warning), *are reversed*—from the point of their connection with the preceding. First, altogether warning—Woe to the savorless salt! Then again, though in part a promise—The light *must* not and shall not be hid! Finally, with fuller grace—Let then the light which is given you shine forth!

The discourse, after having looked back upon the prophets of former times, turns at once to a prophetic contemplation of the entire *destiny of the new church*—the city set on a hill; announces here preparatorily, what comes more plainly before us in the 10th chapter at the first sending forth of the messengers of peace; and just as at the close of this Gospel (ch. xxviii. 19), embraces the whole *earth*—the whole *world*. But what is the distinction which our Lord, who begins here to disclose the essential truth of those natural images which were originally provided for all human language, and to use them as the elementary letters of his own superhuman utterance, makes in this passage between *salt* and *light?* It would be superficial to regard it as a mere abstract distinction between life and knowledge. Rather in *salt* the *inner* essential power and virtue from which the *efficacy* proceeds by natural laws; *light*, on the contrary, is the *outward expression of testimony* viewed in itself. Therefore the *earth* is opposed to the former as a dead, corrupt mass which must be pervaded by it; the *world* is the object of the latter, as a dark region in which it must assuredly shine. The middle term between the two is *fire*, (Mark ix. 49, 50, and Psa. i, 2, 3; compare Levit. ii. 13.)

The salt in itself is properly the power of life in its essence, the imperishable *permanence* of an abiding essence, inwrought into things

* See Roos, *Die Lehre Jesu Christi*, new edition, p. 764.

as their principle by the Eternal. It can therefore no more become corrupted into saltlessness, than the light can become darkness, either in nature, or in that spiritual kingdom of which it is the symbol. Yet, inasmuch as our Lord has graciously condescended to say of those who have salt in themselves (Mark ix. 50), that they are the salt; and to name those light who are only lamps or lightbearers; in this sense the salt may become indeed savorless, and the light in us become darkness (ch. vi. 23); that is, if we again lose the salt and the light. Salt alone averts corruption, and gives a good and savory taste (Job vi. 6), hence it appears in the sacrifices as the seasoning, and a sign of the covenant of God. Without salt the earth is corrupt before God (Gen. vi. 11), and all who live upon it foul and offensive, an abomination in his sight (see Psa. xiv. 3, נֶאֱלָחוּ; comp. Job xv. 16.) But God gives to the corrupted mass a new salt, has checked the corruption from the very beginning by his grace, and will now in the fulness of his mercy and of his truth, salt again the whole earth—if it will receive it—unto life. The instruments of this great restoration are the children of God through Christ. They are the salt of the earth, for they bear God's truth living within them, which is made *their salt*, by which they should salt and season everything around them; just as in v. 16 it is also said *Your light*. They bring and they make *peace*, that is, in the full sense of the Hebrew שָׁלוֹם* for the healing of all corruption; for they bring the only living and abiding truth in righteousness; and only in truth is peace (Col. iv. 6; Mark ix. 50; Zech. viii. 19). Now, the healing influence of this sharply piercing truth, is foolishly resisted by human nature, and if it should therefore intermit its piercing, through unbelief and indolence in its possessors, and give way before the resistance which it meets; if its point should become blunted in the attack, and that which through the might of God ought most powerfully to bear testimony to and approve itself, should in the bye-ways of false peace degenerate by degrees into a thing which only retains the outward appearance of that truth which is for man's peace, but from whence the power has fled; then is the salt again become saltless, as church history has shown in the darkness of Roman Christendom, and more recently in the no less profound darkness of Rationalism.

The salt without savor has indeed the *obvious appearance* of being doctrine which has become impotent and unsound; yet, since this can only be the consequence of the loss of power and life in the salt bearers, who themselves are termed *the salt*, it would be a very false exposition to say that the Lord does not speak here also of *persons*. That he does speak of them, the treading under foot manifestly shows. It would be wrong to say, that though men once endued with grace may become weak and impotent for external influence in the awakening of others, yet they cannot themselves again be quite lost. That would be through prejudice to do injustice to the word which here, as elsewhere often in Scripture, expressly and incontrovertibly warns against relapse as only, alas! too possible. He only can salt the earth who is himself salted, has become salt; the abiding virtue within, and its energy without, are strictly inseparable. Now he who ceases to salt others, loses also the salt which preserves himself; and after such loss of the heavenly gift no second renewal is possible; there remains only the *consuming* fire of judgment, which is by no means the same with the *salting* fire of purifying, saving affliction (Heb. vi. 4–6, x. 26, 27; Mark ix. 49.) Only for the sake of the children of God who prevent its judgment, and co-operate unto salvation, is the *earth* preserved, though corrupt and full of wickedness, in order that it may be their inheritance of the Regeneration. But those who persist in their wickedness, will not abide that spiritual severity which would work out their welfare, that mighty testimony of the truth which is for their peace. Such salt is too fiery and biting for them; they persecute the righteous, and fight against the ambassadors of peace. Now, herein lies the temptation of these latter to become saltless; and the Lord teaches his own not lightly to despise this temptation. Contemplating the future of his church, he lifts up his warning cry, and proclaims what has since so often taken place. Yet our translation here and in Mark ix. 50, is quite correct; rather than—With what shall one salt? Wherewith will ye season? That would have seemed to refer to a *universal* apostasy, and have given to the question such an unsuitable meaning as this—If *ye* fall away, where will be God's children for the world's good? What the Baptist said (Matt. iii. 9), is the fit rejoinder to such view of the question.* No, the Lord most assuredly means: If the salt loses its savor, wherewith shall *it*, the worthless salt, be salted again? What follows proves this—*It* is thenceforth useful or fit or good for nothing. The *casting out* is the lot of that which is useless, which can serve no purpose in the house, and the *treading under foot* further marks the perfect contempt of that which is thus cast out. No "mending of the way as by manure" is here referred to (as Lange thinks); but the Lord God casts the corrupt out of his house and kingdom again, and thereby gives them over to the scorn *of men*. The judment upon Eli (1 Sam ii. 30) has been ever fulfilled again and again in an unfaithful priesthood; and what the

* What I have said concerning this in John xiv. 27, and elsewhere (also in Isaiah), may be consulted and compared.

* Hence with reference to Luther's rendering Hamann writes this vigorous application of it: The salt of *learning* is a good thing; but if that becomes savorless, what shall we season with? With what but the μωρία τοῦ κηρύγματος, the foolishness of preaching? (1 Cor. i. 21.)

Lord here denounces has been true of entire apostate churches as well as of individual faithless men. If the world *persecutes*, it is because it feels the power of truth and righteousness but when the saltless salt comes in its way, it *despises* it beyond measure, treads it under foot with scorn—and that deservedly!

He who alone is in an absolute sense "*the Light of the world*," vouchsafes also to call his disciples so, who yet are only bringers and bearers of the light (φωστῆρες, Phil. ii. 15; λύχνοι, John v. 35; i. 7–9), only lights kindled from above. (Hence also presently ver. 15, καίουσι λύχνον). The light itself can no more be thought of as first lighted, than proper salt as salted. The children of light, heretofore of darkness, are light *in the Lord* (Eph. v. 8): the light of the world is the sun, and the Messiah is termed by Malachi (iv. 2) at the close of prophecy, the Sun of Righteousness. As such the Lord now proclaims himself to all who hear him even in this word, and before that great *I am come!* which follows ver. 17. But as instruction in the law is termed in the Talmud *salt*, and many a Rabbi *a light of the world*, the Lord may be regarded as taking up the Jewish doctrinal language which was already prepared for him and as announcing in dignity that he, the highest Master, designed to make his disciples also true masters and teachers. Yea, in his mouth alone is that quite true, which from human lips appears presumptuous; the testimony and doctrine of his disciples should actually fill the world with clearly shining, true light of the Light. The *city on a hill* is not by any means a mere common figure of speech; the Lord derives the expression from Psa. xlviii. 2 (comp. l. 2, lxxxvii. 1) as afterwards that of ver. 35 from Psa. xlviii. 3. He speaks not of Safed (as Sepp again says idly) nor of any other such hill-town in the land; but of his *Church* or congregation hereafter to be built, of the new *Jerusalem*, to which will be given the light of the sun, when the old Jerusalem, become saltless, the city upon the hill and all her dependencies around, shall be given over to be trodden down of the Gentiles. Now, however, in this period of development with reference to which the Lord is immediately speaking, his meaning includes all the true citizens of the city of God then living in the Διασπορά, or *dispersion*. Although as yet scattered abroad, they can no more with their united light be hidden, than if the new city were already built upon the hill, and reflected God's light upon all the lands. Where light really is and continues to be, it must from its very nature, shine forth. The same God, who founds and builds for himself the heavenly city, and kindles for himself its lights, places them moreover upon fitting candlesticks, each one upon its own. We must take the expression, Do *men* light, and place, in ver. 15, in conformity with the general scope, as the action of men figuratively used for the action of the wisdom of God. The Church of the Lord is to be no secret institution, like the heathen mysteries. The light of the pure word and of holy life is to burn brightly and loftily in it for the dark world, which also itself is, and shall be made a house of God. No human ordinance, no false shame or fear, may place this light under a bushel, which is designed to shine forth from word and work combined. What God has not done, man *ought* not to do; though, alas! it has too often been done in various ways, but only where God's light and salt are lost. Man's worst *bushel* upon the light of God is the bar and covering of "temporals"—the bread and pay dealt out too richly or too sparingly for the mystery in the Church. Individually indeed the Lord will often cover up in his wisdom some small fresh-kindled light, that it may burn up in its time and order; but he who cannot tolerate that, and would himself prematurely ascend the candlestick, may easily chance (as St. Bernard reminds us) to be blown out by the wind of temptation. This remains the essential matter, that the *placing* of the light be left to him who kindled it. He will do it, assuredly, at the right time and in the right manner; for it was never his purpose, when he kindled the light, that it should be hid. Now he who, through fear of persecution or else through sluggishness, leaves his candlestick, and, becoming unfaithful to his calling, wilfully covers his light, shall have his light extinguished: yet *concerning that* the Lord says nothing further now (as in ch. vi. 22, 23); for he has already referred to this in what he says of the savorless salt. It is now his purpose, less as a warning than in promise, to encourage our shining, as that for which we were kindled. God only covers so long as is necessary for the better burning. But our short-sightedness, which we still retain though lights of the world, may often confound, when *self-will* blends with our testimony, the bushel with the candlestick. A proverb says very strikingly—The true light will burn, nevertheless, through the bushel.

It is of importance to observe, that it is not said, we must wish ourselves to shine; but as the translation well expresses it, that we should *let*, freely, without covering or hindrance, *our light*, that which has by grace been given to us, and exists within us, shine before men, according to its own nature and the will of him who kindled it. The Lord says literally—So *let your light shine*, and thus expressly distinguishes the true, and only shining light of the Father, which has made us to shine, from ourselves, these bearers of the light. There is a *promise* in his requirement that we must without any co-operation of ours leave the gift of God to its own self-evidencing power, as if he had said: It *will of itself* shine, if you cover it not! That spurious desire to shine brings only darkness within and around us. It is not—Shine *ye*, but—Let *your light* shine! Before *men*; as the explanation of the expressions earth and world—even before the men who persecute and revile you; for this must be your only retaliation—love and truth for hatred and lies. And now as to the

good *works!* Are not these especially the *word* of testimony and confession of doctrine? This is not excluded, as will appear presently; but our Lord immediately refers to the *life*, because the good word without the good walk is of no avail; a lie before God, it can bear no testimony to truth before men; with the appearance of light it has no power of fire; it tends rather to the temptation of the world, and the dishonor of God. That which, according to Rom. ii. 23, 24, befell Israel, is also repeated in the Christian community. The expression "good works," which explains the figurative "light," forms also the transition to what follows from ver. 17 onwards, where the righteousness of the disciples comes forward as the fulfilling of the law in act and in teaching. What kind of works? Here is already laid down beforehand, as it were, the theme, which is then developed from ver. 20. The external lustre, which proceeds from the inner light, and which alone can be *seen*, shines forth in genuine good works, that is, in works of light, of love, of mercy; so that here the salt may correspond to the *peace*, and the light to the *mercy*, of that pure life of love which was described before (ver. 7–9). And certainly the *shining together* of all the works in the entire *walk* is here signified; which according to Eph. v. 8–13, neither should nor can conceal its revealing, witnessing, light-nature. Of the *individual* good deeds as such it is said on the other hand—Do them *not* before men! (ch. vi. 1.) Isolated works or *deeds* do not properly shine; they are rather as flashes in the night, which make the darkness appear the darker; but the entire and persistent *doing* of all works of pure light and love, is a bright light upon the candlestick of the office and calling. Again, to *men*, natural men, are these works principally and first of all to be shown: the brother already born of God understands our simple word, and God alone *sees* the faith in the heart, the inner light itself as such (Rom. xiv. 22). *That* men should see our works is indeed the most immediate end of our letting the light shine; but the important end within this end follows immediately: *And* glorify your Father which is in heaven.* Not you yourselves, against which chapter vi. presently lifts up a severe voice—Ye may yourselves be no more praised, than *yourselves* shine. Not that men, instead of all manner of evil (ch. v. 11), are to say nothing but good of you; but that the *Father in heaven* (who is here named for the first time) may be acknowledged as *your* Father through your light, your good works; and that ye may be thus termed *his children* even now before the world. Whence arises a new and beautiful sense of the promise in ver. 9—as already ver. 7 had implied: They shall receive mercy from those, who, acknowledging their love, love them in return.

* Roos has remarked among others, that here the Lord, after having hitherto spoken of *his* Father, for the first time appropriates the Father name of God to men.

But now since men are wicked and for the most part so remain; as they reject the salt and hate the light; as they acknowledge or honor neither the Father nor the Son (John xvi. 3); as they consequently refuse the Father's honor in his children, by ascribing that incontrovertible righteousness in them which cannot be defamed, on the one hand to *human virtue* which they praise, or to the *gift of God* which they acknowledge; *therefore*, with the good and shining works *the testifying word* must not be wanting, which acknowledges the grace of the Giver, and cries out—This is my Father's light through Christ, in whose name I do all this (Col. iii. 17). Then are the clothes rent, and they cry to the people—We also are sinful men like yourselves, but the grace of God is with us (Acts xiv. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 10). The life without the word is not enough, although the backwardness to confession often brings falsely forward this expression of Christ, as if to prove, that it is enough to let the light of good works shine before men. Thereby God's honor is not desired but our own; but when we glorify our Father in our life and in our profession, then we *constrain* men, at least so far as in us lies, to glorify him also: first of all and at once, by praising the grace which has been vouchsafed to us, and then, receiving that grace also for themselves, by the selfsame good works and light.

Verse 17. "Finally, there is here also a warning, which in its emphatic restriction and rejection, points forward even now to the test at the end of all." As we indicated previously, this conclusion of the first head, so we discern now, again, the close of this conclusion in that most earnest *warning*—Without a much better, a perfect righteousness, there is no entrance into the kingdom of heaven! (Here, beforehand, just as in ch. vii. 21, though not yet so fully established, but rather set down first as a paradox in order to be fully proved.) This strongly protesting warning (either *all* the commandments of the law *done*, or *no* entrance *by any means* into the kingdom of heaven) is preceded by one more gentle—Not one of the least of these commandments must be broken, either in teaching or in doing, by any man, or he will be *least* in the kingdom of heaven! And *whence* then such righteousness in poor miserable man, to whom a Gospel is preached, yet with such a demand as this? The introduction of the sermon has sufficiently assured us, that he, in whose coming the kingdom of heaven and his righteousness come to the poor as gift, consolation, and food, himself brings with him his righteousness as his salvation: consequently we have here at the outset, as the true foundation of promise, on which alone the requirement is erected, that great, emphatic and critical word—*I am come to fulfill* the Law and the Prophets, as first in myself, so also in *you*, my believing and righteous ones!* Because, moreover, this whole

* It is true, but not by misunderstanding it, to

conclusion of the first main division of promise is the transition to the severer tone of demand and warning which follows; therefore to this especial and distinct *promise* of the whole Sermon on the Mount (by which the benedictions are first made intelligible) there is appended a warning and exclusive declaration—*Think not* that it is otherwise, that the saving grace which hath appeared may remit or relax anything of that whole will of God, which has been testified from the beginning, and waits for its full establishment and performance! Finally, that the whole section (vers. 17–20), may fall into the same threefold form which has become familiar to us, we have between its commencement of promise and its excluding close, the natural middle term of requirement in the simple words—All must be fulfilled (ver. 18). Each least thing, every most isolated precept of the great whole (the Law and the Prophets, ver. 17) must receive its fulfillment.

Thus it will be observed how the whole discourse, constantly rising and reaching forward, evolves gradually its deep meaning—each new utterance springing from the preceding as its immediate consequence. Truths ever new and fundamental, clothed in human language for human apprehension, proceed from the living organ of the one all-embracing truth (I am he, who bringeth to you righteousness) which bears in it the mind of the Lord, and here gives an epitome of its first testimony. This (ver. 17) is the true and essential marrow of that testimony—its immovable foundation of rock. Its clear and luminous declaration is essential to the right understanding of the whole Sermon on the Mount. It prevents us from being terrified by its succeeding *requirements* into a fear of condemnation; and teaches us *in poverty of spirit to seek and find, to ask and receive from him who is come to fulfill all righteousness—who, while he demands, promises likewise, and when he promises demands—all needful grace for the fulfillment of righteousness in ourselves.*

And yet how wantonly do those err, who assert that the Lord's sermon contains only the mere so-called morality which he taught, and would thereby get rid of what they call the dogmatic teaching of faith in his person, its divine dignity and sole merit! As they contradict their own heart and conscience, and will not feel that the benedictions at the commencement set aside all righteousness and fulfillment of the law in our own strength, and speak only of grace for the miserable; so now they entirely renounce their own understanding, shut their eyes and their ears, that they may not perceive and read and hear the inscription that is written upon the sublime portal which is once more erected in ver. 17: It is I alone who bring in and accomplish all. Yes, verily, the testimony which is found in John's Gospel, is anticipated here: *I am He!* Are not all who hear his first word constrained to ask—Who can this man be but the Messiah, who thus announces blessedness, and thus by his own immediate authority administers the kingdom of heaven? His first words are in clear and profound accord with the most expanded predictions and promises of prophecy. And then that lofty and unrestrained—For *my* sake, ver. 11, which is so naturally uttered! So again immediately that first attribution to his disciples—*Your* Father, ver. 16—springing from the communicating grace of him who had already openly called God *his* Father, and continued throughout the entire sermon (all being comprised in *Our* Father ch. vi. 9), until that most impressive *My* Father of ch. vii. 21, closes it! In conjunction with this is the sublime—Verily, I say unto you—which similarly pervades the whole, (ch. v. 18 and onwards) placing him who utters it in divine majesty above all the prophets, in the unity of that only Lawgiver and Lord who spake *by* the prophets; until at last, he who thus speaks announces himself to be the world's Judge in that day (ch. vii. 21–23), as he had in the beginning announced himself as the giver of the world's blessedness. In ch. v. 17, we have the ground of all that high authority which speaks in the preceding and subsequent discourse, in the undisguised answer to the question: Art thou *he that should come?* (ch. xi. 3).

Twice with the emphasis—*I am come*—to wit, as one who was in being before he came, and cometh *into the world* (John iii. 19; xi. 27; xii. 46), knowing *from whence* he came: who is *come forth* from above (John viii. 23, iii. 31), from heaven (vi. 33, 38), from God (viii. 42, xiii. 3), as the Father (xvi. 27, 28). This is much more than Nicodemus, drawing back in the paroxysm of his fear the confession which was springing to his lips, attached to it when he strangely enough called him only—Teacher and Prophet. For all the prophets are but *sent*, he of whom they prophesy and he only *cometh* from God. As elsewhere there is often appended to this expression—I am come! the aim and result of his coming in a variety of aspects (Matt. ix. 13, x. 34, xviii. 11, xx. 28; Luke ix. 56, xii. 49; John vi. 38, ix. 39, x. 11, xviii. 37), so here also it is directly given: I am come *to fulfill*.

This, however, is attested with the negative warning—*Think not*, or *μὴ νομίσητε:* by no means be deluded into imagining that I am come to destroy the Law or the Prophets. Such an utterance pre-supposes testimonies concerning his person already received, and the existence of misunderstanding and false expectations in relation to it. Wherein did these consist? In a twofold error, as the Lord afterwards shows—in false hope and in false fear. Especially, and first of all, the Lord testifies, in immediate connection with the requirement of *good works* (ver. 16), against the delusion that the Messiah (*himself* who assumed to be the

---

be too straitly limited, that the Saviour here "indicated the object of *his own* life" (*Beugg. Monatsbl.* 1847, 9),—for he designs at the same time to say—The law must also by *you*—though only indeed through me—be fulfilled.

Messiah) would dispense with the fulfillment of the holy *law;* for such a delusion more or less consciously pervaded the entire expectation of a carnal Messiah's kingdom, which might instantly be set up with its temporal prosperity and splendor, without repentance and regeneration unto holiness. (Hence once again the *μὴ νομίσητε* of ch. x. 34). The *kingdom* of God consists only in obedience to the will of God, only in and with God's *righteousness:* hence (ch vi. 33) the law remains inviolate—Be ye therefore holy, for I am holy (ch. v. 48). But for the other side of the error which understood not the Scriptures, whether of the Law or the Prophets, he who was come found existing a false *fear* of innovation, and the destruction of established and ancient institutions. In their blindness to the *Law* which must abide ever, they forget the distinction between it and the types and the shadows which God's commandment appointed for their own time, and even between it and the precepts which had been added by man; they consequently inferred in their delusion that a Messiah who should invade the then extant Judaism, could not be the true one of whom the prophets had written; for they understood the Prophets still less even than the Law, and had utterly marred their promises by a carnal interpretation. Both kinds of delusion were in manifold ways mixed up in carnally blinded Israel; yet in the mass of the people the false hope of the relaxation of the Law, in order to their supposed fulfillment of the Prophets; and in the Pharasaic heads of the people, the false fear of innovation rather predominated. There lay, in fine, in the hidden consciences of all the people—whose will and not their knowledge was at fault—*an absolute dread of the true fulfillment of the Prophets in order to the true establishment of the Law.* The Lord's mighty protest against each fallacy that ignorance or opposition of will might beget, embraces all this in its inmost connection, so that every one might take his own reproof; and exhibits the *Law and the Prophets* in their inviolable unity, as one great prediction *of himself*, which waits for its fulfillment; as one great preparatory institute which reaches in *him*, only in him, but certainly in him, its end and consummation, that is, its perfect fulfillment and realization. Now as this preparatory institute was of God, of the self-same God whom the Messiah calls his Father, he could not speak of anything like a *dissolution* or destruction of that which was essential and true therein.

The superabounding fulness of meaning in this sublime testimony of Christ to himself—whereby he places himself between the Old Testament and the New as the living unity and truth of both—embraces thus the whole doctrine concerning his person and his work, is the epitome of all that *Christology* which is to be developed from them, as the substance of all theology, the sum of all true understanding of Scriptures and revelation. To deduce this in all its amplitude is not the design of these our hints; we can only affirm and indicate how the understanding of such a saying as this requires an understanding of the whole Old Testament, as it goes back to its very beginnings and roots; and of the whole New Testament as well, inasmuch as it looks forward by anticipation to the entire fulfillment of those of its last predictions which have not yet been accomplished.

"*The Law and the Prophets,*" taken together, are the name of the Old Covenant (as afterwards, ch. vii. 12, xi. 13, xxii. 40); yet not merely in the sense of the current manner of speech which divided the external body of the Scriptures under the titles תּוֹרָה and נְבִיאִים; but with reference to those two aspects of the Old Covenant upon which such a division was based—viz., *commandment* and *promise.* These two fundamental elements, however, so thoroughly interpenetrate one another, that the whole, the legal as well as the prophetic word, the legal as well as the prophetic institution, may be regarded as comprising both; the one element commanding the fulfillment of the fore-announced will of God, and the other pointing in prophecy to that future which alone will bring this fulfillment. He who does not thus understand the Old Testament, has not yet even begun to understand it; its double name is its only right name; it is a law, which has not yet found its corresponding obedience, and yet which must and shall be done; it is a promise, which yet waits for its fulfillment. When this has come, it becomes an *Old* Testament, and gives place to the New. But this New Testament again is no other than the truth and reality of the Old, its *fulfillment*, which can alone bring it, as old and precusory, to an end. O that our critics of the present day would understand this; whose entire but idle toil is expended upon the vain endeavor to rend asunder the two Testaments of God, to unbind the Law and the Prophets, and then to regard indeed Christ as one who has come, but who fulfills nothing and brings nothing!* Let the Old Testament first be broken, then is broken also the New; as we have seen in the progress of Rationalism into all unbelief; let the *Christ* be taken away, who has come as he was to come, then is there no longer a revelation, and no more a living God.

To proceed, however, with a more specific examination of this subject—What is *the Law*, of which the Lord here speaks? Assuredly not merely the unaptly so-called moral law of the ten commandments; for Israel had learned nothing in Scripture of any such improper division of that one, entire law, which the Lord

* Instead of explaining away with their trifling the assertion of our Lord, they had better deal with it as the old heretic Marcion did, and reverse it at once: *τί δοκεῖτε; ὅτι ἦλθον πληρῶσαι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφήτας; ἦλθον καταλῦσαι, ἀλλ' οὐ πληρῶσαι:* What think ye? that I came to fulfill the Law or the Prophets? I came to destroy, but not to fulfill!

had given them in various commandments, moral precepts and statutes. To that same law belongs, in inseparable unity with it, what we term the ritual or civil law; all is together but the one will of God, which is to be established in the obedience of his holy people. The typical ceremonies of the service of God, with all that appertains to them, are all appointed with reference to sin, just as they pre-announce its atonement; the external regulations of the polity of the people and the state, which are not less typical than the former, are for the correction of disobedience, while they foretell the coming of a people and commonwealth of God, which should be the realization of these forms. The commandments of Sinai, again, with all their condemning severity, rest upon the ground of that word of covenant mercy—I am the Lord thy God, who redeemeth thee; and thus direct the hope of faith to go beyond their letter, and wait for that spiritual fulfillment, in which the law will not be given unto death but unto life. The law itself, as such, secretly testifies and predicts a righteousness of God, which should be made manifest (Rom. iii. 21). On the other hand, the language and testimony of *the prophets*, especially those who spoke after the law, with Moses himself at their head, is always in strict unison with all that word, which from the beginning had been a word of prophetical promise (Acts iii. 21). They speak of the law, as the expositors of its spiritual meaning which the flesh cannot fulfill, and as most inexorable preachers of repentance, of woe, and of judgment—Elias and John the Baptist being their prominent types: but they also with most benignant consolation point to a coming grace; yea, to a grace which already began to be in some measure experienced, but reserved its full proof for the great futurity.* The law requires the *righteousness* of God in us (Rom. viii. 4), and at the same time *predicts*, as being given by a God of grace, that he will bestow it. The prophets promise the *kingdom* of God, and the advent of one as its king, who will fulfill all, yielding a true obedience to the law as a servant, such as no individual servant of God, and much less the whole people had been; offering a true propitiation for sin as a Priest; bringing in the fellowship of God's covenant in all its fulness and reality as the Mediator of the covenant, and the Lord our righteousness! but at the same time every word of the prophets *requires*, as given by the God of *truth*, the coming of that future One, and the fulfillment by him and through him of all that was written concerning him. The law is a prophecy pointing to Christ; prophecy is a law, a will of the Father for Christ to do. Of both together in their unity he who was to come speaks: What is written in the volume of the book is written of me, and all is obligatory upon me; I must come to do the will of God (Psa. xl. 8, 9). *Did no such Christ come*, then would the entire Old Testament, which declares itself to every candid mind to be the marrow of the world's ancient history, and to contain the revelation of the most essential truth of humanity, remain a beginning without an end, a before without an after, a riddle without its key; not merely a longing of the human spirit without is fruition, but a testimony of the spirit of God without truth; an incomprehensible nothing, making an incomprehensible pretension to contain in itself a living germ—a germ, however, that never knew development, withered up in this modern Judaism, the miserable and worthless remains of the religion of that man, who once believed in God, and sought after righteousness in vain!

But Christ *is come*, and as he now at the first by this most sacred "I" bears true and absolute witness to himself as the end of the Old Testament, so has the history of his kingdom and of his work since then, of the institution founded in the New Testament down to the present day, borne witness to the truth of his word. The actual and surely progressing *fulfillment*, in the history of the world and the Church since Christ, of all that waited for fulfillment in the old world, cannot be entirely mistaken, but by such a delusion from the abyss, as knows of no fulfillment either of man's longings or of God's commands and promises, simply because *it dissolves all things* in the Indian Maja, or swallows up all things in a bottomless grave: or rather would dissolve and swallow up, but cannot; for the *law* of God still abides, testifying against *sin*, and urging men ever to the words of the prophets concerning the fulfilling and atoning obedience of one man for all. Yea, Christ himself is still in his Church, and asks most earnestly: If I am not come to fulfill, what then is humanity, history, God?

Has Christ, then, in any sense, brought a new, a better, a more perfect law, than *the* law, to fulfill which he avows himself to be come? By no means; as the whole Sermon on the Mount, his whole word, and the virtue of that law itself in our consciences, attest. All the prophets representing the conscience of the people, which again represented the conscience of humanity, knew of none other than the one, eternal law. But through the Spirit of God, they went on to predict, that one was coming, whose salvation should consist only in the establishment of this law, and its righteousness, and further also, in the establishment in its true meaning and fulfillment of the entire typical, ceremonial and political law of Israel. *The Law and the Prophets* are at all points internally *one*. Therefore the Lord does more than merely place them in juxtaposition—The Law *and* the Prophets; but with deep emphasis—Think not that I am come to destroy the *Law or* the Prophets, that is, neither the one nor the other, neither of the two which are yet but one. The requirement points to

* Thus the benedictions themselves were all of them taken out of the prophetic word: see Isa. lvii. 15, lxvi. 2, lvii. 18, lxi. 3; Psa. xxxvii. 11, cvii. 9; Isa. xli. 17, lvi. 2, lxv. 13; Prov. xi. 25; Psa. xxiv, 4, 5, xxxiv. 19; Isa. li. 7, lxvi. 5.

the promise, the promise to the requirement; the latter predicts the Spirit, as the Spirit enforces the latter. But inasmuch as the *first* and *most immediate* delusion, to which the entire connection of his discourse is opposed, was only that of supposing that he would relax *the Law*, he orders his words for their conviction upon that subject: *No more* will I destroy the Law than I will destroy the Prophets! If ye expect a Messiah, such as the prophets pre-announced, and yet suppose that he will come as a relaxer of the law, ye do greatly err, not understanding the prophets in their central harmony with the law. If I did not fulfill the Law, then would the Prophets also fail in their fulfillment.

Thus does the Lord disclose the deep common foundation of *all* that delusion and error, which withstood himself by a *perverted expectation of the Messiah*. It was simply the Jews who destroyed the prophetic word, by a carnal interpretation of it. It was simply the Pharisees, who likewise destroyed the Law: by teaching it without performing it themselves (ch. xxiii. 3, 4), by sacrificing one part of it to another, omitting the weightier matters, judgment and mercy, while they cared for the externals of its ceremonies (xxiii. 23); by neglecting the spirit that was required, while they were exact in the letter and work of their conscious hypocrisy; finally, by making the most important fundamental commandments of God of none effect through their superadded traditions (ch. xv. 3–6). Therefore he is no Messiah to these Pharisees, who in their evil imagination call destroying fulfilling, and fulfilling destroying. Therefore must the righteousness of his disciples, and of the subjects of his kingdom, be something exceedingly different from the so-called righteousness of these Pharisees; it must spring from the power and grace of his own true *fulfillment*, which has come, and is ever coming.

What is this, in fine, and *how does the Lord fulfill* the Law as well as the Prophets? He fulfills the law as its first perfect teacher and performer (ver. 19); who releases the Spirit, which though in it was bound in it, by the confirming testimony of a spiritual interpretation, and the living exhibition of it in word and work; who, as man, made of a woman and made under the law, as minister of the circumcision bound to all the ordinances of Israel (Gal. iv. 4; v. 3), fulfills in perfect obedience all righteousness, and satisfies every righteous obligation which human nature and the creature sustains in relation to God (*τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*, Heb. ii. 17). But because this obedience, which was freely undertaken in the incarnation of the eternal Son, is fully accomplished in his sacrifice for us sinners who could not render it; an obedience not merely imputed to us, but implanted in us through our actual union with his humanity; therefore Christ in his entire obedience, suffering in doing from the beginning, and doing in suffering to the end, is the one meritorious and living sacrifice finally and fully presented in death, the true object of the whole typical law, which testified of the necessity of such a sacrifice between God and man on account of sin. He is the righteous one, who bears and overcomes in enduring love the sin which rages against him in temptation; yet the *curse of the law* is withal fulfilled in him through his mysterious substitution in our stead, but only in order to make way for the blessing. In this is realized the true use of the law, that for which it was given to sinners; that they through the law may die to the law; that the power of sin may be broken in its conflict with inviolable righteousness; that God may conquer in judgment, and yet man not be lost, but be redeemed to a new life in living righteousness. In Christ's flesh, which is our sinful flesh, and which yet through the eternal Spirit is without sin, the flesh is put to death the enmity is abolished, sin is judged, the judgment of God against sin is executed even unto the securing of a new holiness. He sanctifies and offers *himself* for us, and in this act of obedience unto death he is the servant of God, the Prophet and the High Priest whom the Law and the Prophets foretold. As in his death sin is abolished and its curse is repealed, so also every vain delusion of erroneous expectation in which the blindness of sinners have enveloped the promise, is revealed and destroyed as such; his cross is the death of Israel's carnal hopes of a Messiah. The covering falls from the eyes of those who refuse not to see this, the shadows fade away, the veil of the figure is rent, for its reality is come and is set up. Its further consequence and efficacy is immediately fulfilled in the *risen Redeemer*, the servant is glorified as the Son, the kingdom of the King and the Lord, of which also all had foretold, begins to appear. The Lord who died especially for the fulfillment of the law, though to that also the prophets contributed their testimony, *liveth* now especially for the fulfillment of prophecy in its stricter sense; although the promise of the law—He that doeth these things shall live! is realized also in him, who as the righteous One has voluntarily accomplished in himself the command of the law—For thy sin shalt thou die! even to the attainment of a superabundance of righteousness. This life, thus by right as well as grace obtained for us, is one with the *blessing* of the first promise to Abraham; and thus the righteousness of the law itself, which was for ever beyond our own attainment, turns in Christ into a righteousness of faith for us (Gal. iii. 8–14). The circumcision of the heart which the law required, the profound truth which was testified by the whole sacrificial economy of the tabernacle (for the veil and the foreskin are the same in the inner spirit of the man before God) is, through the obedience rendered by Jesus in his perfect humanity, brought nigh and within reach of us all (Rom. x. 6–10). The law is far from being relaxed, and our being released from it is eternally impossible. We are delivered, rather, from the curse of the law in order to

its being established in its due honor. For the power of sin in the flesh is taken away, and the influence of the life-giving Spirit is shed upon us in unrestrained abundance from the glorified God-man (Isa. lix. 19).

When the Lord, in the Sermon on the Mount, said—I am come for such fulfillment as this, all was not yet accomplished in himself which was incumbent upon him; he had within him as yet but the resources of power and willingness for all. His whole *work* is developed and consummated in and with his *person*. When he cried upon the cross—It is finished—then was his great work truly accomplished, and all that remained, even up to the ascension, was but the manifestation and completion of the victory which he had obtained. When he had risen again and reached his consummation, he fully explained all that the prophets had spoken of him, and in what sense all had been imposed upon him as a sacred necessity (Luke xxiv. 25–26). But that which is in him accomplished and established *for us*, must from this time be also accomplished and established *in us;* in order that the righteousness demanded of the law may be fulfilled in us, and the law be established through faith (Rom. viii. 4, iii. 31). He who has thus shown himself the *end* of the law and of the prophecy, has become thereby the new and living *beginning* of a new covenant and kingdom, the old covenant and the old kingdom of Israel having risen again in their great and high reality. There remains yet for fulfillment in the new Church no less than all that is written in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and in the Psalms (Luke xxiv. 44); and since the time that the heaven received Christ, he intermits not the influence of his spirit, nor will he till the restitution of all things which God hath spoken since the world began (Acts iii. 21). The new creation of the Spirit begins immediately upon the day of Pentecost, in simple and gradual fulfillment of what had before been written; the whole typical history of Israel is reproduced in its essential reality in the true Israel of God, and will go on till the new heaven and the new earth are created, wherein dwelleth righteousness.

The ordinances of men, however, which were not the *Law*, are utterly abolished, as well all the mere human expectations which answered not to the meaning of the *Prophets*. And not only so, but the actual *fulfillment* of the old Scripture is at the same time to some extent an *abolishing* fulfillment, inasmuch as that which was preparatory ceases through its completion, the shadow retires before the substance, and the shell which enclosed and concealed the kernel, drops from it. The servant of Israel, the minister of the circumcision, the Messiah of the Jews, becomes a Saviour of the world, as was indeed most plainly predicted (Rom. xiv. 8–12). That which through the imperfection of the prophetic vision was only uttered with restriction and limitation, is now expanded into most abundant and glorious universality, and thus alone fully corresponds with the meaning which the Spirit in their letter had signified from the beginning. Yet more: as the *prophecy* has found its *end* when fulfilled in Christ, so that no more prediction shall go forth concerning him, and we are released from all expectation of another than he who is already come, and of anything else than what we now have, from all the imperfection of fragmentary prophecies which have not yet found their unity; so also is Christ, as the fulfiller of the law, likewise *its end*, that is, the *law* in contradistinction from its fulfillment (and as such only secretly predicting a future righteousness of grace, while condemning present unrighteousness) has altogether lost its force for those who are justified in Christ through faith. We are no longer *under* the law, for through Christ it lives within us and works its own accomplishment; its requirement no longer presses upon us as a commandment from without—Thou shalt! whosoever doeth not all these things, let him be accursed and die! The *punishment* of the law is no more contemplated than its rewards by those who, through the Spirit of grace in Christ, are made meet to be the people and temple of God.

Finally, there is another sense in which both the Law and the Prophets continue still, and cannot fail till all things be accomplished. Grace itself retains the office of correction, and Christ as the living and life-giving law of the Spirit, chastises sin, indeed, even in his own, until he finds it no longer; but his chastisement is only unto life and peace (Isa. liii). The old law viewed as preparatory, also, has not gone out of the world; but still exercises, as ever, its open or secret office wherever the Christ who has come is not yet preached; and even in conjunction with the work of the Spirit in evangelical preaching, the work of the letter continues upon all hearts and consciences in the outer congregation, before Christ comes into it. The Lord himself as prophet preached the law, to prepare the way for himself; and his servants follow his example.* Similarly Christ himself, in his person and history from his birth to his ascension, is a still-continued prophecy of the fulfillment of his work, of the reproduction of his person in his Church; as the Church again, in its beginning and progress, is still a prophecy of his matured body, of the temple finally completed at the end of the world. This is, indeed, a living prophecy, bearing in itself the power and security of its own fulfillment, but still a prophecy pointing to the future. *Waiting* has no more ceased than *duty;* but for all who are in Christ, the form-

* The law and the Gospel go ever hand in hand, and jointly increase in the clearness and profundity of their revelation. The law reaches its fulfillment in Christ, not only in his bearing its curse, but also in his more perfect revelation of its demand, through his own word and act—even till the final judgment and the kingdom of grace are at once and together fully brought to light. So Schöberlein, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1847. 1. p. 26, 27.

er is a progressive possession and attainment, the latter a progressive ability and willingness. In like manner the prophetic word continues to be a standing witness to all who have not acknowledged the Christ as come, even till they acknowledge him. And all things thus go on, till the law and the prophets have reached their fulfillment in the perfect Church, the body of the great Head; until the final decision and separation of the judgment has come, which is every where attested to be the goal of all law and prophecy; and thereby the end returns back to the beginning again, the entire Old Testament appears spiritually yet visibly in the tabernacle of God among men, eternally new; and after the last rejection of the unbelieving, and the glorification of the faithful, nothing more remains to be commanded or threatened, and nothing more to be foretold.

Thus we have, to some little extent, pointed out the meaning of our Lord's utterance in Matt. v. 17; the enlightened reader will discover how little of its inexhaustible fulness. But we have not once as yet fixed our attention upon the *second* sentence of this great saying, in which he so emphatically repeats—*I am not come to destroy but to fulfill.* Is this really a repetition only for the sake of emphasis? Assuredly so in part, so far as it is the Lord's design to impress a more vivid conviction of the infinite contrariety of these two things, and to place in a more striking light the folly of that delusion which expected any *abrogation* from *him.* But there is also something new in his meaning, something wider and greater, when he now omits the "Law and the Prophets," and testifies in general and comprehensively: I am *altogether and absolutely* not come to abolish anywhere any thing that is right and true, but my coming is throughout and entirely to conserve, to expand and to fulfill all the rudiments, preparations and tendencies toward the kingdom of God in humanity. Hereby likewise he throws his unrestrained glance over Israel even into the whole world of heathenism, for which also he is come, and in which there will be found elements of preparation for his coming, which his new revelation may seize upon; for he comes not absolutely to create anew, but rather to fulfill. He looks into the deep things of humanity in relation to God, and surveys its history as presenting a universal aspiration towards himself, and waiting for his coming. And do not these very Scriptures concerning the future Christ, which were given by God to Israel, that copy of humanity, also disclose the self-same preparation for him, though more hidden and darkened, in the other nations of the earth? Is there not something in them all, which we may also term νόμος ἢ προφῆται εἰς Χριστόν, *Law or Prophets to Christ*? The heathen have a law in their conscience, a worship of God through sacrifice in their religions, codes of morals and rights in their political economy, longings and presentiments in their wise men and poets who are also their prophets (Tit. i. 12; Acts xvii. 28). The Lord brings its fulfillment to every such expectation in the ancient world, and destroys nothing in all this which testifies to the righteousness and truth of God; through its sins and its delusions he destroys every where as being the work of the devil, in order that he may help forward to its development, every, the most secret, germ implanted of God which still existed among them. How gracious and full of encouragement is this word for all in the world, who, as poor as they are sincere, are waiting for righteousness! How solemn and admonitory is the instruction which it gives to all the Lord's servants, his missionaries among the heathen and his preachers in Christendom, that in every relation, internal or external, they must not teach and labor in the spirit of such entire abolition as their Lord here signifies, but bring in every where a universal *fulfillment* through *him who came to be* the Spirit of all forms, the consummation of all beginnings, the answer of all questions, the satisfaction of all necessity!

But *let not the world think*, even the Christian world down to this day, that he came for any other end than to establish the whole will of God, as the Law and the Prophets in Israel especially enforced and foretold it: let this be declared to the world continually in the Lord's own words, both for its encouragement and its warning. *Fear* ye not this new thing which Christ brings, as being a subversion of all established customs, a casting down of your own vain righteousness, and an interruption of your own cherished peace: he does indeed destroy inexorably the old, which was not from God and avails not before him, yet only as the fulfiller of all aspirations towards a true righteousness in God's sight! But *hope* not for that grace as bringing a false freedom from law, wait not for his kingdom with expectation that savors in any degree of the blind delusion of the *Jewish* expectation of Messiah: he does indeed make all things new in the spirit, brings grace, peace, life and blessedness, yet only in order to righteousness in the obedience of God's will. Would you rather have a Saviour who should not establish the law of Sianai, because your evil conscience recoils from it; a Saviour who should leave behind much of the Jewish word of prophecy, because your foolish fancy in the unbelief of a sluggish heart opposes it? then does he most decisively answer you, *Such a one am not I!*

Verse 18. For *all* must and will be *fulfilled*, that is written in the ancient *Scriptures*, even to the tittle. Of this the Lord gives his yet stronger assurance, and confirms with his *Amen*, which was first heard in John i. 51, and had since then often been used to individuals as in John iii. 3, v. 11, but now for the first time occurs in his public teaching of the people. The prophets, who testified of him who was to come, and Moses, the mediator of the law, might only say—Thus saith the Lord! But here that Lord himself is speaking, whose way they all as servants had

prepared; who, greater than a prophet, expound the true meaning of the law which himself had given (vers. 21, 27); withdraws those condescending concessions which it had made to the hardness of their hearts (vers. 31, 33, 37), and re-establishes and re-imposes it in all the perfection of its original integrity; who, indeed, thus early declares himself (vers. 19, 20) to be the one Lawgiver and Judge, who receives into or rejects from the kingdom of heaven. He it is who thus preliminarily asserts his own authority and the authority of the whole subsequent discourse: *I say unto you!* Here at once his peculiar method of instruction begins to become more distinctly manifest, in which he excites the deaf ear to attention by *striking proverbial sayings* which have the appearance of hyperbole, and yet utter nothing but the actual and literal truth, of which no tittle shall be abated, and which he can seal with his *Amen!*

We perceive immediately, if we will only give heed, how far-reaching had been the Lord's preceding word concerning the *fulfillment* of the Law and the Prophets; since the fulfillment is to take place not merely in his own person, but further and ever increasingly through him *in all who are his*, through the whole future history of humanity in all its ages down to the end of the days of heaven upon earth (Deut. xi. 21). He now mentions only the *Law*, as the more common name in popular usage, which employed both interchangeably; but its connection with what has gone before shows that it embraces also the Prophets, whose prophecies *must* as certainly be fulfilled as the commandments of the Law (see the repetition of this at a later period in Luke xvi. 16, 17).* Yet when we mark what follows, we perceive that there is a transition in this expression, and that the Lord is proceeding now to bring into prominence the law in its narrower sense, the *commandments* of righteousness. *Heaven* is not the heavens of ver. 12; as *earth*, here, is not the same which is promised in ver. 5, as an inheritance; but the present heaven and the present earth, which await a *passing away*, παρέρχεσθαι, a vanishing, a growing old (as 2 Cor. v. 17; Jas. i. 10; Rev. xxi. 1), the being changed and renewed, according to the predictions of the Scriptures, which clearly announce this in such places as Psa. cii. 27; Isa. xxxiv. 4, li. 6, lxv. 17; and even in its earliest revelation had occasionally made it known, as in Gen. viii. 22; Job xiv. 12. The first *till* is just as certain and as necessary as the second—compare the direct assertion in Luke xxi. 33. Thus the substance of the word of God, written before Christ and in him to be fulfilled, with the development of this his kingdom and work, stretches forward to the final passing away of all that is perishable and the changing of all that is mutable; then first, when the world passes away, will the fulfillment of all be complete and established!

Heaven and earth, the form of this present world, are but a transitory creation to endure for their season (1 Cor. vii. 31; Heb. xii. 26, 27); but the word of God abideth for ever (Isa. xl. 8). The world passes away entirely and as a whole; there is coming another heaven and another earth; but the word of God, the slightest minutiæ of which are here compared with the whole universe, must remain even to the smallest point. There is in that word, rightly conceived of, neither small nor great; nothing in it can be lost, for it is, and must ever be, a living whole. And this applies to the word *which is written* in the letters of human language, to the *Scripture* which cannot be broken (John x. 35), as the *ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ μία κεραία, one jot, or one tittle*, incontrovertibly declares. The *iota* is the smallest letter; the *tittle*, little horn or point, is the smallest part of a letter, which appertains to the true and established Scripture.* That this strong expression refers figuratively in its special meaning to the least important of its contents, is plainly to be understood: and this saying therefore teaches us that while with the change of the heaven and the earth there will follow also, finally, a change of the form of the word of God, a *passing away* of the letters and points in which it must till then be contained, its full accomplishment yet remains—Till *all be fulfilled.* This *all* comprehends every *ἓν καὶ μία, every individual thing*, which now exists in the letter, and shall remain in its reality; and assures us of such a fulfillment of everything in Scripture, whether great or small, first or last, in its pure and actual truth, as we cannot now apprehend. The *manner* of this establishment of the written word in the eternal permanence of the new world, our Lord leaves in obscurity, even as he does the *manner* of the old world's passing away. Thus much, however, he says, in passing to his subsequent discourse, that this *fulfillment begins* in his disciples' *performance* of it unto righteousness.

Verse 19. He therefore now turns more particularly to the *commandments* of the Scripture, and asserts their inviolable continuance as a whole and in their individual precepts, in opposition to the destructive error of the *Pharisees.* They are obviously referred to here, though without being named, as he presently afterwards places his disciples in direct contrast with them. The Pharisees understood not that the law is a living whole (Jas. ii. 10), although the many threads united in one border upon the fringes which Moses appointed (Num. xv. 38; Matt. xxiii. 5), might have pretypified it to them. They counted the single commandments as single, just as

* *Schleiermacher* would very erroneously (on Luke, p. 207) strike out of the Sermon on the Mount ver. 18 as an interpolation from Luke—because it makes the whole uncertain and ambiguous! vers. 17 and 19 immediately connected are so very plain! Surely Schleiermacher finds some σκάνδαλον here to remove.

* And by which alone many Hebrew letters are distinguished, as ך and ך. The *yod* is often superfluous, yet even then the Jews ascribed to it a peculiar signification.

even yet a blind misunderstanding has nothing better to say than—This God has commanded to us, and this also, and yet further this. They investigated with subtility which were the greater and the greatest commandments; and which as being the least might be left unperformed: just as even now dead systems of spurious morality and ethics speculate about a collision of duties, in which one must give place to another; and dream furthermore of grosser and more venial sins. It was their custom to compare what they regarded as the *least* commandments with the smallest letters of the Scripture, י or ו, and to this folly the Lord had alluded in the previous remark. They at last, in the excess of their perverseness, treated the especial precepts of holiness (which the Lord himself, more strictly defining his present expression, certainly terms *τα βαρύτερα του νόμου, the weighter matters of the law*) as slight and insignificant in comparison with the external ordinances and customs, in the frivolous fulfillment of which they sought their righteousness (Matt. xxiii. 23, 24). In opposition to all this, the Lord asserts the equal validity of the smallest of *these* commandments also, as being always uttered with a like "Thus saith the Lord," and from among *them* he presently takes his examples. By the admonitory—*Whosoever, therefore*, shall break one of these, he does not so much aim at the Pharisees, as at his own disciples, appointed to office in his kingdom, who are warned against doing as these did. This *breaking* takes place, as the connection shows, through a spurious, enervating exposition which *teaches* it as something unimportant, leading as a consequence to an entire disregard of it, so that the requirement of the commandment is annulled, and it is left altogether *unperformed*. Whoever of his disciples deals in any such manner with the law, in this or the other department of its precepts, and teaches the people so, let him know that he is a bad teacher, who himself has understood and received but little of the perfect righteousness of the kingdom of heaven. Since he has not scrupled to term some commandments the least, he shall in just requital, here in the true records of the Church, and hereafter, when every man's praise or blame shall be righteously dealt to him, himself *be called the least*. This is obviously not to be taken in a good sense (it is severer than *μικροτερος*, ch. xi. 11), but has an almost scornful tone, and verges upon not entering the kingdom at all, though it is not altogether the same.* For the Lord does not refer to full and absolute Pharisaism, but to an intermixture of it in his disciples with error of judgment. But whoever of them, on the other hand, is zealous with all his might and before all things, *to do* the apparently least commandments of God, and in this spirit *teaches* the law, shall be called *great* in the kingdom of heaven, shall be acknowledged as a genuine teacher and master (*Rabbi* is equivalent to *great*) in the final and just judgment which shall give to every man his due. Ye must be Rabbis, in a better sense and in the highest truth of the name. Mark, then, accordingly, who are in the sight of Christ the little Rabbis, and the untaught doctors; and who are the great and genuine expounders of Scripture and masters of the law! But art thou disposed to press the matter so far as to cleave to the minutest letter as such, or even to accept this most important expression of our Lord so strictly in the letter as to deduce from the perpetual, external obligation of all those Mosaic precepts, which he, nevertheless, elsewhere has by his Spirit annulled—then hast thou not yet rightly understood the Master, who speaks, indeed, of an abrogation or establishment of the commandments, very different from that which may take place in the letter. We shall henceforward find many more such paradoxes in the Sermon on the Mount, which penetrate into the profounder meaning and harmony of truth. He who, in his exposition of any one commandment, which was written for Israel in the books of Moses, has nothing else to set out with than, "This is now obsolete"—is one of those who destroy the law. But he who discovers in the whole, for himself and for others, an inner abiding meaning and import which even yet applies to us all, is the genuine teacher of Holy Scripture.* He only is a true interpreter of the New Testament who interprets it in harmony with the Old.

Verse 20. How great is the contrast between *this* declaration, which closes the first part, and the promises which commenced it in vers. 3 and 6! The Lord utters it by way of transition, as a general superscription for the whole development of the second part—Let yours be a sound and genuine and perfect righteousness; and it is especially now said for the first time—Not like that of the Pharisees! If that contrast between the beginning and the end is rightly regarded, and the entering of the kingdom of heaven into us is taken in connection with our entering the kingdom of heaven, we cannot but perceive that even this severe utterance has an essential promise within it. For it then runs thus, being reversed—Unless the kingdom of heaven enter into you with its gracious gift, ye can have no righteousness at all. If ye receive it in your poverty, ye shall be filled with righteousness. But just at this point the discourse passes over to a more rigid *requirement* that this gift of righteousness be both received and preserved. The strong expression, *οὐ μή, in no case enter*, goes further than the previous comparison of least or greater in the kingdom of heaven. It is similar to ch. xviii. 1–3.

* There is *to us* more of *irony* in the tone, than (as Braune thinks) of love and gentleness, such as might yet consider the object of it to be in the kingdom of heaven. More correctly Von Gerlach: "To be called the least, is generally an expression of contempt and rejection."

* Richter's *Family Bible* asks, "Art thou not afraid because of thy past treatment of the Old Testament?"

Not all the *scribes* were at that time *Pharisees* likewise, or the reverse;* but the Lord blends them together according to their internal points of union, and thus exhibits under two aspects the absolute opposition between every kind of insufficient and false righteousness, and the perfect, genuine righteousness of his own disciples. This opposition is the same to the present day, in all ages and in all places; for the developments of the Jewish people down to the age of Christ, are but a mirror of that humanity into which he enters as a whole. The scribes are every where those who are *learned* in the letter (γραμματεῖς) and who teach it; and the worst delusion is that of supposing that such knowledge, without corresponding action, is righteousness; it therefore stands first. But it is no better, when even such doing is added as that of the Pharisees. These are in all times the *doers* of the work in appearance but not in reality, retaining now as ever the disposition to add the ordinances of men to the commandments of God, to substitute their *opera supererogationis* and ἐθελοθρησκεία (*will worship*) for the weightier matters which they lightly dispensed with. The book-learned and letter-sifting γραμματεῖς reckon up the precepts of God, as if they were no more than mere letters and points; they determine with keen subtilty which are the greater and which the less; and it is all that they can do, to *give instruction* in these matters. The Pharisees are zealous, also, in the work; but with the same formal, blind, dead, cleaving to the mere work without any life in it, as that of the former to the letter without any spirit. Though the two are sometimes distinct, they generally run one into the other; and therefore the Lord here unites them together. What then is *the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees?* First of all, knowledge and teaching without doing; then the doing without heart, as in the accustomed offerings, tithes, their own self-invented washings, etc., and even in the case of the commandments—Thou shalt not kill! thou shalt not commit adultery! And yet shall this, wherein all is hypocrisy and the lie of pride without any the slightest approach to poverty of spirit, be termed a "*righteousness.*" The Lord so terms it indeed, but with that severe scorn of sharply penetrating truth and love which he must ever feel towards all such as they were, down to the end of time. These *reghteous ones*, these *especially holy*—as the name "Pharisee" signifies†—think that they *exceed* other people, and possess abundant righteousness: but the Lord casts them down from their eminence, when, in ironical allusion to this, he cries to his disciples—Let *your* righteousness *exceed;* let them be the common people and sinners in comparison with you! The tone of this is more severe than what was said in ver. 19; for it means no less than that their righteousness is *none at all*, since it gains them *not even* an entrance into the kingdom of heaven.* On the other hand, that first righteousness which is attained by the justifying faith of those poor and wretched ones to whom mercy graciously inclines, is a *true righteousness*, although the mourning and the hungering strictly speaking should come after, and their hearts be not yet purified in all holiness. The Publican goes down from his first prayer of penitence justified *rather than* the Pharisee; and if he proceeds in this righteousness, if he, now that the kingdom of heaven is come into him, constantly seeks the full establishment of the kingdom of God and his righteousness within him, then will the Fulfiller fulfill all in his experience, until he is perfect, as his Father in heaven is perfect. All this is effected through asking and receiving (ch. vii. 7), through that process of self-denial before God and before men, which, though easily apprehended by the mind, is only possible in act through divine grace (ch. vii. 12, 13). The spiritual law of our Lord, as it now proceeds on from ver. 21, ever anew casts down throughout the whole way to its full accomplishment, every presumption of perfection already attained; reveals the still-existing heathenism of nature in the hearts of the children of God; puts to shame all precipitate judgment of others, while self is not judged, all rebuking of the Pharisees without the much better righteousness than theirs, as sheer hypocrisy; and cries to all disciples from step to step, for their encouragement and warning, in order that all Pharisaism may be extirpated—Let your righteousness be still better; let it more and more exceed, until it become absolutely perfect!† This let us do and teach even as our Master did, and take good heed that we abate not his word by a single tittle any where, nor invalidate his "verily I say unto you" by any falsehood of our own.

Not like the Pharisees, the men of the letter of the law, and of hypocritical outside appearances! This is the first great contrast, by which the perfect righteousness of the disciples of Christ is further delineated, that righteousness which is required as the fruit of the

* At least not according to the more general idea which holds good here. But it will be seen to follow from ch. xxiii. 2, that only the orthodox Pharisees held the seat of Moses.

† פְּרוּשִׁים, according to the Rabbinical writings, those who assume to be separate and holy, so that it might be seen from their very garments that they held themselves different from עַם הָאָרֶץ, the common people.

* Similarly in Heb. xi. 4, Abel's better or greater offering than Cain's.

† At the utmost possible distance from the picture which Zeller (in the *Monatsblatt*) draws of the proud saints who imagine that the paper-money of their own good works must be current, also, in heaven, and be reckoned there *at par*, at least, if not indeed *above par*.

grace which has been previously received. The two other contrasts, as we said above, *develope* themselves out of this—Not as the heathen! Not as the half-disciples, who, being disposed to remain in an imperfect righteousness, fall away again entirely as a consequence, and are put to confusion as hypocrites and evil-doers. *Not like the Pharisees!* The Lord thus, in the manner of the prophets, connects his teaching with the characteristics of the men of his age, embracing and illustrating by them general and permanent relations. But how is this seen? As the development of these words proceeds in detail, they evolve *three* other contrasts which disclose and explain themselves organically, advancing from the original principle of Pharisaism to its consequences, and tracing that *right understanding* of the law which is opposed to theirs into its essentially voluntary and actual *obedience.* His disciples' understanding of the law is *spiritual;* to this is opposed the merely *literal* understanding of the Pharisees: that of his disciples is consequently *correct*, and is opposed to the *false exposition* of the Pharisees; their right understanding approves itself, finally, in a *voluntary and hearty* reception of the law in order to *do* it, in opposition to the *hypocritical* legality of the Pharisees. This is the internal arrangement of the discourse from ch. v. 21 to ch. vi. 18; which cannot, indeed, be viewed otherwise, since it corresponds with the most profound relations of the matter upon which the discourse dwells. The error of the Pharisees proceeded from their merely literal acceptation of the law (ch. v. 21–32); and in its origin was to some slight extent excusable, inasmuch as the letter of the commandment was obviously most prominent before them. But if man's sinful heart would sincerely and humbly permit the law to enter, it would soon reveal its spiritual and inner meaning as designed for the conviction of the spirit; it would thus spiritually expound itself, just as all sincere souls have ever understood it: for we must not suppose that Christ gives now an altogether new publication of its meaning.* But in the wickedness of the Pharisaic mind, on the contrary, this literal understanding of the law produced, and, indeed, had for its foundation, a *false interpretation* (ch. v. 33–48), which, finally, in the progress of perversion, annulled it entirely; so that—Thou shalt love! became in the destroying gloss—Thou mayest hate! In the *detection* of their error we find its *principles* becoming more evident as we go further into its *outward exhibition.* The law is literally understood from the beginning because it has been falsely interpreted. And, finally, as to the third? The law has only been falsely interpreted because it is read and heard not with a view to the simple and sincere *doing* of it; since the design is not to obey the law in spirit and in truth before God who seeth in secret, but only for the sake of man! Hence, thirdly, and quite correctly, we have the *hypocritical seeming-legality* of the Pharisees, which developes itself from this false interpretation, and is also found to be its source (ch. vi. 1–18). With this is brightly contrasted the genuine, internal fulfillment of the children of God before their Father in secret; which alone prevails and will receive reward.

If after this general glance we enter more into detail, we find that the Lord further illustrates *each* of these three contrasts by *three examples* taken from the precepts and duties of righteousness, and evidently according to a fundamental and necessary order of selection. And here we are met by the division of the law into moral, ceremonial, and civil; a classification which, notwithstanding the essential unity of the three, is based upon truth, and will now be exhibited in its propriety. From the ceremonial law, or the law of the sanctuary and divine service, the Lord takes no particular leading example, because that was given not so much for the conviction of sin, as for the typical satisfaction of an already awakened sense of need of a propitiation. He contents himself in relation to this with merely adding to the first example an impressive caution, referring back to the instance of Cain, against the unhallowed *offering of gifts* with an angry and implacable heart. On the other hand, he very distinctly brings forward, in connection one with the other, the civil law or the law of the *political economy* of Israel, and the more distinctive law of *holiness*, as we prefer calling it, instead of the moral law. He begins naturally with the latter, with the *commandments of Sinai*, the heart of the whole divine legislation; and presents as the three examples of the first contrast, *two* from Sinai and *one* from the civil code. In the second contrast this is reversed; *two* are taken from the civil code (concerning swearing and judicial retribution), and *one* returns again to the summary of the moral law, the love of our neighbor. In the third contrast, finally, he very significantly abandons the written precepts of God's word, and takes his illustrations from the three main works of righteousness according to the human Pharisaic idea: almsgiving, prayer, and fasting. The details of this arrangement will exhibit and justify themselves, when we examine them more narrowly.

We now proceed in our more direct exposition to vers. 21–32. The two commandments of the law given from Sinai, are such as exhibit the literal and spiritual acceptation in their rudest collision, and Christ, by his full disclosure of the latter, lays open the very ground of man's evil heart. The civil enactment which follows, concerning the *letter of divorce*, is one which exemplifies the preparatory character of the Mosaic ordinance, its accommodation to men's hardness of heart; and Christ exhibits his fulfillment of this law, to those

* To suppose this, is most fundamentally to misunderstand the relation of the Sermon on the Mount to the law. Christ says even here, only what Moses and the Prophets have already said.

who possess his spirit, as being a canceling of that which was imperfect, and a re-establishment of the original and right ordinance. The first two commandments are united—Thou shalt not *kill!* thou shalt not *commit adultery!* for the pride of self which towers above all others (involving the denial of all that is not I), and the sensuality of entire devotion to the flesh, are in their essence just the two poles of the same sin. *Hatred or murder* and *lust* are forms of corruption in the heart, mysteriously reciprocal and interwoven one with the other, which the two keen commandments of the letter, Do no murder! comm t not adultery! penetrating to the secrets of the heart, will draw forth and reveal. (Let Lamech of the race of Cain be called to mind, Gen. iv. 19–23. Reflect upon the sensuality of vengeance and the murderousness of sensuality, and that both constitute the perfect opposite to that unselfish and pure *love*, which the holy law of God requires.) But the civil regulation, which permitted divorce, is plainly shut out by the prohibition of adultery, inasmuch as every divorce pre-supposes an act of adultery which is either committed in it or revealed by it. Consequently the essential *spirit* of the command—Thou shalt not commit adultery! testifies *against the letter*—Thou mayest practice divorce! so that the law of Moses in its integrity and unity itself contradicts the temporary imperfections of its own ordinances, and at the same time demands and predicts in its fulfillment their establishment in perfection. Thus much for the outset, and now for the details.

When the Lord designs to cast down the delusion of a legal righteousness, resting only upon a literal and false apprehension of the law without understanding its spirit which judges the inner disposition of mind, he begins, here as elsewhere, with the *second* table of the Decalogue (ch. xix. 18). For our conduct to our neighbor lies most accessible to conviction, and he who feels that he loves not his brother, may deduce from that conviction that all is not right when, before the Searcher of hearts he says, "I love God." That the discourse in its further progress does thus penetrate to the revelation of the heart's *idolatry*, will be manifested from ch. vi. 24. On another occasion, when the Lord points out the annulling of the commandments of God by the traditions of men, he uses for that purpose the last precept of the first table, which is the middle term of transition to the second (ch. xv. 4). *Here*, where the whole discourse, according to the note which ver. 7 had already struck, is to reach its climax in—Be perfect in love, as God loveth (ver. 48), the first commandment of the second table naturally takes the lead, the spiritual significance of which is no other than this—*Thou shalt not hate!* The Lord lays down first the letter of the command, and its merely literal apprehension, ver. 21; in opposition to this, he expresses the spirit of this letter, and yet, in order to awaken and excite a spiritual apprehension of it, he employs figurative language which cleaves to the letter still, and is not to be understood in its literal import, ver. 22. From this follows, finally, the direct exhortation to love, without which even the offerings upon God's altar are nothing worth; expressed first, in terms of simple exhortation, vers. 23, 24, and then vers. 25, 26, of solemn denunciation, in the figurative exhibition of the *judgment* which is taken up and continued from ver. 22. This judgment, however, can only be fully understood when referred in its higher sense, as the preceding intimation in the "offering" shows, to the highest and only Judge.

Verses 21, 22. The Lord by this *Ye* addresses his disciples as before, but at the same time all the people, in as far as they belong to him, may learn what his teaching will be, and this is in a sense the beginning of discipleship. Ye have *heard*, not *read;* this latter could only have been spoken to the Scribes; and the Lord does not now at the first address them at all, but warns the people, to whom he speaks, against them. The people only heard out of the law which was read and expounded in their hearing; but, alas! were obliged also to hear their teacher's manner of apprehending and interpreting it (John xii. 34; Rom. ii. 13, 18). That *it was said*—By whom? According to the earlier and customary acceptation, which Luther follows, this was regarded as designedly left indefinite, because the Lord's—But I say unto you! was intended to oppose all false teaching generally, from whatever source it might come; and it was only defined as the doctrine which had come down from antiquity: hence, that it was said *to them of old*. Others think that these ancients were the contemporaries of Moses, and that the Lord places his own word in direct contradiction to that of Moses. This supposition is conclusively refuted by vers. 17, 18, after uttering which it is not to be imagined that the Lord would immediately say: Moses has said thus, but I now say otherwise! For that purpose, also, the standing form of speech, "to the *fathers*," would have been used (Luke i. 55, John vi. 31; Acts iii. 22, vii. 38; Heb. i. 1), from whom the ἀρχαῖοι (*those of old time*) here are clearly distinguished. Does not the Lord expressly confirm, in ch. xxiii. 2, 3, all that the Scribes, who sit in Moses' seat, teach conformably with the word of *Moses?* Does he not every where throughout this Sermon prudently avoid stating in contradistinction to his own words, that *Moses* had said—even, for example, in ver. 31, where this is actually meant (comp. ch. xix. 7, 8), where a preparatory, imperfect ordinance of Moses is abrogated? But here it is *God* himself, not Moses, who spoke the inviolable word, *Thou shalt not kill!* The Lord does not say any thing in opposition to *this word* in itself, but it is against the merely literal interpretation which was immediately attached to it that he contends—"This means no more than that whosoever *kills*, or inflicts a death-blow, shall be in danger of the judgment." Just as in ver. 43 it is not the commandment of Moses, but its altogether an-

nulling interpretation, which is spoken of—Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and *hate thine enemy!* We quite agree with Lange, that "the first corruption of law is exhibited in its not being developed according to its spirit, but *bound down* to its *literal* meaning." Our Lord enters into conflict with all such glosses and teaching as tend to *relax* the commandments (ver. 18); whatever has been said beyond the word of God, and in false exposition of that word, he contradicts by his own sayings; and thus by the same divine truth and authority he confirms and establishes the true meaning of all which before him had been written or spoken as the word of God.

The notion that Christ contradicts Moses, could only be endured by such orthodox theology as that of our day, which holds so feebly to the Old Testament as immediately divine. The most tolerable presentation of this view, which is very generally embraced, and, alas! has been latterly maintained by the sainted Neander, in the "*Deutschen Zeitschrift*"—that which could alone recommend it for a moment to our consideration—is the notion that Christ only designed to oppose the law *as law*, the "legal relation and expression" as such. But the truth of this view must be much more clearly and appropriately unfolded than, *e. g.* it is by Dietlein;* and, moreover, the discourse does not deal distinctively with *this* point at all, but speaks, rather, in more rigid terms of an unconditionally necessary fulfillment of the law and its commandments—and, indeed, with a yet more exacting rigor of legal expression of its own. The old Fathers with whom Neander briefly declares himself (in the "*Life of Christ*") to agree, meant their *correctio legis* in a very different sense from that of the Socinians and moderns, as Tholuck (on the Sermon on the Mount) has very properly observed.

Most certainly it is not the design of the Sermon on the Mount, if we only hear it and read it aright, to *contradict the law*, but to *expound and glorify it in its fulfillment*. Hence it is not said: Ye have heard that it has been *read* in the law. The common people, whose knowledge of the law was only indirect, would have said with regard to whatever they heard, even though not found written there—We have heard *out of the law;* that which was written, and that which was said, being blended together into what was *popularly valid* as "law." But it is our Lord's design now to put a final end to all such intermixture. By the expression which he uses he indicates the entire system of *erroneous interpretation*,† which not merely might have, but actually had to the greatest extent crept in between the true meaning of the letter (ver. 18), and this *hearing* of what had been *said* concerning it. The Scribes read the word "kill," as if it simply meant murder, and as if the limiting addition was strictly proper: but thus they *read* not aright, either what was written, or how it was written; as the Lord elsewhere, in referring to the right manner of reading the law, emphatically expresses himself—What is written in the law? *how readest thou?* (Luke x. 26). Further, they did not sincerely *tell* the people even what their own awakening conscience, in spite of their system, must oft-times involuntarily have perceived in the law. In like manner the people, on their part, did not listen to all that was said to them, but received just what pleased their ears; and thus they limited and weakened it still more, so that the error which understood not the Scripture (ch. xxii. 29), increased as it passed from the saying of the Scribes to the hearing of the people, just as it has ever happened even down to our own time, wherever the people may be said only to hear out of the Gospel. Thus, after having given his assurance that he will not destroy one tittle of the law, if the Lord should say anything different from what thou hast hitherto heard "out of the Scripture," look well to it, and see where the error lay, whether in thy hearing, or in what thou hast heard; and then in the right spirit of hearing let Jesus himself *tell* thee *what is truly written in the Scripture.*

Τοῖς ἀρχαίοις must certainly be translated as meaning that it was said *by* or *among* them of old time,* namely, that it had been handed down by the masters and doctors in Israel, by the Rabbis of a former age, with the false semblance of antiquity as an immemorial statute. For thus runs the Talmudical formula of teach-

* *Das Reich Gottes* (Berlin, 1846).—What Rauh also throws out (*Deutsche Zeitsch.* 1850, p. 360) is more apparently profound than it is well-grounded

† The Pharisaic *caricatures* of the Old Testament—which they made not as *opponents*, but as the *exponents* of the law—as Richter's *Family Bible* has well said on this point.

* As the *ablative*, equivalent to ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων, which construction is preferred by very many, indeed by most expositors. Tholuck regards it as supported by "reasons which deserve notice," though he himself does not accede to it. For ourselves, we regard it as the only possible one, and rejoice that now, in the corrected German Bibles at least, it stands—*bei den alten*. These ancients are *not* "the fathers" (Heb. i. 1) to whom God had spoken. It was not *Moses* (whom the Lord, moreover, would not have referred to by a mere general ἐρρέθη) that had said: Thou shalt not kill, commit adultery, etc. but the God of heaven upon Sinai. (Comp. Matt. xv. 3–6, and all those passages in which Christ places the "commandments" so high, and confirms them so strongly.) We cannot conceive why, as De Wette thinks, our interpretation would have required πρεσβυτέροις to have been written for "elders," (which, however, does not exactly correspond with קדמונים), any more than why, as Von Gerlach thinks, *our* view would have been expressed—"Ye hear, that it is said in the schools and synagogues." Did they not then refer in these synagogues to the παράδοσις of antiquity? Alas that Alford also, in his penetrating work, should have failed here! Of a contrasted "imperfection of the *law* and its ancient *exposition*" (what an unseemly conjunction, as if the latter necessarily sprung from the former), he cannot have spoken who had just asserted ver. 19.

ing adopted by the learned caste, under cover of which they transmitted from age to age error and truth united, under the seal of their own supreme authority:—אמרו קדמנינו, "Our forefathers have said," or merely אותאמר, איתמר, *It has been said;* which was then as firmly established as if it had been the eternally valid *γέγραπται*,* "*It is written.* In opposition to all this, and rooting out all tradition and precepts of men which God hath not planted, stands the mighty *Ἐγω δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν*, "But *I* say unto you," which is one with the כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה or נְאֻם יְהוָה, "Thus saith the Lord," of the Law and the Prophets. Had the contrast been instituted, not with those who had said, but with those to whom it had been said, it would have been *ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω*, "but I say *to you.*"

The false teachers declared to the people the commandment of God—Thou shalt not kill! but with an explanation which coupled the law of Sinai with a mere criminal statute concerning the execution of a murderer (Lev. xxiv. 17; Ex. xxi. 12), and made the two parallel: as if the Lord God did not in the first place speak of that which came before *his own* special tribunal, and signify by *thou* the true murderer, the inner man! Thus they lower the commandment of holiness to the level of a civil statute, just as, on the other hand (ver. 38), they improperly elevate what was only spoken with reference to human judicature, into a commandment of moral obligation. To this exhibition of the literal interpretation of a law degenerating into gross error, our Lord now sets in sharp contrast his own explanation of its spirit and meaning; yet in a manner as attractive as it is emphatic. He most *emphatically* declares the concealed *anger* against a brother to be no less criminal than the open offence; or as it might be further illustrated in the popular catch-word: Thou hast heard it said, and supposest that the gallows is the end of a thief; but know that he who only covets his neighbor's goods already deserves the gallows! But he speaks this also to *conciliate* and win them to the spiritual understanding of the law, since the impossibility which was immediately discerned of carrying this principle into civil jurisprudence must have tended to direct their views to the higher government of God, and to the spiritual law of the Searcher of hearts, whose prerogative alone it is to convict the sinner of his secret guilt before his own judgment-seat. Moreover, the Lord here utters nothing that is actually new; it had already been written by Moses in the same sentence, from which he afterwards extracted the summary of the second table (Lev. xix. 17, 18; comp. Deut. xix. 6). *Brother* is an intenser word for *neighbor;* Moses used it as such in the passage referred to, and by no means with that restricted meaning of the Pharisees which our Lord condemns in ver 47. It has been hotly disputed whether *εἰκῇ*, (whosoever is angry with his brother *without a cause*, needlessly, to no purpose*) is or is not the true reading; such contention, indeed, is needless. The proposition is correct with *εἰκῇ*, if this is rightly understood; and, indeed, without this qualification, if *ὀργιζόμενος* is rightly understood, that is, as signifying that a righteous and holy indignation (Mark iii. 5; Eph. iv. 26; James i. 19) is not only not forbidden, but commanded (1 Sam. iii. 13). It is observable, that such a various reading just here was designed to teach us, that the matter of essential importance is the spiritual understanding of the sense and not the mere letter of the word. Bengel's expression: "This gloss plainly sounds human"—is not satisfactory, since critical authorities are in favor of this *gloss.* It appears, indeed, more conceivable that a rigorist should have struck out this little word, than that its so frequent addition should have been permitted. We rather hold with Grotius (who quotes Aristotle on unrighteous anger): *Merito εἰκῇ additum* (the *εἰκῇ* is properly added). As also Euthymius before him: *ἡ γὰρ εὔκαιρος ὀργὴ ὠφέλιμος* (for seasonable anger is useful). *To be angry* and *to hate* are not indeed one and the same, though Bengel confounds them. He who *hateth* his brother is assuredly a murderer (1 John iii. 15), and Moses said directly, Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart. But there is an anger springing from holy and jealous love, existing as in God so also in men of God; and we may suppose that our Lord in his severe declaration left room for this *by an express word*, in order not needlessly to harass the consciences of his disciples He does not concern himself with the possibility of a still further perversion on the part of the Pharisees, who would never be at a loss to find adequate cause for their unrighteous wrath: for all that follows must also be spiritually understood. The letter even of Christ's word demands an interpretation which adheres not to its letter; for *a letter that may not, without the Spirit, be misunderstood, is a thing impossible*, as is manifestly shown by such subsequent sayings as vers. 29, 30, 34, 37 39–42. Whoever should literally follow out all these, would be at the furthest distance from the Lord's meaning. James addresses the fool, who boasts of his faith without works,

* Correctly and beautifully it is observed by Lange: "This *corruption* of the Law was gradually and slowly produced by the joint errors of ages which engendered this false tradition. It was not the work of any particular person, but of a general spirit of interpretation (*ἐῤῥέθη*); but this tradition was ever received and gathered up with diligence by the elders, or those who were antiquity-minded." Correctly as to the matter in hand, though we cannot but regard this so convenient construction of an *absolute ἐῤῥέθη* with a *dative*, as too artificial. It is a strange, and almost impossible construction. It was so said to the ancients—by those yet more ancient? Who then were the first of all these ancients, the especial depositaries of this *tradition?*

* Lange: "ins Eitle hinein," *i.e.*, frivolously.

with an ἄνθρωπε κενέ, *Vain man!* (James ii. 20), which is literally equivalent to this forbidden ῥακά.* Jesus, like John, termed the Pharisees a brood of vipers, and the Jews even children of the devil (as Paul did Elymas), which goes beyond μωρός, נָבָל, *godless.* Thus it may be seen that εἰκῇ, which it is sought to take away from the anger, must be supplied in this case also—He who, out of the anger of hatred, and not in love, calls his brother *Raca* or *fool* (vain fellow, scoundrel, madman, heretic). The Lord designedly conjoins the slightest invective of a rash but half-jesting petulence,† with the worst and indeed most malignant insult that the language afforded; yet it is not his design to bring this word itself into judgment, but the word as springing from the evil heart. The Pharisee, indeed, asks when he hears this most plain and evident saying: Who is then my *neighbor?* and goes on with his abatements and qualifications till no one is included whom he thinks his enemy. In like manner he asks —What, then, is *anger without cause?* by the same process finding means to stipulate for all his ungodly wrath. The Quaker, at the other extreme (to which he has come, notwithstanding his boast of the Spirit, through the selfsame want of the true Spirit), also reduces the spiritual law to a letter again, swears not at all, lets his coat and cloak be taken, and fulfills the Sermon on the Mount in all external gestures and acts. But all this is no more right than Origen's mutilation of himself as a safeguard against adultery, or the unconditional rejection by our latest zealots of any divorce, however necessary still in the Christian state for the people's hardness of heart. But he who will read and hear aright, cannot fail by this first precept of Jesus to learn what relation the directions of the Sermon on the Mount bear generally to the external laws of the state and the Church; that they are given only for free and most spiritual fulfillment in those who have the Spirit within them to that end. Was it the Lord's purpose to erect any human tribunals before which secret anger and the saying of *Raca* may be brought? where only a brother might always sit in judgment upon a brother concerning the anger *without cause?* He does not reduce the spiritual law of divine judgment to a criminal code after the manner of men, as the Jews of that time did; but rather elevates all the external ordinances which Moses gave at God's command, into the region of their most central truth, not in the letter, but in the spirit, even as Christians should now do.

Thou shalt not *kill;* that is, Thou shalt not *hate!* This is the fundamental meaning of our Lord's words, according to the saying of Moses to which he tacitly referred. He does not, however, once directly express it, but would awaken in his hearers' consciences the remembrance of that word, and the consciousness of his meaning. He therefore points out three degrees in the expression of the spirit of hatred or murder. First, the *inward expression*, if we may so speak, the rising up of hatred in the heart, as an unrighteous and unloving *anger*,* selfish and self-willed (for it means, *Thou thyself* shalt not hate!); and then the progressive outbreak of it in the milder and in the severer word. But the Lord does not go beyond the *word* of anger; for even the Pharisee would admit that the laying a violent hand upon a brother was amenable to judgment—although he interpreted to "kill" as merely signifying the act of murder, yet was he compelled by reason and conscience to extend the literal meaning *so far* at least, even at the expense of contradicting himself. Judgment, high council, Gehenna, were the three degrees of penalty in Israel. We read that in the tribes there were inferior courts of judgment (Deut. xvi. 18); in the holy city the so-called council of the Sanhedrim (Deut. xvii. 8), which might cast out of the congregation; and, finally, as the deepest ignominy, the being cast out into the valley of the dead and of all abominations (valley of the children of Hinnom or Valley of Hinnom, where had been the service of Moloch (2 Kings xxiii. 10; Jer. vii. 31). The corpses of malefactors were burnt subsequently, and all the most filthy refuse thrown there; whence in the prophets we find it used as a type of the place of condemnation without the city of God (Isa. xxx. 33, lxvi. 24); and the symbolical Jewish style of teaching, the truth in which our Lord always appropriated to himself, had yet further carried out the figure. But these three degrees of punishment are, as the Lord here utters them,† only intended to convey an increasing emphasis of assurance in the expression (he already deserves the judgment, yea, even more than that!), and by no means the idea of degrees in the actual guiltiness.‡ For how could the word be more guilty than the disposition? A sincere though forward *Raca*, which might escape from a Peter, might well be a less evil than secret wrath concealed behind the blandishment of words; and in ver. 25 we hear only of *one* punishment, and that

* Which Matthäi thinks proper therefore to interpret "Grützkopf," *blockhead!*

† Which "has nothing at all to do with the morality of one's neighbor" (Braune).

* Which he certainly does not "pre-suppose as something unavoidable by the sinful subjects of his kingdom," as Dietlein ventures to maintain, so that this intensification of the law would *only* lead to the acknowledgment of our sinfulness, and not also to its fulfillment.

† Who does not (as Von Gerlach thinks) merely follow here the usual forms of the judicature of the time, in order to make himself intelligible to the people who expected from him the establishment of an external kingdom; but speaks *figuratively*, in the long established Jewish manner of teaching, as we observe in the use of *Gehenna.*

‡ Against which Roos (*Lehre Jes. Chris.* §138) very well protests; and also speaks with full correctness of the "heavenly Council" of the divine judgment which was typified in the "Sanhedim."

the highest, for the implacable. So that most assuredly there is here only an advancing energy of expression (though degrees of guilt are not necessarily denied): κρίσις, *judgment*, and συνέδριον, *council*, cleave more closely to the transitional figure; εἰς τὴν γέενναν, *into the Gehenna*, points to the ultimate and fearful signification of all these figures taken from human judicature.

Verse 23, 24. Who is my *brother?* Every fellow-man from Adam downwards, every Abel to whom I must not act the part of Cain, and who is called to glorify the Father in heaven (ver. 16) if I let the light of His love shine before him. Yea, even *my adversary*, who has, whether justly or unjustly, any thing against one in the highway of life (though he were as Cain himself), and who at the end of it will bring his charge against me before the highest tribunal, If I should have retained any thing against him in my own heart. Thus does the Lord explain his own meaning in the strict connection of his words; and it would be a great mistake to think that vers. 25, 26 do not belong to this place, simply because they are repeated elsewhere. The Lord here lays the deep preparatory foundation for what is fully set forth in vers. 43–48, where the general conclusion reverts back again to the commencement of the discourse.

It was observed above that in vers. 23, 24, the entire *ceremonial service*, the law pertaining to which is here referred to, is denoted by the *offering*, which is its centre. It is not, as Luther has it, *upon* the altar, but, If thou *now* (consequently, in a state of condemnation before God on account of the anger in thine heart) bringest thy gift *to* the altar, and unreflectingly preparest to offer it, as if it could then be acceptable. This is spoken once more against the Pharisees, who omitted the weightier matters, while exact in ceremonial observances, and violated the most sacred rights of filial obligations and love to man through their own superadded *Corban*, (ch. xv. 3–6). The Lord only re-utters what all the prophets had said, especially that most important passage which he more than once quoted (Hosea vi. 6); yea, what Moses had already testified in his history of the first offering. He reproves all ideas of palliating the lack of charity to man by attention to the service of God, as a remnant of Pharisaism in his disciples. Until he has brought in by his offering of himself the abrogating fulfillment of all types and shadows, he retains in his language to the people the altar and its gifts, but his *meaning* goes forward to the reality which was implied in these figures. It is not τὴν θυσίαν σου, *they sacrifice*, but τὸ δῶρόν σου, *thy gift*, because in the New Testament the offering up of ourselves in spiritual consecration is continually realized. This is now the true Christian service of God, with prayer as its centre; the fundamental petition of which for a perpetual sense of reconciliation is a self-contradiction unless there accompany it a placable disposition towards our brother. Hence our Lord at a later period (Mark xi. 25, 26) illustrates his present words, or more fully in this New Testament meaning repeats them. "And *there* remembered:" before thine and thy *brother's* Father, with a collected and self-examining mind, in the sacred place of atonement and forgiveness, thinking of the way of life and the end thereof—this being the germ of the thought in ver. 25. Its being *first* there remembered is not, indeed, approved, but rather censured. "That thy brother has *aught against thee:*" designedly put thus instead of—That thou hast something against thy brother. For as I must ask—Whose neighbor am I? in order to know who is my neighbor (Luke x. 36); so it is not enough quickly to justify one's self with hypocritical inconsiderateness—I have nothing against thee; while possibly my brother may have well-grounded cause of complaint against me. Probably I have too easily forgotten that there rankles in his mind some *Raca* of mine uttered yesterday or the third day; or there may be some anger in my heart against which he *would* complain if he knew it, as that God knows it who looks into the heart which I have brought before him. Yea even if my brother had any thing against me εἰκῇ, *without cause*, had spoken against me as a ψευδόμενος, *falsely*, (ver. 11)—this also I should remember in my charity before God (though Braune improperly denies this), and show myself, as a disciple of Christ, in the intention of my heart an εἰρηνοποιός, *peacemaker*, (ver. 9; Rom. xii. 18). The signification of this "aught against me"* thus grows, as the sensitiveness of my conscience increases; and the letter of this declaration which fully expresses its own spiritual meaning, tolerates no hasty and partial dispatching of the matter, but pierces to the ground of the heart, and rigorously looks for that pure spirit of love with which alone I can abide in the presence of the Lord, and erect in the consciousness of an accepted offering, behold his face with joy. These are fundamental principles embodied in the history of Cain and Abel, to which undoubtedly our Lord here directs our thoughts: so profoundly one is his new word with the most ancient revelation, and so manifest is the folly of those vain enthusiasts who impute to him, in contrast with Moses a new and purer ethical system of charity.† *Leave there* thy gift *before* the altar, and lay it not thereupon! Without any delay leave everything lying, if it may be possible, in the holy place; there is such danger in deferring it that even the service of God, which till then is worthless, must

---

* Compare the Apostle's word (Col. iii. 13): ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων καὶ χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς ἐάν τις πρός τινα ἔχῃ μομφήν, "forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, *if any man have a quarrel against any.*"

† Which folly now again finds acceptance with Christian theologians and expositors—a lamentable sign, whither this crypto-rationalistic, yea this crypto-pantheistic treatment of the Old Testament must infallibly lead.

be interrupted. Thou standest as Cain before God, if only this *aught* justly cries out against thee in thy brother. How inconceivably strict does the law of love thus become, though only fulfilling its own original meaning! What we wrongfully call a *little thing*, condemned equally with the *great!* By the same Spirit of Christ John likens him who only *loveth not his brother* to the first murderer (1 John iii. 10–15). Many a disciple might be disposed to rebel against this precept of the Fulfiller, and mitigate it by saying: How can I answer for every matter that any man may bring against me? *am I my brother's keeper?* Assuredly men (ver. 11) have many things to say against Christ's disciples falsely; and the Lord of course does not mean that we must be answerable for all that they may perversely say. *But* it is nevertheless true on the other hand, that it is our precious vocation to be our brothers' keepers in love, and to be messengers of peace to them; that in Christ not only should the world be crucified unto us and we unto the world, but in the selfsame cross the world should be reconciled unto us and we unto the world. *Go thy way!* Thus speaks the Father to that child of his who would approach with an offence in his heart against his holy love: *Away from me*, thou mayest not thus see my face! So will the Lord dispense, as it were, with his own service and honor until we have rendered to our brother what love demands as due! "*First* be reconciled to thy brother"—the imperative requirement that for ever recurs as long as there is any, the slightest flaw in this reconciliation. *Διαλλάγηθι, be reconciled*, forgive or obtain forgiveness, do at least thy best, that so nothing may be set against *thy* account by the great Judge. For to "mitigate thy neighbor's wrath"* may not always be in thy power, and is not always to be attained. Pray for them which despitefully use thee and persecute thee, when thou bringest thine offering, that so thou mayest have a vital fellowship with that dying settlement of a great reckoning—Father forgive them! which accompanied the one Offering through the virtue of which alone we may bring our offering to God.

"And *then come* and offer thy gift." The first coming avails nothing; now first thou *comest* aright. The offering itself, however, must not be omitted. The Lord expressly guards against that other aspect of Pharisaism, the Pharisaism of practical virtue; which with equal impropriety sets the duty we owe to our neigbor above the requirements of God's worship, and supposes that *this* may be dispensed with, if that misconceived charity to man be not forgotten.† Whence hadst thou then thy mercy towards thy neighbor, supposing it to be genuine, but from the mercy of God? *Thank Him* that thou canst love, and let that be thy offering! The Lord also discountenances every attempt to compound for a deficiency in the worship of God, by deeds of charity to our neighbor: such charity, indeed, being no more genuine than the divine worship was in the opposite kind of compromise already referred to. For "that is not the most acceptable homage, which is offered to God by a man who loses sight of his neighbor altogether, and seeks to sink wholly and entirely into a consciousness of naught but the highest Being, forgetting altogether the testimony uttered against him by the whole time past of his life, in all relations of right, propriety, and love" (Braune).

Verses 25, 26. The reconcilable and in himself reconciled God, to whom we bring our offering, becomes a *Judge*, or rather continues to be only a Judge to all those who would fain be merely the objects of his holy love without receiving it in their hearts, and rendering it back in charity to their neighbors. This is that rending of his one law which is the last and most subtle Christian Pharisaism. There is an economy of judgment and punishment at the end of the way, corresponding to the provision for offering and reconciliation in the way itself. The penal laws of ver. 22, *which are explained in what now follows, being referred to the tribunal and period of their award*, assume there their full severity. *Now* they only hang threateningly over our heads, to drive us to that *grace* which will take away all our guilt, and extinguish all our hatred and anger. And when after the mention of appearing before God (though God is designedly not named, but only the altar, before which man's conscience should think of God himself), the language of ver. 22 is resumed, we are assisted to perceive its meaning, and the due relation between grace and justice. The *adversary* (ἀντίδικος, accuser, a judicial term which had been received into the Jewish phraseology) is by no means the *Devil* (who presently appears for the first time as the keeper of the prison), but simply and obviously the ἔχων τι κατὰ σοῦ, the "one having aught against thee," my fellow-man in the journey of life, whom I must regard as a *brother* (ch. xviii. 35) whether he reciprocate it or not. But inasmuch as every man who may charge me with omission of the rights of love, does not this by any right of his own (being himself equally guilty), but by the authority of the divine law which takes up and corroborates his complaint; this complaint and this complainant may be regarded as representing the accusing Moses (John v. 45) or *the law*. Hence in the repetition of the parable (Luke xii. 58, 59), this meaning ap-

* As Von Gerlach at Rom. v. 10 explains this place.

† Over the door of a Dessau church is incribed "Preiset Gott *hier und* durch gute werke" (Praise God *here and* in good works); but there are many who not only altogether leave out the "here and," but "God's praise" also; inasmuch as their hypocritical way of speaking of good works as being the only worship of God, must be understood in the same sense as when they say: Cease from revelation, reason is the only "revelation,"—that is, none at all is necessary!

pears more distinctly shadowed out. Be *disposed to agree*, ready on thy part for reconciliation, and proposing it to him; thus is the previous διαλλαγηθι now fully explained. According to the Roman law, which the Lord thus recognizes in Israel, the complainant carries the defendant before the judgment-seat—*in jus rapit;* on the way thither, however, an amicable accommodation, *transactio*, being possible. So is it with us all on our way to the highest tribunal; and inasmuch as this way is short and precarious, the exhortation has a most urgent fulness of meaning: Agree with thine adversary *quickly*, before it may haply be too late! If I have done my best towards my brother in the advances of reconciliation, the amicable disposition will be set to my account, even though the other would not respond to it. It is not always possible to go actually to my brother and speak to him; in that case this inward reconciliation will avail for me at the very place of offering and of prayer. But when this is neglected to the last, then comes in the rigor of the righteous law; the just complaint of the complainant, even though himself guilty, has its force, and the blood, not of Abel but of another Cain, cries out against Cain. So, finally, adversaries mutually bearing testimony against each other meet in one common prison.

Who is then the *officer*, if God is the Judge? In ch. xviii. 34, βασανισταί are mentioned in the plural, but here it is Satan, the chief of the tormentors, the minister and executioner of the divine judicial wrath—a profound intimation, though only thus given by the way! *Verily*—here comes in the second great *Amen* of the Sermon on the Mount, the first having previously confirmed the law, ver. 18. But as the prison of the Devil and of those delivered over to him has its threatening Amen appended to it, so has also the kingdom of the Father in heaven, and of those who are redeemed into it from all evil, with all its power and glory, its Amen of promise (ch. vi. 13). The Amen which confirms the fulfillment of the *Law and the Prophets* unites both. Besides the three main Amens, there is only found the threefold Amen which seals the recompense of the hypocrites (ch. vi. 2, 15, 16). (A contribution, this, of internal criticism in favor of the genuineness of the doxology, as well as testifying to the connection of the whole discourse.)

"By no means come out *thence*"—an ἐκεῖθεν which forms an antithesis with ἐκεῖ, *there*, in ver. 23. If the *Judge* and the executioner of his wrath were not so manifestly before us, and if the whole was not a representation of strict *justice* in opposition to grace, the φυλακη, or *prison*, might have been here as elsewhere regarded as Sheol; and in the admonitory "*till*" an actual period might have been traced when the sins carried forward into the other world would find forgiveness (ch. xii. 32). But the connection will not permit us to regard the Lord as *here* speaking of any such prospect. Though not to be excluded in other connections, here it would be quite out of keeping. They who thus interpret the paying of the uttermost farthing, pervert its meaning; for if there be any deliverance in Sheol it can take place only through *grace*, in the way of *forgiveness* and *atonement:* it is absolutely impossible that *needy* man, possessed of nothing in the sight of God, should ever legally *pay* the slightest installment towards the extinction of his debt. He has not even the first farthing, to say nothing of the last (ch. xviii. 34, 35). Bengel wonders that the *uttermost* farthing is not urged in the argument by those who think otherwise, rather than the *till*; but when we closely look into it, the reality of the former, the ἀποδῷς τὸν ἔσχατον is immediately withdrawn by the latter, the ἕως ἄν, and marked as an impossibility in such terms as we are wont popularly to express what is impossible. To be cast into prison remains therefore just equivalent to the entering *in no case* the kingdom of heaven (ver. 20).

In the discourse upon the second commandment of Sinai, which now follows in its order in the second table (according to Matt. xix. 18, not as reversed in Mark x., Luke xviii., Rom. xiii.), we find the same process observed. First, we have the letter of the law, the merely literal acceptation of which does not need to be more particularly pointed out; against this is set the rigorous vindication of its spirit which judges the heart, now exhibited more briefly and plainly than in the former case; finally, the corresponding exhortation to an earnest endeavor after purity of heart (as before to love or mercy ver. 7, 8), with the warning once more of the prison of hell for the unclean, in which verses 22 and 25 are blended into one.

Verses 27, 28. The doubtful reading "by them of old time" is, by the authority of internal criticism, *now* more properly left out; for thus there becomes evident a descending abbreviation of the words down to "it hath been said" in ver. 31; after which the new section begins again (ver. 33) with πάλιν, *again*, and the full formula. "Ye have *heard* that it was *said*," is immediately understood as in the former case to signify that they had been taught the divine law in its merely literal acceptation; as if he only was guilty of adultery who committed the act of carnal uncleanness. Such conciseness in Christ's words was adapted to open the ears of his hearers, and would test them, so to speak, on the second occasion, whether they understood the first aright. Those, however, who were dull of apprehension must have understood clearly enough what had been intended by the "said" and "heard," when the Lord uttered his own contrasted words: But I say unto you, *that whosoever only looketh upon a woman* hath committed adultery already. Job long ago declared,

In making a covenant with his eyes (Job xxxi. 1, comp. Ecclus. ix. 5–8), that the first provocation to carnal lust was in the eye full of adultery (2 Peter ii. 14). The first spiritual adultery, which was the principle and type of all carnal adultery, began with looking (Gen. iii. 6). In *βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν*, looking upon a woman *in order to* lust after her, is condemned that *active* lust, into which the will enters. This, indeed, only is sin, not the passive involuntary impulse of that flesh which is our *nature*, not the "spontaneous observation of the greater beauty of another man's wife"—as De Wette expresses himself.* He who experiences at a first glance this desire, and then, instead of turning away and withdrawing from sin (2 Peter ii. 14), throws a second glance with lustful intent and in order to retain and increase that impulse, *commits* the sin. He has already committed adultery in his heart; for the proper *deed* begins earlier than the Pharisees suppose. It is in word or look before the act itself is performed, yea in the *heart* before the look is cast; for it is there that that inner act of the will takes place, which alone gives its significance to the outer deed. This is a stronger and plainer utterance than in ver. 22, where it is not directly said, "he hath killed him already in his heart." It is the *perfect formula applicable to all the commandments*, and it was not necessary similarly to quote those which followed, as: Whoso desireth his neighbor's house, has already stolen it in his heart. But so profoundly internal is its application, that it goes yet beyond this: Whoso, only in thought, by a glance of the imagination, *looketh on a woman in his heart*, who is not present to his eyes! The Lord says simply "*a woman*" (even if not the wife of another), and "*whosoever*" looketh (even if himself not any woman's husband). Just as conversely Job (xxxi. 1) speaks of a maid when the married woman is also signified. (In like manner it must necessarily be understood: Whatsoever woman thus looketh upon man, &c.) Has *committed adultery*—how then, if both man and woman are unmarried? The Lord speaks according to Old Testament usage, in which *adultery*, in the sixth command and everywhere, indicates and includes lewdness in general.† Marriage is the making one flesh, and consequently every carnal lust which seeks its gratification independently of the union which God has appointed in marriage, is a breach and offence against this sacred order. He who has not recognized a spiritual meaning in the law generally,‡ must at least discern it here, where the Lord evidently includes every concupiscence under the letter of the commandment. And the unmarried by this offence commits adultery by anticipation, sinning against that future marriage for which he should reserve himself; and further in the deepest sense he is guilty of infidelity to himself, and to the Lord to whom his body belongs.

Verses 29, 30. Contemplate it now more closely and observe that there is a desire which, springing indeed entirely from the body, becomes an offence which thou must involuntarily endure: but that, at the same time, there must be a continual victory over this desire and casting away of this offence, or a consent to it which implies the actual sin of positive and active lust. The commandment stands in terms which already explain its meaning (Deut. v.) לֹא תִתְאַוֶּה, *Suffer thyself* not to desire! The Lord mentions the *eye* and the *hand*, and means, as he explains himself, *one of our members*. This he does, partly for the sake of a decorous concealment of the member to be further alluded to afterwards; partly on the ground of what had just been laid down, that the impulse of lust usually begins with the eye; and partly, because of the general importance of these *two chief members* in every impulse to every kind of act. (For in the profoundest sense all sin is here included as being uncleanness, spiritual impurity; hence the repetition of this saying with this wider meaning in ch. xviii. 8, 9.) The *eye* is both the organ of reception through which sensual, and therefore already spiritual, enticement enters, and the most certain betrayer of that conceiving lust which will bring forth the act of sin; the *hand* is the general organ for its performance and practice. Casting the eyes upon a forbidden but desired object leads directly to the stretching out of the hand towards it (Gen. xxxix. 7, 12, 13), and the rest follows. The eye—the light, the lamp of the body, its most precious and dearest member (Deut. xxxii. 10.); the hand or arm—the strength, the support, the defence of the body, its most indispensable instrument. Now it is quite evident that objects and persons around us may be, through our close connection with them, like an eye or hand, or one of our own members; and that if any of these should become a stumbling-block to us, they must be resolutely cast off (Deut. xiii. 6–10; xxxiii. 9). But it is folly to take that as the only meaning, which is only a right application of it; since this very application must rest upon the internal, intrinsic truth itself. This first and most obvious meaning of the expression is doubtless to be sought in the words "*looketh upon to lust*" (to long for, and then to reach forth towards), with which it is directly connected, as well as in their manifest antithesis

* Matthai has further and rightly mentioned, that as we must in order to marriage, look upon a woman to desire her; so only the adulterous, sinful "desire" can be referred to.

† As in ver. 32, fornication stands, conversely for adultery.

‡ Although the last Sinaitic commandment already and expressly forbids *coveting*. No one but Ernst Meier, with his universal perversion, could have *concluded* that *because* Christ brought in a *purer* morality than the Old Testament, therefore he could not have spiritually understood this לֹא תַחְמֹד, *Thou shalt not covet* (*Dekalog*, p. 73).

—*thy whole body.* The expression which is so readily termed figurative, is, as usual, very literal and real in its meaning, though obviously not in the bare literality of an external accomplishment. It is not the eye or the hand that we are to pluck out and cut off, but the *offending* eye, the *offending* hand, and this leads our thoughts to those members of that inner body, of that internal organism of *sin*, which corresponds to the external members, and which might continue all the more vehemently to look and to lust and to strive, if those external members were actually plucked out and cut off. (As a eunuch embraceth a virgin, and sigheth, Ecclus. xxx. 20.) They are *πράξεις τοῦ σώματος, deeds of the body* (Rom. viii. 13), which we are to mortify, and this, indeed, is only possible through the Spirit of life, without whom the body of this death brings us into captivity to the law of sin in its members (Romans vii. 23, 24). How it is to be accomplished, we are taught by the experience of grace—of that grace which, preparatorily given, had taught men before the coming of Christ; having from the beginning placed enmity between the woman and her seed and the serpent, and from the time of Cain downwards provided, in the very exhortations which it uttered, a certain gracious power to resist sin in the will, and conquer it. But that such inward mortifying of the members which in idolatrous, adulterous desire mind and aim at the things of earth (Col. iii. 5), is demanded by the rigorous voice of the law—*Thou shalt not!*—and that the ceaseless process of sin from within outwards can only be checked by the suppression of that lust which is the root of all its acts, must be manifest to every sincere hearer of the law who observes that his eye is not himself, and yet that the commandment of God says—*Thou shalt not!* The important word is not *ἔξελε* or *ἔκκοψον, pluck out, cut off*, which are figurative, but that which is attached to both, the *βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ, cast from thee*—renounce in thy will and deny the *ὀφθαλμός σου* and *δεξιά σου, thine eye, hand*, declare thy member to be *not thine*, place thyself as far as may be in contradiction to thy member, *hate thyself*, that is, thy flesh, thine own life, so far as it is bent upon sin! Yet *cast from thee* with earnest detestation the offence of thine own dear body and life! Every unconditional *Thou shalt not!* is accompanied by the tacit addition—Not even if thou must die!*

But because every creature in every condition, and fallen man also in his ruined estate, cannot and may not cease from *loving self*, so that even the self-murderer only destroys himself from a conviction that it is *better for him* to die, and the diseased man will undergo amputation rather than that his whole body should perish; therefore to the commandment —Hate thyself! there must be appended—Only by so doing *dost thou love thyself* in truth! The requirement to cast from us an eye or a hand must derive its force from—*It is better for thee.* Not merely—"It is good for thee" (*συμφέρει* carries with it a comparative sense); still less is it merely—"It will hurt thee not." *Thy whole body should be cast into hell*—that fearfully greater evil, to avoid which the lesser evil becomes an advantage; that essential *death* in death, from which only a "dying to sin" before death can redeem us. *Thy* whole body; just because thou regardest it with false kindness as *thine own*, and wouldst not kill its sinful members. *Cast out* thyself from Jerusalem, because thou wouldst not *cast from thee* thy offending members. *One* sin developed into dominion draws the whole man after it. The *body* is the organ of sensation for future punishment at the last, when the prison of Gehenna opens to receive the eternally corrupting and burning, who in dying shall never die; even as it is now the organ for the commission of their sin. Hints are here given us in passing, the far-reaching significance of which we can only now forecast. In *everlasting life* even the body has become spiritual, and enjoys the life of God received through the Spirit; in *everlasting torment* even the last remains of spirit are entirely absorbed in the body, and thus the condemned man experiences bodily that death, which is the wages of sin. This death is something very different from that *perishing* of our members, by which the casting them from us is immediately explained. Their present perishing is the means of avoiding that eternal death. And the member which has offended in the sinful life withers away, but is spiritually given back as in a present resurrection.

Finally, let it be observed that the sacrifice of "one of thy members" is demanded, definitely and inexorably it is true, but yet with a certain forbearance towards cases in which man's soft nature would shrink from the exaction of an eye or a hand. He who does not shrink, but accepts it in all its rigor, will evermore experience that it is through many such acts of mortification that the way of life is won. He finds, indeed, at the same time, that this exaction does not proceed once for all from the eye to the hand, but that it is ever beginning anew. As it is intimated in these words, which simply mark the commencement of it, it advances from the hand to the arm, from the arm to the heart, and thus *all* the members and the *whole body* must submit, lest as the body of sin it should be cast into hell. And yet such dying is not death, but tends to true *life* in the overabounding restoration of all that is thus sacrificed. What the Lord says in chap. xviii. 8, 9, concerning the entering into life maimed or with one eye, is spoken in yet stronger and more

* Which might literally be the result of an instant cessation from some accustomed vices. How profoundly spiritual, moreover, the application of this mortifying of our members may be made, and how comprehensively it may meet every man's distinctive individuality, may be seen in Oetinger's exposition of plucking out the eye: Does thy studying offend thee, lay it by for a while; just as Paul was blind for a season.

striking proverbial language, and with yet more condescending accommodation to the position of those addressed; but it has its own deep truth which may be viewed under two aspects, as the hearer may accept it. The old body, as *the old*, must undergo *entirely* the process of healing destruction: thus viewed, the language is that of severe irony—Shrink not, at the beginning of thine entrance from becoming maimed or from losing one eye! The *new* body, however, will be perfectly restored, for all who inherit eternal life: and thus viewed, the language assumes a character of affectionate appeal to their shame—Art thou then foolish enough to think that thou wilt remain halting in the resurrection, or that anything will be wanting to thee in the kingdom of God, which thou mayest have given up in order to enter it?

Verses 31, 32. When our Lord turns from a commandment given by God upon Sinai to a *civil ordinance* connected with it—which latter may be regarded as given by Moses in God's name, but the former rather as given directly by God through Moses—when he passes into another region of law, where its precepts in the nature of the case assume a more transitory character, he designedly adopts that most general and concise expression—*It hath been said.* Neither Moses is mentioned nor the ἀρχαῖοι, *those of old time;* although Moses actually spoke what is here briefly quoted from Deut. xxiv. 1. Thus vers. 31 and 43 stand in conjunction: in the former a Mosaic law, and in the latter a human ordinance immediately attached to God's commandment and entirely perverting it, are joined under one general, "It hath been said." For the Lord's *saying* is opposed in the most comprehensive sense to every kind of false reading, or teaching, or hearing, out of the law. We have observed above that the Mosaic precept concerning the letter of divorce was closely connected with the Sinaitic prohibition of adultery, and by it alone could be rightly explained, the fulfillment of the Mosaic ordinance in its spirit, being itself the abrogation of its letter. Marriage is the most sacred of human relations, in which pure love, that in which one person loves another as himself (Eph. v. 28), finds its highest expression; and impure carnal lust, which conceals in itself the spirit of hatred and destruction of another's personality, its most perfect cure and prevention. So that this question of divorce most appropriately follows in strict connection with ver. 27, as well as with vers. 21 and 22. Marriage is the foundation and nursery of all social relations, and therefore the bond of that *civil order* which, deranged by sin, is to be re-established through Christ according to the design of the Creator at the beginning of the creation (Mark x. 6). It was quite natural that the letter of the Mosaic law in relation to this would be miserably perverted by sinful men, since every law, in proportion as it descends more directly into the details of common life, becomes more liable to abuse through the spirit of literal interpretation. And here we are encountered by an actually *false exposition* of the law, in addition to the merely literal acceptation of it; the transition being thus effected from the first to the second department of examples. For what was only a permission is regarded as a law, as if it had been said, Thou *shalt*, and not merely, Thou *mayest*, be divorced (ch. xix. 7, 8); whereas divorce was in no other sense tolerated than that in which polygamy was, which is still more directly opposed to the design of God's original creation. The precept was read, expounded and practiced as if it had been written כָּל-דָּבָר, *every cause* (κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν, ch. xix. 3), instead of עֶרְוַת דָּבָר, *some uncleanness* (Deut. xxiv. 1); and thus it was altogether falsified, every thing being made to depend, according to the mind of Moses thus interpreted, upon the the observance of the mere *formality* of divorce. But as Moses at the beginning took care, in immediate connection with his precept, to prevent that wanton and abominable divorce and remarrying between the same persons which would have been the worst consequence of such perversion (Deut. xxiv. 2–4); so also the last prophet Malachi, who at the close of the Old Testament (iv. 4) enforces the whole law of Moses with its statutes and judgments till the coming of him who was to come, bears similar witnesss against polygamy and divorce, alleging the high example of Abraham. Deal not treacherously, he says, with the wife of thy youth, who is thy companion (helpmeet) and the wife of thy covenant, for the Lord hath been witness between thee and her; that is, in effect, what God hath joined let no man put asunder! (Prov. ii. 17). Take heed to your spirit, he says, that ye apologize not by the letter of the law for your sin against its spirit. "If he hate her, let him put her away, saith the Lord"—that is the wicked language of your own spirit, *but* it is *also* said, "Evil will defile his garment, saith the Lord" (Mal. ii. 14–16). Mark here again, that the Sermon on the Mount utters or lays down nothing new, even where it seems most to do so; but where in any sense it annuls the commandment, actually fulfills it in its harmony with the prophets.

As, further, in the Sinaitic commandment the letter of the law was first laid down, which expressed the extremest development of the evil in act (*kill* instead of *hate*, *commit adultery* instead of *lust*), thus manifesting a *condescension* to the position of that hardness of heart which would only thus apprehend it at first; so do we also find it in the further statutes and ordinances of the civil law. The spirit of the ordinance to which its letter must give place, is not an abolition of it, but rather its re-establishment in the spirit of the original command—Thou shalt not commit adultery!

Hence we shall sufficiently understand in what sense the Lord speaks when he proceeds—It hath also been said (by Moses), but I say unto you: *Divorce* either pre-supposes

past *adultery*, or contains and involves it; ye shall not in any case practice divorce! (in the absolute manner of ver. 34, to which indeed this is a transition). He who is divorced from his wife, *saving for* a **λογος** (equivalent to דְּבַר in Moses or **αἰτία**) **πορνείας**, that is, the *cause of fornication* in the woman which had already taken place, not only *himself* commits adultery by his *unjustifiable* divorce (which is not mentioned, as being self-evident), but *is the cause* that *she also commits adultery* through another marriage or illicit intercourse without marriage; especially, however, in the former case, which therefore is additionally explained. The man himself sins who puts away the divorced woman, the woman so divorced sins, and, in addition, the other man who marries her thus divorced; so that from this wantonness of divorce nothing but perpetual fornication can follow—nothing but the *weakening, annulling, and contempt of the inviolable sanctity of marriage*, which is the essential and distinctive meaning of "adultery."* It is clear that the Lord here designedly says *fornication* instead of adultery, just as in ver. 28 adultery, on the other hand, included fornication. Yet the expression has a wider scope, and does not, for example, exclude the incontinence of the wife before marriage, if she should not be found a virgin by her husband, or impose upon his paternity an illegitimate child.

But let us see to it that we rightly understand the Lord, and fall not into the same error of a too literal understanding of his new law. Let us take heed that, while he in abolishing fulfills the old law, we do not conversely, in thinking that we fulfill it, abolish the new law which he has given us. What then is the relation of the New Testament age to that of the Old Testament in regard to the law of outward ordinances? It belongs to the *perfection* of the New Covenant that it contains no longer any external statutes immediately given by God, no theocratic constitution for society and the nation. And wherefore not? Because those who are in the fellowship of the New Covenant stand and live in the *Spirit*. Thus *for these his disciples*, so far as they are, or aim to be, perfect, the Lord lays down the original commandment of God's pure ordinance as his own new commandment, doing away with all that conventional license which had been given in condescension to an imperfect state. But only for these, as they have his spirit for its fulfillment. Now if any should pervert the letter of the *new legislation for God's spiritual commonwealth* to an external use, instead of spiritually subjecting himself to its judgment and rule; if he should impose it as a yoke upon the neck of those who have not yet received the requisite spirit, and thus transform the law of liberty into an ordinance of bondage again; could he be said to deal with it on New Testament principles, and according to that love, which is the abiding and true spirit of all fulfillment of the law and application of the commandment? That would be rather the re-appearance of a New Testament Pharisaism, the *Quakerish* observance of the Sermon on the Mount, which, in the corresponding aspect of the opposite extreme, coincides with the *Catholic* externality of the church of Christ. And the well-meaning zealots who would elevate the Lord's command into a church ordinance, have by no means escaped the Catholic error, which goes only one step further beyond the express letter of the Lord's word, and holds every marriage to be indissoluble, forbidding every re-marriage. Wherefore then do they not expound the whole Sermon conformably? Is it the Lord's design then, as the letter of his word plainly seems to run in ver. 34, to abolish swearing as a necessary regulation in imperfect human society? He himself swore! Is it his design in ver. 38 to banish the *jus talionis*, which is the divine basis of all requiting justice, from the tribunals of Christendom? No, he will not abolish *in matters to which it must ever appertain*, the rule laid down in Lev. xxiv. 19, 20, any more than what is said in Exod. xxi. 12: He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall surely be put to death. As the law in its Sinaitic letter *condemning* sin continues its function in the Gospel, so also does the law as wisely *restraining* sin in the Mosaic ordinances. Is it the Lord's design to forbid to his disciples in his discourse (vers. 39–42) all protection of themselves, their interests, or their property; and to impose upon them such *all-endurance* and *all-abandonment* as would require them to go out of the world in which they must nevertheless live? He has himself obviated this gloss, for he did not turn the other cheek! and as all this is to be understood, so also is his word concerning divorce. The unconditional ordinance, which the Mosaic account of the creation reveals, runs in simple terms—*Let no man put asunder!* (ch. xix. 6). Now, if sin or fornication has sundered, may not enduring patience and forgiving love join them together again? God himself in his covenant of grace takes back again that which was separated from him. Or, if adultery has been committed, *may not* the unoffending consort retain the offending one in the bond of love, and receive her back if penitent? The Christian church from the beginning has determined that he may, and practiced accordingly.* And God himself takes

* It is clear to us, that **ἀπολελυμένην**, "divorced," signifies only the *unlawfully* divorced; and thus that the re-marriage of one put away because of adultery, lies under no prohibition here. We find in this no such "obscurum," as Augustine in the place here cited by Alford, *De fide atque oper.* c. xix.

* Though not always, for in the *Const. Apost* vi. 15 we find: **Ὁ κατέχων τὴν παραφθαρεῖσαν φύσεως θεσμοῦ παράνομος.** Luther on the other hand confidently urges that the unoffending party should forgive. Hengstenberg (on Hosea) speaks of great criminality on his part, if he do not use every means to bring about repentance and reconciliation.

back his adulterous people to himself, becomes anew the husband of the adulteress (Hos. ii. 1–20), and continues to do himself what he has forbidden in his precept (Jer. iii. 1). But we should, and we must love perfectly, as our Father in heaven loves. So *if thou wilt be perfect, thou must not divorce even on account of fornication.* Wherefore, while we find once more in Matt. xix. 9, "*except for fornication,*" παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας (in another expression), it is wanting in the parallel passage (Mark x. 11, 12) as well as when the Lord a third time alludes to it (Luke xvi. 17, 18). This is not accidental, but an intimation of the Spirit which goes beyond the letter. The Lord constrains us, by this change of the letter, to understand its meaning spiritually: for both are true; on the one hand that fornication, or any infidelity, gives the right of divorce, since that has already in effect taken place; but that also on the other, neither the man nor the woman in the church of Christ ought, generally speaking, to exercise that right. When the apostle, again, having the Spirit of God, quotes the Lord's word with emphasis in ver. 10 of 1 Cor. vii., and then immediately after, in ver. 15, gives his more liberal decision (not *by commandment*, but, on account of sin and infirmity, by *permission*), that a separated person, having been left and repudiated by the unbelieving partner, might marry again; is not that also a no less manifest intimation how this commandment of the Lord is to be understood, and that it is not to be carried out literally in all its rigor and literal compulsion in the external church, mixed up as it is with heathenism? What then, finally, is *fornication* and *adultery* in our Lord's mouth? Shall we be willing to limit the word just in this place to the gross act, after he himself has in ver. 27, 28, immediately preceding, expounded it otherwise? Will the Lord abate from the עֶרְוַת דָּבָר, "*some uncleanness*," which is written in Moses, one jot or one tittle; will he not rather provide for its being retained, like the whole law, but for right use? (ἐάν τις αὐτῷ νομίμως χρῆται, 1 Tim. i. 8.) What other shameful things of various kinds might not in Christian matrimony be brought forward as a ground of divorce equally valid with the accomplished act of infidelity!*

Our Lord's new law of marriage, consequently, like all the laws of the Sermon on the Mount, is not uttered with design to abolish the wholesome relaxation contained in the Mosaic institution of divorce, viewed according to its original *spirit*. It does not intend to do away with it once for all by a compulsion which works from without inwardly, but by a fulfillment of its design working gradually from within outwardly. This is its true relation, conformably with God's will, in every external national church down to the present day. The secular law of the state (albeit Christian), and no less the ecclesiastical statute also (which should not be violently sundered from the state), not only *may* exercise a Mosaic forbearance, but *must* do so, where the same reasons are pre-supposed as those for which the Lord by Moses exercised it. "Divorce may no more be removed than the oath." It is impossible that Christ should command marriages sinfully contracted, such as were properly no marriages and therefore dissolved themselves, to be made binding by force; and equally so that he should intend to oppose the sin which might afterwards break in, by any thing but the power of the Spirit. When severity, through the infirmity of the flesh, might aggravate the evil, he still may relax the law. For such *ordinances of nature*, as this—Man shall not divorce! are in their *externality* not on a level with the commandments of holiness uttered on Sinai, which are fulfilled inwardly in the spirit, and which alone unconditionally admit of no relaxation. The external church, which in a sense is still partly after the spirit of the Old Testament, condescends, like Christ himself, to sinners in many ways, with all its severity of testimony; and has for the unconverted a confirmation, for the unworthy (whom she in most cases has not the power to judge) a Eucharist, a marriage service for those who come in wanton carnality to marriage; but she must give up all this, and by a licensed civil marriage separate herself in this also from the state, if her doctrine of divorce were otherwise. A presbytery, synod, or consistory, standing to mediate between the law and the Gospel, *bears witness* of the *commandment of Christ*, with all the spiritual force of his words, to the consciences of those who should hear *it;* but those who insist upon separation, even when no future marriage can take place, are sundered and granted a bill of divorce—for their hardness of heart! and the Church under certain circumstances may have a blessing for the second marriage of those who are thus separated, bestowed upon them in the hope that *now* the true grace of matrimony may find its true New Testament entrance into their hearts.

The *false interpretation* of the law more distinctively considered now follows, as the developed result of this literal acceptation of it. Of the *three examples* which are given in illustration *two* are taken, as we have already shown, from the civil code, and *one* from the law of holiness. Viewed yet more closely, the first two deal with our *words* and *deeds*, the third with our *disposition of mind.* Thus the error is exhibited as advancing from a too close and insincere straining of the letter of the precept first, onwards to the complete perversion and destruction of its meaning, such as is seen in the antithesis which is unscrupulously added in ver. 43, and which entirely subverts the precept of love with which vers. 21–26 set out. The first example concerning our *words*

* Maintaining this, we are not perplexed by any such rigorous views as Sixt has lately once more defended (*Stud. u. Kr.* 1845, 3.) The *Kirchliche Vierteljahrsschrift* declares its agreement with us, and Rothe's *Ethik* often quotes us with approbation.

goes back in its ultimate allusion to the Sinaitic precept—Thou shalt not bear false witness, *not speak falsely;* but conjoins this with the commandment of the first table which forbids the taking God's name in vain; and mentions particularly *swearing* or a protesting use of that holy name. The false exposition or application of this Mosaic ordinance borders upon a too strict adherence to its letter; but the perfect disciple of Christ in reality stands by that ordinance. In ver. 33, we have the letter of the ordinance, with an *intimation* of that abuse which being well-known is not directly mentioned; as was the case in vers. 27, 31, after the pattern of ver. 21. Against this is set vers. 34–37, what in a certain sense may be considered a new and severer rule, yet perfectly in the spirit of the old one: The disciple of Christ need not in general swear at all! although he may, on account of evil (having to do with the sin and untruthfulness of the world), swear *by God*, yet is he never to do this without strict necessity and solemn earnestness. By *things independent of God* (and here was the Pharisaic abuse of swearing most manifest, particular examples being named of their perversion) *he may not swear at all!* Neither by things *out of himself* (heaven, or earth, or Jerusalem, the place in which both meet), which are altogether God's; nor by any thing *in himself*, since his *head* (his life) and even his *hair* (the highest individual thing belonging to him) is also and only God's. For the disciple of Christ must speak the simple truth in its most simple possible expression.

This general analysis would give a clue to thinking minds for all that should follow; but however anxious we might be to keep these hints within concise limits, they must become here a little more diffuse, on account of the evil of false interpretation, which underlies, even in Christendom, the word of Christ.

Verse 33. The πάλιν which now meets us, equivalent strictly to *again* in English, indicates the commencement of another series of examples of a different kind, as an arrangement of the discourse has already shown. It speaks once more of our *words*, as ver. 22 did; for in word as well as in deed our holy dispotions must manifest themselves, and perfection excludes every sinful word as well as act (James iii. 2). Our speech must be sanctified in truth, as our deeds in love. But that which the ἀρχαίοι, "those of old time," in this matter taught the people, as if out of the law, did not immediately and directly refer to the decalogue, but to the Mosaic ordinance concerning oaths and vows given to the holy commonwealth of Israel. This, indeed, is yet more closely connected with the second (properly the third) commandment of the first table, than the ordinance concerning the letter of divorce was with the seventh—Thou shalt not commit adultery! Yet the Lord does not directly cite Exod. xx. 7 as he had done Exod. xx. 13 and 14; but he makes what we may term a collective-citation of the Mosaic ordinances, designedly changing the expression* in doing so—because it is not what was written there that he opposes, but its incorrect apprehension. He refers to Lev. xix. 12; Numb. xxx. 3; Deut. xxiii. 21, of which the last two places deal more especially with *promissoriis* or vows. The first passage connects itself immediately with the decalogue—Thou shalt not desecrate the holy *Name;* in the other two also τῷ Κυρίῳ, "the Lord," is expressly inserted; hence arose the false interpretation, that an ἐπιορκεῖν, "forswearing," consisted *only in the express mention* of the divine name, and the consequent shameful abuse of other kinds of frivolous and deceitful protestations. This unrighteous limitation our Lord indicates in the concluding sentence which he cites; Ἀποδώσεις δὲ τῷ Κυρίῳ τοὺς ὅρκους σου, "But shalt perfom *unto the Lord* thine oaths;" *i.e.*—Thus you have heard it said out of the law, as if *only to the Lord* was signified! If we place οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις, "thou shalt not forswear," in juxtaposition with οὐ φονεύσεις, "thou shalt not kill;" ver. 33 will here have a meaning similar to that of ver. 21: Ye vainly think that killing only is murder, and that only a lying and faithless abuse of the holy Name is perjury. But as the letter of the law in the former case had reference in its spirit to perfect love in disposition, so in the latter it refers to perfect truth in word.

Verses 34—36. Μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως, "*Swear not at all*," that is, assuredly, *by all means*, generally or absolutely swear not. To expunge the comma between ὅλως, "at all," and μήτε, "neither," and read: Absolutely not by heaven, earth, Jerusalem, or the head—is, whether we regard the language or the matter, extremely forced, yea, decidedly false; for it overlooks the sharply defined antithesis between μὴ ὅλως, "not at all," taken by itself, and the simple οὐκ ἐπι-ορκήσεις, "thou shalt not *for*-swear." And in any case there would still remain in ver. 37 the unconditional prohibition of every word that went beyond Yea and Nay—consequently of any oath. To say with Stäudlin (*Geschichte der Vortstellungen und Lehren vom Eide*) that the apostles afterwards in their permission of the judicial oath deviated from the Lord's interdict, does not touch the point. But what, then, is the relation of these, one to the other?

That Christ forbids *to his disciples as such*, and in their intercourse one with another, every form of protestation, including God's name; that he abolishes them al as useless, because without their aid his disciples should speak the truth, is most manifest, in spite of all invalidating misinterpretation; hence James (ch. v. 12) thus repeats the Lord's commandment: μήτε ἄλλον τινὰ ὅρκον, "nor *any other* oath;" yet more irrefragably

*Ἐπιορκεῖν is not found in the LXX. canonical Old Testament—only in Wisd. xiv. 28. Similarly for נְדָרִים, the LXX. never have ὅρκοι but εὐχαί

strengthening his Master's μὴ ὅλως, "not at all." But are we therefore, with a Quakerism which is only the re-appearance of Pharisaism on the spiritual side, to set up externally the spiritual law of Christ alone and contrary to its spirit in the midst of an evil world; to apply the perfect ordinances of Christ for his perfect ones to the regulation of churches and states which are in a condition in which imperfection so largely mingles? and may we, similarly, thus summarily *send abroad* peace in the earth (ch. x. 34), where yet the angels' word (Luke ii. 14) must *excite conflict* among men? The Christian should not divorce, but on account of fornication he does it, and it is then not a divorce which proceeded from himself, but the outward expression of one that had already unhappily taken place. The Christian should not utter "Raca" or "Fool," as the language of hatred or anger, but, nevertheless, on account of the vileness and foolishness of men, he may, in his holy hatred of sin and in the anger of his zealous love, term them what they are, even children of the devil. So also he swears and confirms his word by oath on account of the deceitfulness and incredulity of men, and the strife which thence arises; and this he can all the more readily do, as all his words should be and are Yea or Nay—words of truth spoken before God, that is to say, oaths. Consequently in the perfect kingdom of God the oath-ordinance ceases simply because the oath has no longer a distinctive or special force, beyond any other utterance of a man's mind. Hence, again, it is written by the apostle, and his words are not a relaxation of the Lord's prohibition, but when rightly understood actually include it, just as that prohibition itself includes some such abatement as the apostle's seems to be: "Men verily *swear* by the greater, and an oath to them is an end of all strife"—a *confirmation* of truth and love, only the Yea and Nay more effectually said (Heb. vi. 16). That can by no means be wicked or sinful in itself, since God himself, on account of our unbelief, oftentimes swears by himself (Heb. vi. 13, 17, vii. 21; Isa. xlv. 23, &c.); since the Son of God incarnate not only takes a judicial oath (Matt. xxvi. 63, 64), but even in this Sermon on the Mount, as also elsewhere, appends his Amen to his words; since the holy angels (Rev. x. 6) swear by him that liveth for ever, and the apostles frequently by the Lord whose coming they announce. As Christ, according to ver. 17, does not destroy the Law and the Prophets, so neither does he abolish that unconditional toleration of the oath which we find in the Old Testament. The Sinaitic commandment permits and *enjoins* the right use of the name of God, in that it condemns its profane abuse; in Deut. vi. 13, x. 20, the swearing by his name is actually commanded to Israel as the avowal of his worship; in Psa. xv. 4, swearing and changing not, is attributed to the true and spiritual Israel; and, finally, in the prophets, Jer. xxiii. 8, Isa. lxv. 16 swearing by the God of their deliverance, by the God of truth, is vindicated for the distant future of his kingdom. Consequently the εἰκῇ, *in vain*, too harshly rejected in ver. 22, may be added also in this connection, if it be rightly and spiritually understood. As pure love would prefer to say "Brother" only, if for that brother's sake "Raca" is not necessary, so pure truth would prefer the simple Yea and Nay, if stronger confirmation were not necessary in order to its overcoming the falsehood to which it is opposed.

We should certainly be very far from discerning or exhausting the full meaning of Christ, if we regarded him as *merely* prohibiting that profuse and frivolous swearing to which the Jews were addicted in common life, in contradistinction to judicial swearing. That might be the preparatory instruction for catechumens, whose apprehension could go no further. There might, indeed, be light swearing even in a court of justice, and the Christian man "in common life" may stand and make his appeal to the judgment-seat of God, if there be need. Yet assuredly Christ in what follows does take account of the customs of his age, and draws his examples from them. It is his design to exhibit and to condemn Pharisaism in the aspect which it assumed before his eyes. "As heaven and earth pass away, so pass away all vows by heaven and earth," was a saying uttered in Israel at that time. Thus while they abused the name of his throne and footstool, yet because they barely evaded the name of God itself, they dared to think that they avoided the lie and the sin! Thus they forgot that heaven and earth should be changed but not pass away; that they were rather to become more plainly manifest, the heaven as the throne of God's glory, this lower earth as his footstool, before which all his enemies should be bowed down. Hence Christ, designedly sustaining his word by Scripture (Isa. lxvi. 1), traces back all such formulas, here as in ch. xxiii. 16–22, to the name of God; and by so doing gives us in his wisdom much else to reflect upon (let Isa. lxvi. be read carefully again). After heaven and earth have embraced the whole universe of the first creation, he most significantly mentions further the holy Jerusalem (Rev. xxi. 1, 2), as the type of the new creation of grace which brings heaven down to earth, designating it out of Scripture as the city of the great King, which is himself.* It is in direct contradiction with the rightly understood meaning of the oath generally, if I, instead of mentioning his name, *by whom we swear*, simply because heaven and earth, and Jerusalem especially (as a citizen of which I know his name), are his; if I, instead of naming this great Ruler of the creation and King in his city, make mention of some particular portions greater or less

* Hamann *contra* Mendelssohn (see his *Works*, by Roth, vii. 120), found, and not without some grounds for it, a far-reaching meaning of general significance in this prohibition to name *Jerusalem* needlessly and irreverently.

of his kingdom, and think that I thereby avoid mentioning him, and that this effects him not! As if aught could have significance when conceived of independently of God, so that to swear by it without thinking of God were reasonable and right, or that such an oath might innocently be trifled with! The God of truth, who will not let his name be falsely used, will not permit any particle of dust in all his universe to be thus dealt with. If I indeed know his name, then must I also know that heaven and earth are his, as well as I know that my head and its hair belong to me, though not essentially and only to me. When I pass from things out of myself (things which in their true sense are holy, being sanctified by God), *to myself*, and *swear by myself;* there is more significance in this than the former, though that significance is altogether godless, since I thus regard myself as my own, pluck self from the authority of God, and wickedly usurp God's own prerogative—to swear by himself.* "By my head"—borders closely upon—"By my life! By my soul! As I live!" and then the sin becomes most manifest, for none of us liveth to himself. But even the smallest hair of the head or the beard (by which they also swore in the East) is not mine, as I may soon discover if I attempt to change its color by my own power, though this is still less than making one hair grow.† I may, indeed, with deceitful dyes give it a brighter or darker tincture, but nature reasserts its original color in the hair which grows afterwards. I can no more make other hair grow the length of a line, than add a span to the measure of my life (ch. vi. 27). We see, consequently, that Christ here *interdicts* to his disciples *first*, all swearing generally, even by the name of God, inasmuch as it is enjoined upon them as their perfection to speak perpetual truth in the name of God, without the necessity of any confirming appendage whatever. As the consequence of this, the oath which protects truth is supposed to be abolished in the intercourse of Christians by an influence working *from within outwards*, just as the locks and bolts which protect against thieves. *Secondly* and especially is forbidden all swearing by things independently of God, be they appertaining to ourselves or otherwise; because we should think of God and give his name its honor in the mention of all his creatures; because he only has and he only is the confirming *Amen* of all truth; because his name only is above the Yea of any creature.‡ *Finally* is prohibited all *inconsiderate* and *useless* swearing, all confirmation and corroboration of our Yea and Nay without cause. As this was miserably current in the Pharisaic Israel of that age, so it attests the hypocrisy of men in every age: for by adding such strengthening appendages to our discourse, we confess ourselves to be, without them, untrustworthy.* But when adequate reason for an oath occurs, it is not only *permitted* but even *commanded*, as a service to God and our neighbor, to corroborate our plain words by such confirmation as may maintain the truth and advance the cause of charity. Consequently the judicial oath of the Christian citizen is justified under such circumstances, as well as the oath with which the apostle, the preacher, the disciple may solemnly confirm his testimony.† He who, in what he is constrained to say before man, looks up in his spirit to God as his witness, may and indeed ought openly to avow it. The true New Testament oath, however, must ever retain its own formula—*I call God for a record upon my soul* (2 Cor. i. 23). On the other hand the formula—"So help me God"—if it mean, "Otherwise may he not help me! May God punish me!" though under the old covenant of the law's severity it might have been tolerated ("The Lord do so to me!"), must under the covenant of grace be absolutely avoided as being a self-willed invasion of the future, like the language of Cain (Gen. iv. 13).

Verse 37. Our communication should be Yea on the lips where Yea is in the heart, Nay on the lips where Nay is in the heart, and therefore *sincere*, not like the devil's or the liar's, or what according to Shakespeare is "no good divinity," consisting of Yea-nay and Nay-yea. This is the first and most obvious meaning. But then it must be *only* Yea or Nay, that is, of course, not just necessarily this little word, but *affirmative* or *negative* without περισσόν or "more," without any superfluous corroborating additions, therefore *simple* and definite: What I say I say and believe, and let me be trusted! James' expression embraces both (ver 12): The more sincerely we speak, the more simply also shall we be able to speak, since others will have learned to rely upon our word. Further there should only be Yea or Nay in our speech and in our heart, where there is Yea or Nay in the thing itself, as it is before God, as the eternal truth of God says Yea or Nay: consequently our communication must be *true*, according to the reality of the matter we speak of, so far at least as with our best ability and in good conscience we can discern it. Finally, for this cannot be excluded, more particularly as the discourse

* As Cæsar by the "*Fortuna Cæsaris*," and the young Doria in Schiller's *Fiesco* with his "*Donner und Doria!*"

† But we much doubt whether this is to be regarded (with Sepp) as meaning that they swore: "May I become gray, if it be not so!"

‡ To swear by the life of the *king*, Pharaoh or Solomon, was in a sense tolerated in the Old Testament as being a type, which referred to *the greater*, the only King (Psa. lxiii. 12).

* It is worthy of remark that the ἐπιορκεῖν which is here used meant originally to *swear* merely, or to *swear often*, and thence naturally passed in its signification to *false* swearing—just as oaths, the more frequent they are, the more frequently are they perjuries also.

† Indeed "the sanctity of the solemn adjuration is exalted by the prohibition of common and gratuitous swearing," as Von Gerlach says. Compare also Rothe's theory in his *Ethik*, iii. 576-586, which agrees with my exposition.

had just run upon the keeping our word and vow; we may not afterwards say Nay, where we had previously said Yea, or the reverse, and consequently our communication must be *consistent* and steadfast and trustworthy (2 Cor. i. 17). Thus does the Lord set before us, himself using the simplest possible form of words, the ideal model of what the holy speech of God's children might be and should be, if the sin that is in the world and their own remaining sinfulness be left out of the question. It does, indeed, exclude even the oath by the name of God, and relatively abolish it; but it is not unconditionally done away, for after the preceding words μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως, "swear not at all," *this*, as being the only oath permissible, was not expressly mentioned. What then is the meaning of the following position? It evidently modifies the former part of the sentence. The literal observance of the former clause is necessarily connected with a false interpretation of the latter, as if the Lord had said—*Whatsoever is more than these is sin.* But this he did not say, nor could he have said it, without subverting the system of the world as arranged since the entering in of sin, and reflected in the law of Moses; nor, indeed, without condemning himself. Not only is every oath a περισσόν, "something more," but so also is the *Amen* of Christ which strengthens the Yea (2 Cor. i. 20), and even that second Yea which on this occasion the Lord adds to the first. Every confirming addition of any kind may be said to be only a second, more emphatically repeated Yea. All this *cometh of evil*, the Lord says: and we are not to understand ὁ πονηρός, *the wicked one*, as immediately referred to in this place. (As also not in ch. vi. 13; John xvii. 15; comp. Rom. xii. 9; 1 Thess. v. 22.) Often enough it does, indeed, spring from the sin, the evil that is in the speaker himself, just as "Raca" springs from his malevolent anger, and divorce from his own infidelity. But *not always:* the speaker may thus utter in truth and in love, *what is forced upon him by the world's sin, with which he has necessarily to do;* just as the manifold and incessant protestations which pervade the entire Holy Scripture must be accounted for. Such conformation is consequently permitted and necessary, that is, where and so far as it is directed *against* evil. The "Yea, yea" and "Nay, nay" of God, which his servants must maintain and protest against the Nay-yea and the Yea-nay of wickedness, comes not, therefore, in an evil sense from the evil of him who utters it, although it is spoken on account of evil and therefore may be said to originate in evil; it is essentially good in itself and cometh of good, even of the very zeal of the good to overcome the evil.

The *second example*, passing from the word of truth to the work of love, has reference to the Mosaic *judicial ordinances* concerning *revenge*, which had been subject to a still worse interpretation and application than the former. For although before the tribunal of the sinner's Judge a strict and righteous *requital* or *retaliation* of evil inflicted will take place; yet it is both perverse and perverting to appropriate to oneself the prerogative of such requital in private life. The Lord gives a fundamental example, which illustrates strikingly the relation of the external, legal ordinance, to the internal fulfillment of the law according to its spirit—Christian love. The disciple of Christ should, in *patience* or *passive* love to his enemy, rise superior to all revenge for the evil inflicted on him: and this forms the wisely preparatory transition to the injunction which follows, of *active* love towards our enemies, as being the sum and end of the spiritual law, loving as God loves The Lord first specifies the falsely applied and wickedly misunderstood law of Moses, by simply quoting its letter just as in ver. 31, pre-supposing and intending that misunderstanding and perversion of it, as the contrast which follows makes evident. He commands his disciples rather to *endure* evil or injustice; first, by a general prohibition of resistance, and then by a corresponding command, which expressly and precisely indicates the *spirit* which he requires, by the act which is the test of it. To do this he lays down *three* significantly chosen examples, and closes by a requirement, ver. 42, which being in its letter incapable of being fulfilled, draws our minds from the literal to a spiritual acceptation of it, and leads the way to the active love of our enemies.

Verse 38. These words occur thrice in the law of Moses: first, among the first fundamental precepts given to Moses immediately after the Decalogue and still upon the mount (Exod. xxi. 23–25); where it is defined by what rule the arbitrators shall be guided in a particular case (and the proverbial maxim goes on—Hand for hand, foot for foot, wound for wound): then in Lev. xxiv. 19, 20, where the general judicial law for injuries, and their compensation is laid down—If a man cause a blemish to his neighbor; as he hath done, so shall it be done to him: finally, once more in Deut. xix. 21, where this principle is laid down with reference to a particular case, not being one of injury, as a rule of proportion to be rigorously applied—Thine eye shall not spare! To administer this compensation of like for like, is entrusted to the judges as אֱלֹהִים or "gods;" for it is and must ever be the fundamental law of the eternal and divine government of the world, and as such is confirmed afterwards by our Lord in ch. vii. 2. Consequently it is not our Lord's design in what he now says to condemn the application in every commonwealth of this perfect rule of justice,* which provides against all excess or deficiency in punishment, for judgment and justice are to be administered in the name of God by the magistracy

* Especially, of course, directed against the *excess*, though not that alone as Augustine supposed Non fomes sed limes furoris est (*Contra Faust.* xix 25).

in every human society, and the pattern of that administration in every state must be sought for in the government of the great King over his people. What he designs to condemn is the reading and enforcing and obeying the statute, as if it had been written—*He*, the injured man, may exact like for like from his neighbor, in the exercise of a private revenge which is guided by hatred and anger. As even king Solomon in his time, though not unmindful of what appertained to magisterial authority and judgment, knew how to teach it in his exhortation—*Say not*, I will do so to him as he has done to me; say not thou, I will recompense evil: but wait on the Lord, and he shall save thee (Prov. xxiv. 29, xx. 22; compare Ecclus. xxviii. 1–3). So that the Lord here again utters nothing new, but that which Moses and the prophets had already uttered; in confirmation of which consult further Lev. xix. 18, and mark what is there said in connection with that other law which the Lord is about to bring forward in ver. 43. Our exposition may now become more and more brief, since this example has found in part its illustration in the two preceding; and the three great fundamental principles for the understanding of the Sermon on the Mount are now firmly established in our minds; viz., that the Lord does not abolish the law, but fulfills it; that he only demands a perfect obedience to it from his own, through the power and grace which his fulfillment of it has obtained; and that his requirements to that end are by no means to be externally and literally put in practice in this evil world and mingled Christendom, but all the Mosaic laws and ordinances continue also to hold their place. And if in these we find the idea of *law* as opposed to Gospel, and of strict right as the antithesis of patient, forgiving love, made prominent; so also will it be made clear that in the present condition of this world, love can only very gradually and in restricted measure have its perfect exhibition; nay, rather, that while the children of God are supposed to possess the spirit of patience, they must, even for love's sake, maintain and enforce punitive and protective law.

Verses 39—41. Τῷ πονηρῷ is not to be understood as in the masculine, *the evil one*, the Injurer, any more than in ver. 37. The expression is indeed related in the two verses, but it advances the meaning here, for τὸ πονηρόν is not so much evil or sin, as the *evidence* of it in the injury and injustice actually inflicted upon myself. We must of course oppose the sinner as such, and his sin, even as we resist the Devil, the wicked one whose malignity shows itself in each individual sinner (James iv. 7). Τὸ πονηρόν is the fundamental principle generally of that evil which opposes, injures, oppresses and burdens the children of God in the world. Thus is chap. vi. 13 to be understood, where *misery*, and sin its cause, are united in one grand and comprehensive expression; as, on the other hand, in Rom. xii. 21 τὸ κακόν makes prominent the *evil* distinctively, as sin, yet not without including its consequent suffering. The fundamental words and ideas of Scripture must be apprehended in all their depth and universality of meaning first, and then their distinct and critical meaning in individual passages will obviously and naturally present itself. *To resist not* evil! So does the Lord absolutely, in the infinitive mood, lay down the law of his kingdom for his disciples. What means this ἀντιστῆναι, *to resist* or to oppose? Were the word expunged, we should probably, looking at the connection, supply its place and its meaning by *render back* like for like, or retaliate; and this is the actual signification of the passage. As we might say: Ye shall not *put yourselves in opposition* (ἀντιτάσσεσθαι, James v. 6), not strike again, not revile again, not take again (ver. 38), not inflict injury, in retaliation for injury, *or in defence* against it. This latter is necessarily involved, inasmuch as he who thus defends himself, anticipates the functions of the magistrate. (If we could requite without reference to self, not in our own person but in the stead of God, *then might* every man be his own blood-avenger and arbiter.) The *three examples*, which illustrate the general position, are so selected as to descend from the worse evil to the less: actual personal assault, spoliation of property, forcible constraint to a service not due. The Lord, indeed, refers only to things comparatively unimportant, in order that his words may find their easy application to ordinary life. He does not begin, for instance, with the dashing out of the eye or the teeth, or with any such wounds and bruises;* for the sentiment and conscience which his word necessarily awakes, testifies against the instant exercise of private personal vengeance in such cases, as being sinful and like the haughty violence of Cain (Gen. iv. 23: I have slain in my retaliation a man who wounded me!): but he would teach us, that we must also patiently receive the smiting on the cheek, without permitting ourselves even in things so slight as this, *any measure* of self-revenge or retaliation. This is one side of the case: according to another view, however, the slighter injury is oftentimes more irritating and more fraught with temptation than the greater, since we are led by the natural impulse of fear to retire before the enkindled rage of one who would assault us, unless our own rage be as hot and violent as his. In this case it is not so much the pain which is to be taken into account, as the shame of a scornful insult: hence among all people, and in all times, smiting upon the cheek has been in proverbial use in such a sense as this (see in the Old Testament, Lam. iii. 30; Job xvi. 19; Isa. l. 6; and in the New 2 Cor. xi. 20). The general usage which puts the members of the right side first,

* Hence Braune speaks at least without sufficient precision when he says that bodily injury stands first, because it is hardest to bear and most swiftly provokes revenge.

will explain the circumstance that the right cheek is mentioned first, and not the left, which would receive a blow administered by the right hand: in Luke *the one* and *the other* are used instead. Immeasurably more important than such a remark as this is the rigid and most impressive contrast which must be noticed between the requirements—Turn to him the other also! and that heathenish law of honor, which will not accept the very slightest indignity, but even in the midst of modern Christendom, demands the duel itself. To this *point d'honneur* stands opposed the patient acceptance and endurance of insult, as the genuine Christian courage and knightly honor. Offer him the other also—that is, in thy heart, and in the disposition of thy mind; calmly and patiently wait if he may strike thee another blow, and be ready to receive that also; so far let thy spirit be from opposing, or declining or avoiding it! This is all that the Lord intends to say by this emphatic expression, the figurative, proverbial letter of which must be understood in its spirit, just as we saw in a similar case before; for the actual turning of the other cheek might be no other than a challenge to continued sin, consequently itself sinful, and opposed to the love of our neighbor. There might even be a proud despite in it, or a mere hypocritical affectation. Christ interprets his own word by his own act, in John xviii. 22, 23, where he gives to the rude officer a gracious word of gentle admonition in return for his blow, which, according to Isa. l. 6, the Lord's Spirit would, however, have suffered him to repeat. The inquiry in the next example is of little importance as to the relation between the χιτῶν, "coat," and the ἱμάτιον, "cloak," used conversively in Luke vi. 29, which gives a slightly different presentation of the discourse. We must regard Matthew the apostle as giving the more precise words of our Lord; the Spirit in Luke, in another grade of inspiration, teaches us that literal exactness in such details is not strictly necessary. Luke's view is more general, referring to an actual *seizure* (αἴρειν), and this begins from the outside garment (Mic. ii. 8, in the Heb.); but Matthew's refers to an unrighteous process at law (κριθῆναι), to obtain possession of the property; and the closer body-garment is therefore first mentioned, because the law of Moses contemplated the taking of the outer garment also, as the last and most aggravated evil* (Exod. xxii. 26, 27). So that it means: If any one would unrighteously rob thee (τῷ θέλοντι), and aims to do it under the impudent guise of right; even if it touches thy necessary clothing as nearly as the blow on the cheek touches thine honor, thou must rather be entirely stripped than manifest a disposition, in the spirit of discord and violence and personal enmity, to defend thy rights at law. We cannot but understand, however, that this speaks of express outward *conduct* (which could not always be externally maintained), only as the figure and the test of an inward *disposition*, which should ever be prepared so to act. To every one who would go to law revengefully, selfishly, stubbornly, or out of a weak devotion to this world's good, it may be said, as the apostle wrote to the Corinthians, "There is yet utterly a fault among you (ἥττημα); why do ye not rather take wrong? why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?" (1 Cor. vi. 7). But if thou art conscious of the indwelling of forbearing love in thy heart, that very consciousness will enable thee, with all the more propriety, to *withstand* the *sin* which would wrong thee by defence of law, and hold fast thy property, as God's steward, for a better use.* The ἀγγαρεύειν, again (*to demand service* as messenger or guide, to lay claim to it by force as the only right; a word which passed from the Persian usage and speech into other languages, since the same thing every where takes place, Matt. xxii. 32, where this word occurs, being an example), violently trespasses upon personal rights, so that a high spirited and unloving man might well defend himself against it with all his might, on the common principle—Thou hast no authority to demand this of me, I am not under obligation to render thee this! It might indeed, in some circumstances, interfere exceedingly with one's own wishes and business. But yet it is, in comparison with the blow on the cheek and the robbery of one's garment, the lesser thing, and therefore the Lord's injunction is more imperative—Art thou compelled to go one mile, go with him twain! shouldst thou serve any one for an hour in any matter, add yet another hour! This goes beyond the mere negative endurance that went before, and with ver. 42 begins already the transition to the exhibition of *active* love, ver. 44. Say to the impetuous maker of the demand, but say it with thy heart as well as with thy lips—Although I am not bound by any obligation of external right or law, yet am I, according to the spirit and law of love, both willing and obliged to serve thee and every man; that which thou art disposed to enforce from me, I will do for thee in free will and in double measure, preventing thy sin by my kindness! Such conduct is actually practicable in many cases; and how effectual is the rebuke it administers, how it tends to peacemaking and the prevention of sin!

Yet it is not the Lord's will, when such a motive is out of the question, or anything else might stand in the way, to impose it upon

* Roos thinks, that perverters of the law having no conscience, might have taken away the lesser garment, imagining that so the letter of the Mosaic law would not be transgressed.

* Kieuker: "Where Christ's aim is attainable, there the means to it becomes a duty—that is, though Christ specifies it not, where such means are means really to that end; and where the spirit of Christ's aim cannot be attained, the mere mockery of the means to it, is unreal and unnatural, even though seemingly coming under the Lord's specification."

his disciples as an absolute necessity to render every service that may in this evil world be demanded of them, any more than he requires them to allow all their property to be taken from them, or to tolerate every kind of personal insult. He enjoins only the requisite disposition of mind. As he himself often before his hour was come, withdrew from the sinners who assailed him and hid himself; as he counseled his disciples to flee before persecution (ch. x. 23); as Paul availed himself of his rights as a citizen, and made his appeal unto Cæsar; so it is permitted also to us to do in all respects the same, and even indicated to us as better so to do, for the sake of the world's sin, even though we would sincerely prefer to suffer. The Jews made the regulations of public justice the rule of private life; but Christians must not elevate the sacred private prerogatives of love into statute law before the time. The spirit which this would require being absent, nothing but disorder can follow. As the office of the magistrate continues in existence for punishment of evil and protection from wrong, it is our right and our duty to avail ourselves of it. However willingly I might suffer myself to be smitten, so far as myself and my cheek are concerned, yet I must maintain also the honor of that office, and not let presumptuous outrage go unpunished. I have not the less fulfilled the Lord's command in its spirit, though I make my appeal and go to law for my right, being *compelled* thereto by another's wrong, and resigning myself patiently to litigation, which is directly opposed to my principles of forbearance.* Even absolute self-defence is not excluded, where a man assumes the office of judge himself: it is observable that the Lord did not say—If any man will kill thee, defend not thyself, but let it be so! There remain cases quite sufficient in which patience may have her perfect work, and Solomon's word may have its force—Wait on the Lord and he shall help thee; as well as Christ's example, who committed himself to him that judgeth righteously. "A father says to his children: Bear what your brothers or sisters may do to you, and hurt them not in return; will one of them take away your fruit, give him your bread also rather than engage in quarrel with him. But it is tacitly understood that the father means—I will presently compensate the patient child, and visit the wrong upon the other."† The Lord will render judgment and justice to all who suffer wrong; vengeance is his, he will repay, and that in the full measure of the most rigorous *jus talionis*.

To these three examples of deepening wrong which is inflicted upon us, the Lord adds yet another word, which requires a more profound consideration than at first sight appears. *Asking* seems obviously after *demanding* to be an inversion of the order; for it is the gentlest kind of desire, which acknowleges my right and submits to my volition. The Lord's saying, indeed, is in the same strain with that of Moses in Deut. xv. 7–11, where it is commanded to lend and give to the poor brethren, and forbidden to harden the heart or shut the hand against them; just as it is commanded by the apostle, 1 John iii. 17. Compare also Ecclus. iv. 4, xxix. 2; Tob. iv. 7; in harmony with which passages we have here the admonitory: *Turn not thou away!* Yet this asking may be in an imperative style; and many ungodly ones are eager enough to borrow, who never think of repaying (Psa. xxxvii. 21). Must I then be ever giving and giving, contrary to all propriety, encouraging every hardy beggar; and must I suffer to be begged and borrowed from me all that I have for mine own proper use, to the glory of God and the true service of my neighbor? Here becomes most manifest the utter impossibility of a literal accomplishment of all this. He who should thus give, would indeed give no good gift to such unrighteous ones, but would violate the law of love to individuals and to human society at large. Consequently we must regard our Lord as only laying down this saying of Moses and of Sirach, in order that he may point out and enforce the spiritual and not the literal fulfillment of this commandment of love, which has become a maxim among all nations: he speaks *figuratively* as in the former instances. The transition from them to this is plain in this obvious connection: Do to him who violently *compels* thee, what he asks, just as if he had *requested* it.* Whom does the Lord, in his deep meaning, intend by him who asketh of thee? No other than the "whosoever" of vers. 39–41, just as the "adversary" of ver. 25 was the "brother" of ver. 24. Not merely he who expressly and in words asks of me; that would be a Pharisaical cleaving to the mere letter: so interpreting I might let my benevolence wait till asked, and keep the commandment by not turning from one who never asked me; or with hypocritical, proud or heedless dispatch send him away with "There, thou hast it," which could only do him harm. (Give also to him who asketh not of thee—is as valid against this as, on the other hand, Give not to every one who asketh of thee!) The asking, which I must be accessible to, is *need* itself; the seeing my brother in want. The needy one speaks by his very presence to

* Rud Matthäi: "The *disposition* to reconciliation must be as strong as life, unquenchable as the soul —the *act* of forgiveness should be as discriminating as the distributing of any pearls. If thou wouldst actually heap coals of fire on the head of an enemy, and thus confirm the neighborhood in faith and love, thou mayest also literally turn the other cheek, and go the two miles, &c. But where thou wouldst only cast thy wheat amid the hemlock which would choke i, keep it for better soil, and stand upon thy right."

† *Philosophische Vorlesungen über das sogenannte Neue Testament* (Leipzig, pub. by Junius, 1785); an original book of Pfenninger, too much forgotten.

* Which connection in Luke vi. 29–30 is yet more obvious: Let the taking away and robbing be like asking from thee.

my heart—Help me to the best of thy ability! And, finally, in the spirit of the word, what is it that he who injures and constrains me seeks of me, without saying so or being conscious of it? Nothing less than the best and highest gift I could bestow, the proof of my love, which he in his hardness of heart so pressingly needs as an example for his reproof and amendment. And that I should give him in the form which may seem best to the wisdom of my charity; either by enduring or resisting, by giving or withholding. Thus much remains certain after all is said; whoever opposes the evil which comes against him by any the slightest exhibition of evil, that is, does any thing to the evil-doer which is opposed to the spirit of enduring, forbearing love, himself commits evil, so far as in him lies—aggravates instead of amends it on the other, and denies that example of righteousness and of love which his neighbor's unrighteousness and uncharitableness demanded at his hands. That is the most profound significance of the "*but*" in ver. 39. Oppose not πονηρόν to πονηρόν, *evil to evil*, but good to evil, patience and love to evil-doing! Every enemy as an enemy asks of me to overcome him with love, to heap coals of fire on his head; that thus I may take away his enmity by the requital of abounding love, according to the highest examples of my Father in Heaven (vers. 44–48; Isa. lix. 17, 18; Psa. xli. 11). It may probably be found to be only a lending of love, which will come back to me in rich return: but I should be disposed to impart it also to the ungodly, who *would borrow* it without ever repaying; and unweariedly to impart to every one from the inexhaustible capital of my love, and that without hope of interest in the return of love. Consult Luke vi. 32–35, which, in a more extended discourse, perfectly confirms the view that *lending* is a figurative expression for *love*.

How abundantly has the Sermon on the Mount hitherto drawn out of the depths of eternal wisdom its fundamental far-reaching principles of truth! In what luminous words of its own has it set before us its new teaching, which is yet only the kernel of the already extant word of God in the Old Testament released from its shell, and in the unity of fulfillment is one with the Law and the Prophets! How majestic in its independence does every isolated word stand, and yet how does one hang upon another, and spring from it in a living, harmonious organic progression! Could the publican Matthew, or any other hand, successively have woven together this fabric from detached and single words, after the manner of men? Or could the Spirit of Christ himself have blended them together by the apostle's instrumentality *under the untrue superscription:* He went up into a mountain, opened his mouth, and taught them saying—? No, the Lord did verily speak from the mountain, and in this very manner did he open his mouth for his first most solemn discourse.

It may be hoped that we are now more able, the further we proceed, to enter into the meaning of the Lord's words and manner of teaching. The two examples taken from the Mosaic statute and penal law were intended, in opposition to the Pharisees' false exposition of the law, to point his disciples to such a fulfillment of it in its spirit as should, by working from within outwardly, render those ordinances useless; while at the same time it should assign to the legal, judicial element in them, its proper place, and vindicate for it its true use. Now follows the third example, which returns again to the moral law, or law of holiness. As this is to close the distinctive reference to the commandments, it is not one of the individual commandments of the decalogue that is introduced, as the first quotations had been; but the epitome of the whole second table, as Moses had already specified it; viz., the law of *love*, of that one central *disposition of mind*, which should evidence itself in every word and every work. In this case, in which the wicked principle of natural selfishness *not willing* to understand the law, comes into direct collision with its clear and unmistakable terms, the mischievous perversion takes the form of an arbitrary *addition*, which mutilates the precept and entirely annuls its meaning. The misinterpreting appendage at ver. 21 was actually a precept of the Mosaic ordinance; the error consisted only in bringing down the Sinatic—Thou shalt not kill! to the level of a mere sentence upon homicide. But the daring addition to the divine precept—*And hate thine enemy!* is no where found in Holy Writ. This human and wicked selfishness, which would assert its hatred in the very face of the commandment of love, is met and opposed by the fresh disclosure in its clearest expression of the central spirit of the old law. Thou shalt *love* just as God loves, that is with the love of *mercy*, with the *active love of thine enemy*. That is the holiness which is to be established in thee. The whole aptly fits in with that which began in vers. 21–26; where the *adversary* was manifestly a *brother*, with whom I should be reconciled in the love of God. Ver. 44 merely lays down the command to love our enemies with its evidences, as the express opposite to the perverted addition; ver. 45 immediately follows with its foundation in the example of our heavenly Father; then the importance of the subject demands a reference once more to the contrast of those who, with all their selfishness, yet make their talk and their boast of love (vers. 46, 47). This, however, is no love; but the *Pharisees* prove themselves to be no better than the *publicans*, the arrogant, self righteous ones in Israel no better than the despised sinners; yea, even, the *heathens* (this latter paves the way for the second main contrast in ch. vi. 19–34: Not like the Gentiles!). These are two convincing *questions*, which presuppose, notwithstanding all their hypocriti-

cal perversion, a right understanding in their conscience; the one points forward to the *reward*, which will presently be discussed (ch. vi. 1, 4, 6, 18); the other points back to the *exceeding* righteousness which in ch. v. 20 was required. Ver. 48 forms the sublime conclusion—the first of those *three fundamental laws* (or in the superficial language of modern times, *principles of morality*) which are laid down by the Sermon on the Mount; the second and the third being found in ch. vi. 33; vii. 12. This first one points towards heaven, and the fountain of mercy in the divine love to enemies (Rom. v. 10), as the source whence our love should flow. It also at the same time prepares the way, in passing, for that which ch. vi. introduces: Let your righteousness be *in the sight of the Father*, who looks to the hidden thought of the heart; and not terminate in hypocritical acts in the sight of man.

Verse 43. The beginning of that wicked and wanton misunderstanding which is here condemned in Pharisaic Israel, was their restriction of the commanded love of our *neighbor* to their *own people* only, and their contempt of the heathens as enemies whom they might, and indeed should hate. This was the all-pervading false interpretation which their uncircumcised hearts put upon God's revelations and institutions for his own peculiar people. But as the Jewish, like all other national pride in general, is only an expansion of the selfish haughtiness of the *I* into that of *We*, the limitation did not tarry at that point, but the "neighbor" became more narrowly interpreted even within their own bounds as a people. It has been assumed that Moses does indeed often so speak as if the neighbor were only the fellow-Israelite; but this was only so far the case as such was naturally the most obvious application of the term in common life among a people so isolated and self-contained. Let it be noted, moreover, how expressly, in the very chapter from which our Lord derives the compendious law of brotherly love (Lev. xix. 18), the *strangers* are included in that law (vers. 33 34), just as in ver. 10, they are coupled with all other poor.* And does not the constantly recurring רֵעֵךָ, "thy neighbor," point back to the *decalogue*, the commandments of which are recapitulated in the beginning of this chapter (Lev. xix)? But where is the expositor who would venture to say that it was lawful for Israelites dwelling in heathen lands to bear false witness against the heathen man outside the land of Israel, or to covet his wife or his house? Thus in this chapter (Lev. xix. 18), "the children of thy people" and "thy neighbor" cannot be one and the same; but the latter part of the sentence is the general law upon which is based the more limited application in the former: Thou shalt not bear grudge against the children of thy people, *for* thou shalt love every man! and no less than *as thyself!** It is in the highest degree characteristic that the Lord imputes to Pharisaism the omission of just this word; although the doctors of the law tolerated and included it in the dead letter, they utterly disregarded it in effect. What means it other than this—that I should place myself in thought in the place of the other, and do to him what I would desire to have done to myself? (ch. vii. 12). Thus apprehended it gives of itself an immediate and sufficing answer to the cavilling question—Who is my neighbor? Every one, assuredly, by whom I would be loved; and would not the Jew, needing charity and its kind offices of help, desire *them* even from Samaritans and Gentiles? (Luke x. 29–36).† But here, instead of *this* rejected appendage, which condemns all selfishness and opposes all limitation of the precept, another is substituted which absolutely sets *self* upon the throne, *above* our neighbor and *against* him, with all its bitter wilfulness—*And hate thine enemy!* Who then is my enemy? Every one, in fine, whom it pleases me so to term; for some cause of enmity sinful man will never be slow to discover or invent. But the law says rather—Thou shalt not hate; that is, *on thy part* thou shalt have no enemy, thou shalt regard and treat no man as such. Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart (even when he sins against thee), but rebuke his sin in the spirit of sincere love:‡ thou shalt not bear grudge nor avenge! (Lev. xix. 17, 18). Even the adversary in judgment is continually spoken of as a "neighbor" (Exod. xviii. 16; Lev. xix. 15). But the Pharisee who will insidiously evade the law without tampering with its letter, gives its meaning a rash and narrow interpretation, until, finally, nothing remains but—My neighbor is he, *who loves me* (ver. 46). And since this love, so eagerly desired, very easily admits of any cause of interruption, *he* is only my neighbor so long as no offence causes me to declare him my enemy. Thus is the godless perversion of the precept perfected in an express contradiction of it; just as now-a-days the proverb too often runs among Christians —Every man is his own neighbor!

Verse 44. In sublime contrast to this is the mighty re-asssertion of the law which must be fulfilled: *But I say unto you!* What terms

* Zech. vii. 10 includes the stranger among others, who are called *brethren*.

* There can be no more mischievous perversion of Scripture, or slander of the Old Testament, than what Dietlein maintains: that the law commanded hatred of an enemy, not merely permitted it—and that the enemy whom the Mosaic institute commanded to hate was every stranger! Formerly the Rationalists only spoke thus, and every Christian man contradicted it.

† Observe hence once more, how falsely Christian theologians impute hatred of an enemy to the Old Testament law. Against Von Gerlach let the great difference be remembered between hating "*the* enemy" and "*thy* enemy." Where in all the Old Testament is the latter found?

‡ The enemy is just so far our neighbor, as he most of all harasses and occupies us" (Lange).

more entirely harmonize in the natural mind than *enemy* and *hate?* It is the full, undisguised heathenism of the carnal mind which the Pharisees condensed into an express precept, a genuine essential precept of man, and then appended it to a commandment of God as its exposition! But when that commandment said—"Love thy neighbor," it also signifies no less—*Love* thine *enemy!* impossible as it may still be to human nature to reconcile the two. All heathens have been *conscious*, that the love of an enemy was a beautiful and a noble thing: and it is actually asserted throughout the Old Testament, in its histories, proverbs and precepts; see, for example, Exod. xxiii. 4, 5; Job xxxi. 29; Prov. xxiv. 17; xxv. 21, 22. Thus it is not anything new which the Lord announces as his law. He only brings new grace for its right fulfillment, as he thus erects brotherly love into a new spiritual commandment. After having, in the impressively simple antithesis—*Love your enemies!* laid down first of all the internal sentiment, which was of chief importance; he exhibits its progressive operation in three degrees, which through word and act lead back to the inner disposition again. As enmity advances, the maintenance and proof of love must keep pace with it. Bless them that curse you, oppose words of love and peace to words of scorn and insult! If the word of blessing suffices not (which is mostly the case), proceed further, to deed answering deed; do good to them that hate you, that show themselves by more than a single curse, by persistent conduct, to be your haters! And when the good deed is not sufficient (which again, when rightly understood, is always the case), continue nevertheless to preserve that disposition before God, which was the *love* spoken of at the beginning: Pray for them which despitefully use you* and persecute you! Bless them not merely in words but in acts—which is more difficult: the answer of kind words might be in vain without the proof of deeds. Let it not be thought enough to say—I will not revile again, but will speak affectionately; yea, not enough to dispatch it quickly by saying to God—Let them curse, but bless thou! But there must be a real earnestness in the prayer, as it is uttered in the prophetic Psalm (cix. 28): Bless thou *through me*, by my well-doing to them! and when even this does not overcome the enmity, and cause the despiteful treatment and persecution to cease, continue, nevertheless, in intercession: Bless *thou!* This is the last and severest test of the pure spirit of love, without which the blessing and the doing good could never in God's estimation bear the name of love at all. The putting one who hates to confusion by abundant deeds of kindness might even be a matter of Pharisaical and hypocritical pride, a sweet revenge under another form; but he who can pray for his enemy, loves him indeed. This penetrates that secret region of which cl. vi. 4–12 speaks more at large, and is the transition to what immediately follows concerning the Father in heaven, who looks in his children's hearts for love like his own.

Verse 45. That which in vers. 9 and 16 was preparatorily spoken, is summed up in one word—The children of your Father which is in heaven! The regeneration that underlies this, and is procured through the grace of the Son (John i. 12), is, in the Sermon on the Mount, a mystery unspoken, but which betrays itself to our notice, or at least to our anticipation, in the very foundation of the discourse. For the faith of any one who heard it might have concluded: He who discloses and condemns with such severity the sin of the heart, and exacts such lofty acquirements, himself designs to bring the kingdom of his Father to the poor, and with it satisfy those who hunger and thirst after God's love as their righteousness. That the Lord sets up the perfection of merciful well-doing after the example of the Father, as the high *aim* of an ever-growing *exercise* and *appropriation*, was already intimated in the progressive series of the benedictions, as it is now again in the ascending stages of ver. 44. The mercy of the Father comes to us freely and preparatorily: he who exercises to others that which he has obtained, experiences thereby more and more the purification of his heart from every thing which is contrary to that mercy; as we there apprehended and expounded it. So that we may here also, without hesitation or fear, lay the stress either upon the ὅπως—*in order that* ye may be so ever more and more, that ye may approve yourselves more and more fully, and at last in absolute perfection as children resembling their Father; or upon the γένησθε—in order that ye may *be so*. Our Lord designedly does not refer to the spiritual exhibitions of mercy to sinners as the pattern of the divine and fatherly benevolence; but, in order to work a more instant conviction, appeals to that general testimony of nature which was as open to the heathen as it was to Israel (Acts xiv. 17): for it is his purpose to reduce Israel and the heathen to the same level, in relation to the law and to grace, even as the Baptist had done before him. Moses and the prophets had demonstrated the goodness of God from his sending down *rain* and the blessing of heaven which made fruitful the earth (Deut. xi. 10–15; Psa. lxv. 10, 11; Jer. v. 24, xiv. 22). The heavens cannot rain of themselves, and we should not be content with an unmeaning "*it* rains," which places Nothing in the place of the living God; for it is God who rains, or who causes rain (as Israel sadly learned in the frequent shutting of the heavens), even as it is *his* sun which he causes to rise. His manifes-

* Ἐπηρεάζοντάιν is not "slander" or "revile," for that would be no advance in meaning upon cursing and hating, but according to Hesychius it is equiv. to βιάζειν, inflict injury. The persecution points back to ver. 10. Or we should have with Lange (iii. 386–389) to oppose the secret intercession to the secret and quiet vilification—but how could this be philologically established?

tation of himself as the mighty Creator and Lord, is also, as such, the revelation of his goodness: "for he is mighty and despiseth not any; for he is mighty also in strength of heart" (Job xxxvi. 5). His loving kindness in nature is further the type and the promise of the spiritual gifts of his grace for the innermost necessities of the heart of man. Rain, in the prophetic Scriptures, is often referred to with this meaning (Psa. lxxii. 6; Isa. xlv. 8; Ezek. xxxiv. 26; Hos. vi. 3, x. 12), and also the light of the sun, as the Lord had already intimated in ver. 14. Christ himself, according to the concluding promise of the Old Testament (Mal. iv. 2), is the sun of righteousness, and in him beams forth in its fullest radiance the divine *love towards enemies* (Rom. v. 8–10). We who now know this, detect such meaning in his words; but he then spoke, even while the light of grace was graciously beaming in his face, only of the light of the natural sun. He did not say: That ye may be *my* disciples and *my* brethren (as afterwards John xiii. 34, 35, As I have loved you; and the apostles, Eph. v. 1)—but in his labors and his lessons of love glorified his Father in heaven. He blessed those who reviled him,—even in rebuking he blessed them; he persisted in works of benevolence and healing in spite of all opposition; and he openly prayed for the evil-doers, who inflicted upon him the last injury, as he had prayed for them all his life long in secret (Psa. xxxv. 12–14, cix. 4). That he here magnifies the Father's goodness to *the evil and the good*, the just and the unjust, is to be understood partly as referring to the relative proportion in a mixed multitude between the seeming good and bad; and partly as if it had been said—On the evil and the unjust, who deserve it not, as if they were good and just, without any reference to merit and worthiness.* For who is just and good in *his* sight? We are none of us worthy that his sun should shine upon us. Hence Luke briefly expresses the fundamental idea—He is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil.

Verses 46, 47. Returning once more to the contrast of the Pharisaic spirit, we have an advancement in the idea, a full revelation now for the first time of their unrighteousness and want of love. Before, it was—they hated their enemies, thinking that that was lawful, provided only they loved their "neighbor." But they really *love* not at all, in strict truth, these their so-called neighbors, friends and brethren. They have so far narrowed the circle, that not merely those who hate them are excluded from their love, but also those who love them not. But if ye only love those *who love you*, can this be indeed called love, which is in its very nature anticipating, and abundant, and universal, like the shining of the sun? Is it not rather a seeking of your own, and in its principle simply a loving of yourself? This *question* the Lord presses upon their consciences, which cannot refuse to give back a true answer. If he speaks of this as "love," it is with that severe irony which he may use towards hypocrites; they are said to love, in the same sense as they are called *righteous* and have *righteousness* attributed to them (ver. 20). This is, indeed, the sense of all mankind: no man ever yet hated his own flesh; he that loveth his wife loveth himself, and seeks his own personal comfort (Eph. v. 28, 29); he that loveth friend and brother is not impelled by any voluntary disposition of his mind, but by the mere natural feeling that it is *his own* friend and brother that he loves. This is the so-called love of his neighbor which the natural man is said to entertain. If he attempts to plead it in justification, however, in the presence of strict law, the mask of "more than others" is plucked away by the Lord, who shows it to be only the common *Pharisaism* which extends even to publicans and heathens. No man is so wicked and abandoned, no sinner is so essentially devilish, as not to have some objects of his selfish election, of whom he may say—I love them because they love me. Do not even the *publicans* the same? In Luke this saying is expressed in another form, which simply gives the general principle involved in it—Sinners also do even the same. But here the Lord's expression deepens its emphasis in the second question—Do not even the *heathens* the same? (which reading is both on external and internal grounds to be preferred.) For the Pharisees always placed the publicans on a level with the heathen (Matt. xviii. 17); as they were seen to be no better than the publicans, the second contrast (afterwards again in ch. vi. 7) is ready to be introduced, by which the Lord will teach his righteousness—Not like the heathen! Therefore he had not said that the Father caused his sun to rise and sent his rain upon Jews and heathen; because this Pharisaically-apprehended antithesis is merged in the one, true distinction of just and unjust. Ἀσπάζεσθαι, to "salute," to count worthy of greeting and friendly intercourse, attaches itself to the εὐλογεῖν, "blessing," of ver. 44; not without allusion to the fact that a Jew only gave his שָׁלוֹם, "Peace!" to a Jew, a Pharisee, certainly never to a publican. Your *brethren* is ironically spoken, even as the love here apparently conceded is to those whom you regard and acknowledge as such; whereas (vers. 22–24), from the days of Cain and Abel every man is every man's brother! Alas that the disciples of Christ in the present day should need so much to be warned against a Pharisaism still extant—Let not your brotherly love fall short of love universal! (2 Pet. i. 7, τὴν ἀγάπην simply, which is alone the truly catholic *love*.) What *reward* have ye? A precarious and transitory reward in man's praise and in his fleeting favor, but none from the Father in heaven: which prepares the way for ch. vi. 1, even as it looks back to ch.

* Which is also indicated by the interchange of the leading word—the *evil* are mentioned first in the former, the *just* in the latter.

v. 12. Similarly *τί περισσόν, what more?* refers to ver. 20, where a *περισσεύειν*, or *superiority* of righteousness was required, beyond that false one of those "saints" who were like all other sinners. Thus progressively the inner connection of the fundamental idea of the Sermon on the Mount exhibits itself to our view.

Verse 48. *Τέλειος*, "perfect," is primarily, according to the usage of the LXX. equivalent to תָּמִים, but *ὥσπερ*, "*as*," gives it such an elevation of meaning that it becomes equivalent to the קָדוֹשׁ, "holy," of God. It is used here in the sense of that fundamental commandment which comprised within itself the whole law of Israel, as well the external ordinances as those moral precepts with which they were inwardly bound up: Ye shall therefore be holy, for I am holy! (Lev. xi. 45, xix. 2, xx. 7, 26.) It is to this that the Lord now refers on closing his *citation* of separate commandments, reducing the sum of the second table to the sum of the first table and of the whole law. *This* is the distinctive *περισσόν*, "more," of the children of God (Deut. xiv. 1), through which they are sanctified and separated from an evil world to the honor of the ever-praised Father. But what is that virtue of his *holiness*, of which he will make his children *partakers?* God is holy as the condescending and merciful One; his highest, most perfect praise is that it must be said, *He is love*, in a sense in which it is not, and cannot be said, He is omnipotence, he is justice. Love is even in him the bond of perfectness, the essence of all his other attributes and perfections. We may be, and we should be, not almighty as God is, but *merciful* as he is; and Luke with perfect propriety used this word instead. This is *our* perfection, this is our being entire and complete before God and in God. For children are indeed only perfect as children. This is set up by our Father as the goal of our attainment—*Be ye* therefore; and as this command contains a latent pre-announcement that the holy One designs to make us holy, the perfect One to make us perfect, so now in the Son is the fulness of the Godhead, the plenitude of divine love brought down, in order that it may enter our needy souls through the Spirit. If we believe on his name, we are already regarded, through the imputation of righteousness to our faith, as *πεπληρωμένοι ἐν αὐτῷ*, "complete in him" (Col. ii. 10). If, apprehended of Christ, we press towards the mark with full earnestness of spirit and walk according to the rule, we are now *τέλειοι*, "perfect," in the principle of our mind and will; though not yet *τετελειωμένοι*, "perfected," in consummation and attainment (Phil. iii. 12–15). But the living law of our Lord gives us a sure and comforting security in this *ἔσεσθε—Ye shall be* perfect, if ye abide and increase in love. This, however, does not set before us a general prospect of an unending progress towards perfection, without a definite goal of completed perfectness; but the God of peace will sanctify us until we are actually *ὁλοτελεῖς, wholly perfect* (1 Thess. v. 23), until in the perfect work of patience we *have become ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι, wanting nothing* (James i. 4.) To that end it is said, *Εἰ δέ τις λείπεται σοφίας, αἰτείτω παρὰ τοῦ διδόντος, If any man lack any thing, let him ask of him that giveth* (James i. 5)—as also in the Sermon on the Mount our Lord opens to us the path of prayer, which leads to the fulfilling of all the commandments.

The discourse, which set out at first with the most deep-drawn, fundamental principles of truth, the pregnant language which embodied them demanding most rigorous attention for its exact interpretation, becomes henceforward more easily intelligible in its phraseology, and descends to a more popular style of teaching. There fellow, however, at intervals, sayings the meaning of which is somewhat disguised in figurative and obscure expressions, and is not immediately obvious, such as ch. vi. 22, 23; vii. 6. The section ch. vi. 1–18, may be termed a sacred example of popular *reformer-polemics*—if it is allowable thus exactly, though in unidiomatic language, to express our meaning.

The third contrast with the *Pharisees* fully discloses, as our general survey showed us, their *hypocritical and external legality*, as the complete development of that false system of exposition which originates in an adherence to its mere letter. This is exhibited, that is to say, as the original internal principle, and essential quality of their *pseudo-righteousness*. There is designedly and appropriately no further reference to individual commandments of the divine law and their fulfillment; the appealing reference to that which is written, and to what they of old time substituted for it or perverted it into, was brought to an end in ch. v. by a most searching and comprehensive contrast. The *three leading examples*, however, which are now to follow in conformity with the Lord's prescribed plan, are taken from the three meritorious works of righteousness, so to speak, the highest acts of all so-called righteousness according to *universal human estimation*, heathenish as well as Pharisaic. For this whole section aims, in transition, to exhibit the Pharisees as, in their natural state, heathens in the true sense of the word. These examples are the three works which even Christian Pharisaism, especially in the Romish church, has on similar grounds reproduced: *Almsgiving* to our neighbor, *prayer* to God, *fasting* for ourselves. See them thus united in Tob. xii. 9. It may probably be thought that prayer would have more fitly been placed last, as thus the contrast between the hypocritical and the sincere performance would have been more direct, and the transition more immediate to the fundamental idea which fol-

lows in vers. 19–23, viz., the single-minded aim and pursuit after God's own righteousness. But the order in which the Lord places them is, nevertheless, that of their natural development, whether in the good or evil intention of man. He who seeks righteousness, begins with external good works (instead of the right commencement, which is directly in prayer); then proceeds to prayer, that his God may regard his good deeds, pardon their deficiency, and be pleased to strengthen him for their performance; and finally, in order to further the devotion of prayer, he fasts and exercises himself in keeping under the flesh. Thus we find it with Cornelius. Acts. x. 2, 30, 31; and precisely the same with hypocrites, although in caricature of the truth. Yet at the same time almsgiving was most immediately included in the divine statutes for Israel (ch. v. 42; Deut. xv. 11); fasting, on the contrary, was for the most part optional, since there was only one fast-day appointed to Israel, the day of atonement, to which very early were added other times of general fasting (Zech. viii. 19), till in process of time came the fasting twice in the week of the individual Pharisee (Luke xviii. 12).

In ver. 1, there is laid down a general warning against such a performance of the duties of righteousness, such a righteousness of works, as consists only of hypocrisy and semblance, inasmuch as it is exhibited only *in the sight of men*, and to be seen of them; an apparent contradiction to ch. v. 16, which, however, really explains it. The preliminary—*Your righteousness* of ch. v. 20, here recurs. The reference to the Father in heaven, and the only standard of worth and of reward in his sight, is here continued, following ch. v. 46, 48. He who was there in ver. 45 exhibited as the highest *exemplar* of perfect holy love, is also the *Rewarder* of all true righteousness, which consists in similitude to himself ("Before Thee nothing else has any value, but thine own likeness"). He is merciful to the merciful, and gives the pure in heart to see his face. Hereupon follows in order, first of all *almsgiving*, distinctively by the Pharisees termed "righteousness," but here taken as a general designation of good works towards our neighbor. Now occurs for the first time the expression—*The hypocrites*—so often cast in the teeth of the Pharisees down to ch. xxiii. For they are no better, who are like the publicans, and yet arrogate to themselves a special and exceeding righteousness, throwing the veil of an apparent sanctity over the wickedness of their hearts. The same is uttered again, in connection with prayer, ver. 5, and fasting, ver. 17. Thus it is the leading idea of this section, although in the central part of it concerning prayer, ver. 7, the reference is extended—Like the heathen. In opposition to this our Lord tells his disciples, that they should, so far as possible, perform their good works *in secret even to themselves*, to avoid all imagination of having by the deed in *itself* done any thing. For deeds of charity by their very nature neither can nor should be altogether concealed; they cannot indeed admit of concealment at all. It is somewhat less so with prayer to God; hence afterwards, Enter into thy closet, and shut thy door! Finally, exercises of self-restraint and discipline cannot by their nature be concealed from ourselves, and they should on that account be all the more closely hidden from others, for here is the greatest danger. Ascetic discipline, not hidden, loses all its value; consequently, in ver. 17, there is commanded even a holy disguise of fasting, as the only and effectual antidote to a wicked hypocrisy. These are the three stages of concealment before man, of which the righteousness of Christ's disciples admits.

Prayer, again, is the centre and soul of all acts in general that pertain to the service of God. In connection with this, as the point of most importance, the contrast developes itself more plainly as twofold: not before men first, but also not before God and men together, which is the consummation of these Pharisees' hypocrisy, and of the wretchedness of the blind people who follow them—*By much speaking!* Word-making, instead of prayer from the heart, whether before men or only in the closet, is ever the direct opposite of true prayer. Our Lord sets against this his own sacred *model of prayer for the children of the Father;* which teaches that they must in the simplest terms, before and after, and in connection with all their earthly necessities, pray for the establishment of his kingdom, in the doing of his will, to his own glory (*the fulfilling of his law*), as *the gift of his grace;* that thus *through prayer they may fulfill the commandment.* We see this in a very different light from Neander, to whom it appears *evident* that vers. 7–16 are altogether *foreign* to the organism of the Sermon on the Mount. *To us*, on the other hand, it is manifest that this prayer, inserted in the very midst of the second division of the discourse, is its proper *centre*, the key to all the mysteries of its demands, by which the way to their fulfillment is pointed out. To ask is all that is required *of us* in order to the performance of every requirement (ch. vii. 7–13), and the *command* thus to pray, with the *promise* involved in it, is *the heart of the evangelical law.* Hence the Lord's Prayer, as we shall see, is arranged as the counterpart of the ten commandments. Here does our heavenly Father exhibit himself the third time as the hearer of prayer and *giver* of righteousness; as in ch. v. 45 he had shown himself to be its pattern, and in ch. vi. 1, 4, 6, its rewarder. In vers. 14, 15, the fifth petition is again repeated with the most solemn emphasis, for in it is especially fulfilled the law of love through the asking and receiving of the love of God; yet, as is strictly appropriate here, with a *warning* against the hypocritical conceit, which might lead them to imagine that such prayer as this is already heard even without any such condition.

Finally, in vers. 16–18, concerning which we have almost said enough already, we have

fasting as significant of all asceticism and *abstinence* of every kind. There is a simple repetition of the terms of the first contrast, which thus, after the apparent interruption of the pattern-prayer, closes the section as it was begun.

Verse 1. Δικαιοσύνη, *righteousness*, for which ἐλεημοσύνη, *alms*, has been substituted as a well-intentioned but mistaken gloss, does not here convey the meaning of liberality or almsgiving; as the equivalent, צְדָקָה, does in the Pharisaic usage which pervades the whole Talmud, though never in the Scriptures of the Old Testament.* The Lord speaks assuredly according to the Scriptural usage only, and δικαιοσύνη ὑμῶν, "your righteousness," can be no other than that of ch. v. 20, to which this fundamental position looks back before it is followed out into more specific detail. It is consequently quite similar to ch. xxiii. 5: *All their works* they do for to be seen of men. Therefore is added the *admonitory* προσέχετε, *take heed!* as this was also contained in ch. v. 20; and the third contrast with the Pharisees now deepens, according to the general fundamental plan of the sermon, into a tone of warning. Yet the Lord at the same time addresses himself generally to the poor misguided people who blindly followed these hypocrites, as well as to his own separated disciples, in order that he may open their eyes to the cunning treachery of their guides and examples, and thus awaken and secure their desire for his discipleship and its better righteousness. A slightly ironical ambiguity in the expression, which rather lay in the word as understood by his present hearers, than in the Lord's own design, paves the way for the mention of that ἐλεημοσύνη or almsgiving, which to the Pharisaic Jews was the most eminent δικαιοσύνη or righteousness. It is not the "before men" which is forbidden as such, but making that the improper aim, in opposition to the proper aim in ch. v. 16. Hence θεαθῆναι, "*to be seen*," is quite different from ὅπως ἴδωσιν, "that they may see," in that, and contains a bye-reference of an evil kind to θέατρον and the like, a mere *show* before the world. Hence afterwards, in vers. 5 and 16, the yet more severe ὅπως φανῶσι, which plainly expresses an empty *appearance* without any truth within. But the reference to the everlasting reward of the Father in heaven detracts not by any means from righteousness, but rather belongs essentially to its reality, since it is wrought *for God's sake*, for his approbation, and in order to blessedness in communion with him.

Verse 2. As the *you* had already in ch. v. 23, 29, 36, 39, passed over into the *thou* of a more specific application, so does it uniformly now in each part of this section. The Jewish over-estimation of almsgiving begins already to show itself in certain otherwise well-intended Apocryphal sentences, such as Tob. iv. 11, 12, xii. 9; Wisd. iii. 28, xxix. 14, 15, which themselves seem to lean on such canonical sayings as Prov. xix. 17; Dan. iv. 24. The truth which lay at the foundation of this error, but which was, alas! perverted and altogether lost in Pharisaism, Christ himself acknowledges, for instance in Matt. x. 42, and also his apostles, 2 Cor. ix. 9. The sounding a trumpet or letting it be sounded cannot, in harmony with the connection, be regarded as a mere figure, denoting, it may be, "loud and shrill begging-litanies" (according to Lange), but also an actual custom of that age, of which nothing further is distinctly known to us:* for the Lord is now describing the hypocrites and their work strictly after the life. Before *thee*, the saintly man, the great benefactor—as descriptively as it is scornfully spoken—that thy name and fame might be trumpeted forth! This were then also thy reward, dismissed with which no other awaits thee.

Verses 3, 4. But *when thou*, a child of God, doest alms—which must no more be omitted than the offering of the gift according to ch. v. 24—let it not be with ostentation, but keep it rather, so far at least as the act of giving will admit, a secret from the world; no artificial concealment is necessary, however, or that thou shouldst show that thou art ashamed of it by false anxiety or affected modesty. Especially take care—for that is the main point—not to glory in thy act, which should be as natural to thee as shining is to light. The saying concerning the right hand and the left is manifestly proverbial; forget it, if it may be, even while thou doest it; let it be far from thee, while the right hand is giving, to hold in thy left a trumpet, or to stretch it out for reward and praise. If the hands know nothing of it, the soul knows nothing—we may say with Von Gerlach. That is at least more simple than to regard it, with Lange, as referring to the solicitous counting from one hand into the other before the gift, and the clapping of hands afterwards. Take ch. xxv. 37 as its best exposition. Be not afraid that thy good work will be done so secretly, that even God will not know it and find it again for its reward. He forgets no work of love (Heb. vi. 10). If thou thinkest of this, and at the same time of the strong temptation on thy part to forget and to lose it while receiving the praises of men, thou wilt prefer ever to do thy work in secret: thus shalt thou be more sure of that secret and true estimate in the sight of God which alone gives its value to what may be termed good. Not as the Chinese proverb runs: Give thy alms in the day, thy reward

* The transition is seen in apocryphal passages, such as Tob. xiv. 9, φιλελεήμων καὶ δίκαιος, xii. 9, ἐλεημοσύνας καὶ δικαιοσύνας, where also in ver. 8 the whole three occur together, prayer with fasting and alms.

* Compare, however, Sepp, *Leben Christi*, ii. 183. Moreover σαλπίζειν is not merely *tuba canere*, but *tuba cani curare* also, according to a general usage, which Meyer cannot well deny.

will come in the night—but just the reverse: Give in secret, and thou shalt openly receive the true divine recompense, partly even in this world (Eccl. xi. 1), but in all its fulness at the resurrection of the just (Luke xiv. 14). As again the Mohammedan proverb says: Hast thou done a good deed, cast it into the sea; if the fish finds it not, yet will God see it. He reckons to thee capital and interest in rich return; for every deed of love, done from a pure heart, as unto him, bears its fruit unto everlasting life.

Verses 5, 6. Sincere worshippers pray, indeed, in the *synagogues*, and there is nothing wrong in that; but they who *prefer* to pray in the congregation, instead of the closet, are thereby convicted as hypocrites. How much more so when it is *in the streets*, to which, with rare exceptions, prayer is not appropriate—and even *at the corners* of the streets, where is the greatest concourse of passers by. There *stand* they, the wicked ones, who pervert the most holy act of secret, interior communion with God—concerning which, therefore (according to Braune's deep and striking remark), Moses gave no direct precept—into a mere matter of *ostentation* before the world. They have artfully so watched their opportunity as to be at the street-corner at the hours of prayer; they then continue standing there as if it were a matter of conscience not to omit, even there, the holy hour. For without any such pretext and occasion, to stand in the street for prayer would appear even to the world to be such frenzy as the essential, indelible feeling of the truth in the most wicked hypocrite would be ashamed of; manifest as it is that prayer is out of place in the street, hypocrisy itself requires another cloak to hide the same which clings to it. They have their reward: they pray not indeed to God, and seek not to be heard; therefore they have only just what they desire and seek. But thou, if thou truly prayest to God, must know that while the temple is a house of prayer, and the synagogues places of prayer also, this does not prevent the equal sanctity of all other places, where the Lord may be near to all who call upon him, and dwell in the heart of the contrite ones. Thou shalt not be ashamed of the public prayer under fitting circumstances, but shalt in addition *especially* and *habitually* retire into solitude, where nothing must interrupt, hinder or tempt thee in thy devout abstraction. Go into thy closet, if thou hast one (Judith ix. 1, viii. 5; Tob. iii. 12); or else seek one under God's own heaven, which may become to thee a Bethel. Shut to the door, if thou canst and it should be necessary (2 Kings iv. 33); but in any case the door of thy senses and thoughts, that no distraction may interpose between thee and thy Father. So pray to thy invisible Father, himself concealed to thy sense (τῷ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ as before in ver. 18), and he who out of his secret place looks into secret, will openly reward as well thy prayer as thine alms, each in its kind. Reward is here the common middle term between the ideas of recompense and simple grant.

Verses 7, 8. Frightful and shameful, but alas! true, was it that the Israelites, the holy Israel, in their *very prayer* to their God, have become like the *heathen*, because they actually do not pray to *him* at all! The heaping up many words is essentially the manner of all heathenish prayer, which supposes that God must be awakened by human cries (1 Kings xviii. 27), as all the babbling of the heathen shows to the present day. This is, however, so deeply rooted a mischief in the heathen mind of the natural man, that it may follow the disciples of Jesus even into their closets. Therefore it follows: And *when ye yourselves pray in the closet*, before God and not before men, beware of this same folly, which would convict you either of hypocrisy in your own hearts, or at least of unbelief in a present and living God. Even Sirach (vii. 14) said long ago: "Make not much babbling when thou prayest!" and the Jewish teachers abounded in good maxims to this effect, though they were neutralized by others of opposite tendency, such as—He who multiplies his prayers, is sure of a hearing—Whoso lengthens his prayers will not return empty—Every man should daily repeat at least eighteen prayers—and so forth. To these clung the hypocrites of that age with their long prayers (ch. xxiii. 14): but the same evil breaks out in every age where simplicity and truth decline, as the confusion of Paternosters, Ave-Marias and Rosaries among the Catholics bears witness; and no less the pious babbling of many a pietist keeper of the hours, of many a devotee in the closet, relying on his enforced *opus operatum*. Nothing indeed is farther from the Lord's meaning than to repress the prayer which is ever welling from the full heart, the spirit of persistent wrestling with God. But the *multa locutio* wherein there is not *multa precatio* (to quote Augustine), the *words* which are not urged from a vehement and overflowing heart, he esteems a vain heathenish work; and condemns as an idle delusion the imagination that any words, as such, might contribute to the acceptance of prayer (Isa. i. 15). For our object in prayer is not to inform the Omniscient of what he knew not before. The universal subject and matter of our prayer is—that which we have need of for body and soul, in general and in specific things. This the Father *knoweth* before we ask him, yea better than we can ever ask or conceive; for poor fallen man *knows no longer what he is in need of*, first generally for his soul, and then in particular, at least very often for either soul or body (Rom. viii. 26.) While we are thinking before God *what* he may know to be our real need, we shall also remember to trust it entirely to his hands. In this utterance, finally, so stern in its condemnation of all that is not simple in prayer, and yet so encouraging to all that is so, the Lord solves that ever-recurring doubt: Will God, in deference to our prayer, interfere with the order of the world? He

has already in its arrangement provided for the answer of every prayer, as generally for every foreseen expression of human freedom, and for every necessity of his creatures known to him from eternity. Superstition, which can only take root in hypocrisy, supposes that words must do this; unbelief into which superstition ever degenerates, for it is essentially one with it, expects no help to acceptance from the words of prayer. Neither knows aught of the living God, in whom true faith only can confide for the knowledge of its need and the willingness to help it, and therefore alone can truly *pray*, even as children ask of their father.

THE LORD'S PRAYER.

(Matthew vi. 9–13).

Verses 9—13. But where shall we begin and where shall we end with the exposition of the *Lord's Prayer;* not his own, that is, ("after this manner pray *ye!*") but *our* prayer who are and would be the Lord's, *given to us* as the children of the Father, by his Son our Lord?* What has exposition to do, we had almost said, with the words in which the wisdom of God descending upon us in perfect love, has condensed and enshrined for us neither more nor less than *all, all* which ever has ascended, does now or ever will ascend from human hearts in prayer to heaven? Yes, verily, whatever may not be included in this, cannot be fit subject of prayer, and may not be asked. Such unlicensed prayer is indeed no prayer at all in spirit and in truth, for God's Spirit has not prompted it; neither can it be real communion of the heart with the living God, for presumption and error have never the confidence of faith. Think of and utter aught which it is in thy will or thy power to ask, and thou wilt find it already spoken for thee in this prayer of prayers. Whatever from the beginning, since men first, on account of sin and evil, lifted their hearts and hands to heaven, has been in their minds to ask, is here reduced, in the simplicity of the new and everlasting covenant, the last utterance of God to us in his Son, to one word, which will remain man's last utterance also to God, until heaven and earth are divided no more. All the cries which go up from man's breast upon earth to heaven, meet here in their fundamental notes; and are gathered into words which are as simple and plain for babes as they are deep and inscrutable for the wise, as transparent for the weakest understanding of any truly praying spirit as they are full of mysterious meaning for the mightiest and last struggles of the spirit into the kingdom and glory of God. Whatever Israel may ever have prayed in words given by the Spirit of God or shaped by the spirit of man; whatever there was of just and sound in the contents of any Jewish formulary or collection, any *Kaddish* or *Machsor*, which was extant in the time of Jesus, was but the preparatory aspiration towards this most living of all formulas, full of spirit in its letter; this most comprehensive of all epitomes so marvelous in its brevity; into which our Lord and Master condenses now for his own, all that those words imply: *When ye pray, say!* Thus has his Spirit expounded it for nearly two thousand years to those who have prayed in his name; and all that it has ministered to their thoughts and they have derived from it, is the comprehensive fulness of its real contents. Learn to make it *thy prayer*, and it will interpret itself to thee with ever-deepening impressiveness, from the Father-name which it places upon thy lips down to that Amen of faith, which having first impressed it upon thy heart, it draws to thy lips, that out of thine own mouth thy heart may be strengthened; but all through the power of God the Spirit, without which the most consummate words to those who resist it—remain but words. Let the reader receive the exposition which will now be given, only as a finger-post to indicate where the paths of profound thought go on to their endless development; especially as giving some very necessary hints for the *unity* and the *harmony* of those paths, which as the individual petitions open them up, proceed in compact and harmonious progression towards the one great end.

After this manner then pray *ye*—the Lord says, in immediate connection with the prohibition of heathen babbling. In the most obvious meaning, therefore,—thus briefly and simply, embracing in plain and sound words whatever thy heart prompts thee to utter before God; not going round and round for the mere sake of saying many words, as if he did not understand. But when we see presently after, that the Lord, in giving a pattern of its *form*, incorporates in it at the same time the *substance of all prayer* for which words can ever be required;* and in so doing goes entirely out of and beyond the immediate connection of his discourse in order to condense the whole meaning of the Sermon into this prayer as its kernel;—we shall not be disposed to agree with many who unwisely think that he *only* designed to commend to us by an example simplicity and brevity in the *expression.* He who should cordially assent to this might

* How Braune can suppose that *the Redeemer* himself often used this prayer is to us inconceivable; particularly on account of the fifth petition, and also on account of the sixth and seventh—for "evil" must be *pre-eminently* sin. from which Christ redeems us, but he never needed himself to be redeemed from it.

* "Not so much a sacred formulary, as for divine instruction as to what petitions are universally good, universally necessary, universally acceptable," says the Beuggen *Monatsblatt* with perfect correctness, although it cannot be gainsaid that the Lord set out with the *immediate* design to inculcate simplicity and brevity in the expression.

well despair of matching this by any other prayers, and therefore rest entirely in the given form itself. Did the Lord by, "after this manner," signify these very words, or only their substance and their manner? No rational man can think that it was his meaning that we should use these words exclusively. But that it was his design that they should be adhered to and used, as his church has understood him and acted accordingly, we have most decisive proof in the *repetition* of the same words upon a *subsequent* request of his disciples for a *form of prayer* (Luke xi. 1–4.)* For there they wished for a directory and form for daily use—As *John also* taught his disciples. The Lord did not refuse it, but most emphatically referred them in their need to that which he had given a long time before: he knew nothing and had nothing better for them, and now says more distinctively than on the former occasion—When ye pray, and have need of prescribed expressions, then *say ye* the same words! There is a prayer of the heart without word, but let him who should think himself so qualified and capable for that at all times, as to be able to despise the prayer of words, reflect upon this saying of our Lord: When ye pray, *say*.† Further, the Spirit of prayer does give the special and ever new and appropriate words of prayer: yet this does not remove the necessity of the weak to fall back upon a given form of words, yea, even of the strongest who are, sometimes at least, equally weak, and know neither what they ought to ask nor how to ask it. In any case, there remains, finally, the great necessity of a *common* prayer of general consecration and promise. Therefore, the Lord's commandment—Pray thus, and say! is the actual appointment of a letter sanctified and blessed for the church's spiritual prayer, the institution of an almost sacramental word-element resembling that other—*Do this!* For as we have need of the Lord's Supper, *well nigh in like manner*—I say not more, for there is yet assuredly a difference—have we need of a word of prayer full of promise to be placed in our lips, that we laying hold of it may by the word excite the Spirit, in the name of Jesus, who has himself commanded us thus to pray ourselves from the poverty of receiving faith into the full confidence of being heard and accepted. And this confidence is especially strengthened by the fact, that we offer the same prayer in fellowship *one with another*, whether an external or internal communion. In that request of the disciples a purely human need uttered itself, which the Lord could not have left unsatisfied, yea, well knowing what they needed, he had already provided its satisfaction. If, on the one hand, alas! this most sacred prayer has been desecrated into a most profane formality of babbling by the misuse of it in endless Paternosters and Our-Fathers in the many tongues into which it has come; yet on the other hand an unlimited experience attests the gracious and condescending will of the Lord to bless these words, with which he has connected, and into which he has inwrought, a sanctity beyond that of any other prayers that we may use. In them the little child begins to spell out the rudiments of its prayer, and when the church unites, in its loftiest festal assemblies, to pray, these words and none but they are still its most perfect concerted utterance, sufficient for the most sublime occasions, and beyond which nothing can be expressed. All that is needful for every act of divine service, and all that any man may have especially in his own heart, is comprised in this prayer; as the ecclesiastical formulary (which we do not blame although Nitzsch does) so excellently says.

Thus the Lord over and above the *how* teaches us abundantly the *what*, and not merely *teaches* it, but *gives* us the petitions which he commands us to pray, as simple *promises*, for the encouragement of our confidence in asking, if we laid hold upon them in faith But it is indeed only a prayer for *us* poor sinners, who have need of forgiveness and deliverance. He himself, as the Son, prayed otherwise to the Father, and has opened a way whereby we, having become children of God through him, may have liberty to pray to his Father as *our* Father too. Thus does he turn our asking into receiving, and makes our *prayer* the way and means of our *fulfilling the commandment*. This is the meaning of its position here in the Sermon on the Mount. Jehovah cried upon Sinai amid the thunders of his majesty—Thou shalt be holy! Jesus on the Mount of Beatitudes gives to the people, who sit down at his feet and receive of his words (Deut. xxxiii. 3), the word of living power from his own mouth: Ask and it shall be given you to become holy, yea, finally to be holy for ever in your finished redemption to the glory of God!

Hence it may be presumed that this central word, containing the very heart of the Gospel as the *life-giving*, *self fulfilling law* of grace, would stand—through the marvelous wisdom of the Holy Ghost which has *so ordered* it, that all things in the great whole of revelation correspond and are fitly joined together—in immediate relation with the *decalogue*, the authentic expression of the *law of commandment* for all ages. And so it manifestly does. First of all, it is obvious to every one that in this, as in that, there are two tables, and indeed in a similar manner referring to God and man. As the commandment begins—I am thy God

* As certainly as the Sermon on the Mount was spoken by our Lord in the form in which Mathew gives it, and the Our-Father is an essential part of it, so certainly Luke's is not merely a "more particular account of the circumstances under which the prayer was given." Alas that the excellent Harms should thus express himself upon it, from whose valuable expositions in his Sermons we have elsewhere received much that is useful! [The same view, however, is taken by a large class of evangelical divines.—Am. Ed.]

† As Dr. Schurf answered some such one.

thou shalt consecrate thyself to me alone, but not in any forms of thy own devising, and regard as holy my name, my day, and my representatives (my image, in their united human life, thy father and mother), and then descends into the circle of man's relative duties and obligations; so also in the prayer, after the invocation come first the petitions, which, as they ascend to the Father, utter only "Thy," and afterwards the others which may also say "Our." If even there the gracious covenant-word—Thy God—preceded the commandments, how much more must all the petitions here have that first word of appropriating faith before them—*Our* Father! Further, as there the precept concerning parents (according to right reckoning the fifth), while it essentially belongs to the first table, is yet the middle-term of transition to the second, so also here the fourth makes such a transition from Thy to Our. It does, indeed, say "*our* bread," but at the same time—*Give* it to us as *thy* good; while in the following petitions we ask only for the turning away of *our evil*. *To honor* God in the person of men, is the internal principle of the loving our neighbor as ourselves (submitting one to another in the fear of God, in honor preferring one another); the filial feeling is the foundation of family life, from which society and the community grow as a more extended home in which thou shouldst do thy neighbor no harm, because he is thy brother. So also the filial petition for the true bread from the true Father, is the beginning and foundation of all further petitioning for all our need, as will presently be shown. Finally, as there we have *ten* words (עֲשֶׂרֶת הַדְּבָרִים), so here, though the petitions —to distinguish the new above the old—are contained in the holier number *seven* (repeating the most holy *three*); yet the prayer itself is found to be also comprised in *ten* words, or sentences, if we include not only the invocation and doxology, its commencement and its close, but also, as is fitting, the single *vow*, which appears as the condition of the fifth petition. It is that "as we forgive," which is in itself something distinctive, as the Lord's immediately following repetition teaches us; yea, in this member of the prayer is its essential heart to be found, for we attain to this love, which is *the fulfillment of the law*, only in the way of asking and receiving from the love of God.

Thus the one prayer runs through both: Be *our God* and *give* us all *thy* good; *take* from us all *our* evil, in order that in us also *thine* may be the glory! give thy grace, take our sin; give thy glory, take our evil away. But as the prayer bears the relation to the commandments of an abounding fulfillment of them, the *invocation* does not merely correspond with that first word of the covenant—I am thy God, but at the same time transforms the first two commandments into a prayer which fulfills them. Every other God, and every self-invented likeness and image, is already excluded, when we cry in faith—Our Father which art in heaven! The first petition for the hallowing of the *name* embraces in itself the true principle or beginning and the final end of all prayer, but it aptly corresponds also to the next commandment—Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain. The New-Testament order of conception, however, enters here. Now in the great fulfillment we pray down from heaven to earth the *kingdom* which is come and is coming, and we pray the good and gracious *will* of the Father into the hearts of ourselves and all his children. The first three petitions are inseparably *triune*. The Old Testament already contained at the law-giving, in the hidden back-ground of its word,* reference to the sacred Three in God; but now there comes into clearer prominence the name to be hallowed, of the *Father* just now invoked, of the *Son* whose kingdom is to come, of the *Spirit* through whose inworking the children of God are disciplined to do his will. The three petitions are inseparable, while each introduces and includes that which follows; yet do they, at the same time, exhibit the development in which they are fulfilled, through beginning, middle, end. For the first invocation and petition already hallows the name, then comes the kingdom more and yet more, until in its perfection the will is fully done.

Such is first and essentially "*that which we have need* of" (ver. 8). The following supplication is grounded on this, and follows from it, as Olshausen rightly seizes the connection between them: "*In order that this may be*, give us daily the bread of life." Thus may we understand the true meaning of the fourth petition, which mediates between the two tables, though so often, alas! wrested from its connection: Give us thy good! It is, in some sort, as a condescension that it begins with the expression of our earthly, bodily need; it designs to signify more than that, however, elevating bodily need into the figure of spiritual: Impart that to us whereof we live; give thyself to us for the good of our hunger, for the satisfaction of our desire. This is essentially the central word of all prayer: *Supply our need!* Here is also the proper meaning of the much contested ἐπιούσιος, "*daily*," in its plain position before us; that which is necessary to our οὐσία, or *existence*, the sustenance of the creature derived from the power and gift of him, who alone is himself ὁ ὤν, *the Existent*. But man lives not by bread alone; and as the Lord has spoken at the commencement of the Sermon (ch. v. 6) of a hungering and thirsting of the inner man, so

*Namely first: אָנֹכִי יְהוָה, *I Jehovah*, the Father; אֱלֹהֶיךָ, *thy God*, in the Son, אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִיךָ, who brought thee out, through the Spirit's power. Then again: No other Gods before me, the Father; no likeness besides the Son, in whom my *name* is; the *Sabbath* for a sign that I sanctify thee, and will carry on in thee the work of my Spirit (Ezek. xx. 12).

now in its centre, yea, in the innermost heart of the prayer which is its very kernel, he most assuredly does not bid us pray *merely* for the need and nourishment of the body, but speaks also of the *bread*, which the Father giveth from heaven, just as in John vi. 27–33, iv. 34. The details will follow upon the individual* petitions.

We also see plainly how the three petitions of the second table further describe and explain that bread of life, for which we, on our soul's behalf, must pray. As the first table of petitions is from above downwards, invoking all from heaven, to which *he who prays has risen in his invocation*, until the earth in re-established obedience becomes like heaven; so now the prayer returns back, rising from the confessed and expressed necessity, into which the Lord's merciful answer descends, towards full satisfaction and accomplishment, and, indeed, in the order of a sacred three, corresponding to the former: our *trespass* is that we have not done the *will* of the Father, and reconciliation is the bread which we first and most inwardly need; then comes *temptation*, opposing, through the might of the wicked one, the coming of the *kingdom;* then the *evil*, under which we sigh, to the very last opposing of the full glorifying and hallowing of the *name* of God in his saints. All that we here pray for is indeed embraced in order in the Son: the true *wisdom* of the children of God which is to pray for bread from their Father (in the first four petitions, but especially expressed in the fourth), is taught in the *doctrine* and *life* of Jesus; this leads us to his *death*, which is our justification from guilt; then to his *resurrection* in order to our *sanctification* against all temptation; finally, to his *ascension* and return for our full *deliverance* from all evil. Yet are these petitions on the other hand inseparably three-one; so that in the first we already perceive the last, and each prayer petitions for a spiritual sacrament, in which there is forgiveness of sins, and also victorious life, and salvation to blessedness in hope. Thus we pray for health and life in place of decay and death, for that true and only *deliverance*, in which the *Father* forgives his children for his name's sake (1 John ii. 12); the *Son* strengthens those who are his against the evil one; and the *Spirit* perfects the deliverance unto glory.†

As, consequently, the *fourth* sets out with the expression of *bodily* need, which is to be developed into a spiritual meaning; so the *seventh* petition obviously first of all refers to *spiritual* evil in its principle, sin and temptation (as the connecting ἀλλά, *but*, evidently intimates); but it also includes all the external, bodily evil which sin has brought and is bringing, and authorizes us in this legitimate way to pray for deliverance from it.

Thus has this general view placed the two petitions concerning which opinion has been divided in the true light, harmonizing all differences; and it has pointed out our way for the right understanding of the particulars, to which we must now direct our attention.

How much more is that which the Son now puts into our mouth—Our *Father!* than that former—I am *thy God!* He graciously tells us—Thus *say ye!* well knowing that the permission—Thus may ye say! would have been by far too little for our diffidence. Would the disciples have been able after the Sermon on the Mount to lay hold of that permission and diligently avail themselves of it? It appears, from Luke xi., that every one would not; and therefore must the Lord repeat for all, what that one had not heard or had not understood and embraced. We may place our little children's hands together, and teach them—*Say ye.* Well for every one, for whom this is early done: it is not too soon, as early as the child can cry—My father and my mother! (Isa. viii. 4), and lifts up his eyes to heaven as a child of humanity. How perfect is the *simplicity* of this beginning of all prayer, descending to the root and principle, already naturally present in the heart, of all sense of love, and trust for gift and help! In "Father" the Creator is at once included, but the glance towards heaven immediately adds: Who hath made all these things! Me, *with all other* creatures; this beginning of all prayer given by our Lord himself should be proof enough to all, that it is his will to build up his church in families and in nations from the very commencement of life, and every Our-Father in the mouth of a child of Christianity (and should we then by any means suppress it?) asks the question—Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who are already taught by the Spirit to cry Abba? But again, if the simplicity of childhood has departed in after time, and sin has broken out, how hard is the return to it and the becoming again as little children! We might almost without qualification say that he who has never trembled at the invocation, and confessed that he dared not take it upon his lips, has never yet learned to utter it from his heart. Then does the

* It may be taken for granted that it is no design of ours to exhibit the initial petition for *bodily* necessity as a "*common* petition among the other more elevated" (Rothe's *Ethik*, p. 339), but we admit, at the outset, its full significance and justness as such. Yet the position of Karrer (our Lutheran critic, to whom we shall again revert) that the true meaning is *only* the earthly bread, and that it is perpetrating robbery upon poor Christians if they are not allowed to use the prayer in that individual sense, seems to be pushing the matter to an extreme. I am entirely misunderstood, as if I only tolerated the most obvious and bodily reference, with little approval.

† The reader must consider whether this disposition is the logical construction which Theremin deprecates (*Abenstunden*, p. 439, 3d ed.), and also whether, besides this not absolutely necessary arrangement, other quite different combinations are supposable, as is there conceived. But we very much doubt whether the parallel with the commandments, which our critic Karrer gives (*Zeit sch. für die luth. Theol.* 1848. 3) can be regarded as preferable.

word of grace attract the spirit and overcome—Have I not brought it down to thee in thy sin and misery, do I not give it up to the common use and even desecration of all men, in order that those who receive it in faith and are willing, should *learn* to use it in spirit and in truth? Then we hear the appeal to those who are parents—If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven! And then comes that knowledge which can never be enough learned, that we, through the Son, have also a Father, who is never weary of coming and laying hold of us through the power and impulse of his Holy Spirit. Only begin with this encouraging assurance, and let every Our-Father anew from your lips to your heart declare—that he who hath given thee the word, gives also the faith, the grace and the spirit of prayer to use it. Thus the Gospel goes forth among the heathen in this prayer, laying hold of their innermost and first natural feelings after God—"On high above the stars a good Father dwells!" and transforms the presentiment into assurance, in every one who receives it to his heart.

Further, what an inexhaustible meaning is there in the conjunction, in this first glance towards heaven, of the Father-name, which is inborn and sweet to every child of man, with the universal compass of all things and the hosts of the universe! He whose are all the heavens, and not thy own earth merely, is the Father, is thy Father! All true prayer from under heaven goes up to him, even though eyes and hands be not lifted up, even though the heart should return into itself to seek the Thou of prayer. Yet whoever would in the wilful delusion of his spirit seek it there *alone*, is at the very first appealed to by this prayer of our Lord: Not so! Not in thyself! every good gift cometh down from above! The heavens give not showers (Jer. xiv. 22); the sun, and the moon, and the stars have no power in themselves and can impart nothing, but the Living God in his own world. By this is all pantheism condemned, which, having first miserably compressed and shrivelled up this universe of things, knowing no other spirits than the spirit of man, knowing nothing of secret things beyond the history of the earth; then proceeds to make this scanty "all" into the god of its idolatry. Every child who can utter "Our Father which art in heaven," may put to shame such vain thinkers, and teach them a lesson of faith (Heb. xi. 3).

But the Lord at the outset does not teach us merely to say—In heaven, as afterwards in the third petition it is used in contradistinction to earth (Matt. xxviii. 18): this would have been ill adapted to inspire the confidence of prayer, and would have removed him who is nigh at hand to a far distance again. But he teaches us to speak according to the language which described the creation: *In the heavens.* It would be well if the Lutherans would take that again from the Reformed. Where God is, there is heaven; and where is God not? When these first words are more deeply pondered after this first upward glance, there is found to be no antithesis in them to the *here below* of him who prays, but they rather suggest a responsive descent of heaven to earth, and into the heart of the petitioner. I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit! Here is the heaven of prayer, which opens to the petitioner when the high and lofty One, whose glory is sung by all principalities and powers in his temple, and in his house of many mansions, bows down in his holy mercy to the abject ones, who otherwise could never by any struggles and endeavors rise to him. He whose are the heavens is the Almighty Father; as he *can* help as God, so *will* he help as Father. He is the true Father, in a sense beyond that of his faint images—the fathers upon the earth He is the universal Father; high and extendec as the heaven is above the earth, so universal is his presence to praying hearts, opening up in them every where the countless heavens of his manifestation, like the suns in the drops of dew. The Lord had, however, previously said: But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and pray to *thy* Father—for the "thy" must have its own prior claim, and it is obviously understood that he who prays, first of all prays for himself. Yet he now gives us a *common* prayer—*Our* Father! And even in the most essentially personal supplication and wrestling, which would only cry—My bread—My trespasses—Deliver me—we must ever bear in mind that we do not alone thus pray. If faith utters the word "Father," then love, without which faith cannot be, immediately associates with it "*our*," that all its prayer may go into the great fellowship of supplication, and all its petitioning be *intercession* also.* There is here an anticipation of the subsequent—As we forgive our debtors (Mal. ii. 10). If with all others, but also all others with me and for me, in the presence of the one common Father of us all. Just as if thou wert to enter in diffidence and fear the audience chamber of thy king, and foundest there hundreds else with whom his majesty was kindly speaking; so should thy closet be large enough for all to enter with thee who pray under heaven, that thy faith may thus gather strength: Where all are will I be, I will wait with them and with them be heard and be blessed!

But now to the *petitioning.* Between every word of true prayer, which does not remain the mere conversation of the heart *before* him, but becomes communion *with* him, God speaks in answer. Listening to these answers the soul is moved to the most inward progress of its utterance. Thus now, after we have boldly uttered the invocation, the first voice of Ma-

* As Lange says: "Even childhood is not without its distinctive feeling of human brotherhood," though this expression seems to embrace too much, when "all good spirits" are incorporated into this great brotherhood.

jesty speaks from his throne—Am I a father, where is mine honor? (Mal. i. 6). Then comes the confession, in common with all who pray, and on behalf of all who pray not: Alas we are not yet thy true children! we are yet under the heaven, and where the "Holy! Holy! Holy!" of the highest heavens fills not yet all lands and all hearts. *Holy* is the first word, which we are taught to learn in the Lord's Prayer, the vocabulary of all fundamental and elementary ideas in which man must speak of God and to him; and it can only be learned in speaking *to* him, out of the *invocation* that is first uttered. He has not made us shrink back terrified by his—I am holy! He has indeed by anticipation impressed this upon our hearts in the Father-name, but he now demands that which he has given, not indeed as yet by his solemn—Be ye holy! but by the prayer of his own Spirit proceeding from our spirit: We would be holy—O! that we were so; that we may be, help us, good Father in heaven! *Hallowed be*—the race of thy fallen children, mankind, upon earth; they who call upon thy name, as well as they who do not call upon it, yea know it not as yet. This is its meaning, but it is not so said. Not for our own sake do we pray, so much as for *his name's* sake. We have taken it into our lips with all the boldness of permitted and commanded confidence, and now meets us the solemn—Not in vain! Befitting lowliness and reverence are joined with this childlike confidence, and we only pray for the honor of his name. Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but to thy name give the glory! By this is the self of the natural man, which even in prayer would ask and have for its own sake only, cut up from the roots; and the first and last principle of all prayer, is laid down in the *first* petition which so far includes all the rest. The prayer proceeds from the individual heart, and then goes forth, with a—Hallowed in *us*—which must be understood, over all the world, even as far as the "Our-Father" reaches. It has its degrees of meaning, and three in particular: for children who begin to learn it, as for heathens and all who know it not—Reveal thy name that we may know it, and utter it! for all who know it, but hold that knowledge in error and human delusions—Take away man's lie, which hangs around thy name! finally for all, who know it but deny it in act, who acknowledge it, but not from their hearts—Take away that most grievous dishonor of thy name, that those who call upon it, sanctify it not in their lives! Thus do we here for ourselves and for all the world lift up our confession and our vows: Glory be to God in the highest! In this all is included in one compendium; and the Pharisaical—*Mine* be the glory! which has a tendency to rise in God's children's hearts, is for ever condemned. For the *name* is, indeed, not merely the word of appellation by which we address God; neither is it (as a false catechetical tradition in its pretended wisdom runs) God himself in his being and nature, but the *acknowledgment* and the praise of God, *revealing* himself to us and in us.* But he reveals himself through him, *in whom his name is* (Exod. xxiii. 21), the Son, in whom the Father himself is honored, in whose coming God's *kingdom* comes.

The kingdom *is come*, as the Lord's first preaching announced in another sense; but he here teaches us also that it is not yet come, but ever continues coming until the time when there shall be no more room or reason for such a prayer upon earth. The kingdom of God, by which he rules the world, is not here signified: that stands immovable and admits of no coming. But it is his kingdom of grace, which not only judges but extinguishes sin, and re-establishes his honor, his Father-honor again in the sinner. It comes, indeed, of itself without our prayer, inasmuch as, if it did not descend as a free gift for the poor in spirit, they could never have prayed for it, much less have drawn it into themselves by their prayers; nevertheless it comes not without our prayer, but in it and with it. The supplication which is excited and nourished upon earth—*Thy kingdom come!* is itself the evidence of its coming, its fruit at once and its seed in continual mutual co-operation between God and man. Thus it begins to exist, and goes on progressively until the kingdom of grace is consummated in the kingdom of glory. Until this is accomplished, the prayer thus given to us retains its value and force as a promise. Again, as it is not *we* who are hallowed but the name of God in us, just so it is not—Help us that we may come into thy kingdom! but—Let *thy kingdom* come to us! Whoever with a kind of selfishness supplies in his heart—To *me*—and seeks even in the kingdom of heaven *his own* blessedness as his, is at once and always condemned by the language of this petition, which does not here mention "to us" at all. It does indeed belong to it, and not merely in the sense of the narrow "even to *us*," but, *in earth*, yea upon the whole earth, where as yet far other than thy will reigns! That Christendom has prayed this second petition so long, and prays it now so much, without the corresponding missionary impulse, and missionary work, is the most mournful evidence that could be adduced of the great blindness which opposes every where this prayer and its clearest words of light. Where, however, this blindness is only that of the understanding, the horizon over which the eye may range being limited upon this subject, the prayers for the coming of the kingdom which have issued from believing hearts may, notwithstanding, co-operate to the good of the

* Assuredly the first petition goes out from the previous invocation—"Our Father," continuing its invocation and adoration; yet it is not the same with it, in the sense of being its application, or, as it were, a customary doxology appended to it. It has an actual petition of its own. We cannot concur with Laufs (*Rheinische Monatsschrift*, Nov. 1847), who, following older precedents, would deny this, and refuse to admit that *veneratio* and *laudatio* may be made, in any sense *petitio*.

heathen. From the beginning they may have been sowing secretly and unconsciously the seed of future harvests, even as the children's Hosanna contributed to the destruction of the Adversary.

Finally, where is the kingdom, and where does it come? Where the *will* of the King is done. The three petitions, without any "and" interposed, are inseparably three-one, as was said above; and as we pass from one to the other, we become more and more convinced of the deep principle that underlies them all. Thinkest thou that his name is hallowed at least in this place or that, so that one might confidently cry out concerning it, Lo here or lo there? then look narrowly whether the kingdom of honor and glory be indeed fully come, and pray on! Thinkest thou that the kingdom, too, is come here or there? then question profoundly whether it be indeed *inwardly* set up in the children of the kingdom, whether they do the *will* upon earth as it is done in heaven, *voluntarily*, and entirely without any evil will or device openly or secretly contradicting it, and pray on: *As it is in heaven;* where there is no disobedience, nothing disorganized, nothing but the will, the kingdom, the honor of God. As in the courses of suns and stars, so among the morning stars and sons of God (Job xxxviii. 7), there is the festal service of those who, active in rest, shout for joy in the ranks of blessedness. So should it be *upon earth;* vast is the meaning which carries the promise in this prayer far above all the stir and tumult of humanity, inviting and urging all the children of God to unwearied wrestling in praying and receiving, and fervor in doing his will! By this petition, if he ventures to take it into his lips, the Godless man condemns himself; with it the sufferer comforts himself, and is assured that through the gracious will of God all evil shall lose its hold upon the meek, who already have in hope the earth for their inheritance; by it the slothful man invigorates himself, the self-willed rebukes himself, and by it the will of the Spirit, which must conquer, prays itself through all the impediments of an imposing flesh, to perfect victory. The Forerunner himself, in the weakness of our flesh, prayed *this* prayer before us, yet *without* sin.*

In this manner have we, arrived thus far, prayed down and prayed away through the invocation and right confession of God the Father, all *false* selfishness of mine and ours, though without naming it, from the most impious and devilish pride of self-glory which reigns in the world down to the slightest and merest volition of poor individual humanity. Let him who has not in this sense used this prayer, *begin it entirely anew.* In the first three petitions all that follow them were profoundly included; where then was the need of these after the former were fulfilled? The gracious giver of our prayer permits and requires us to *speak move plainly*, and, after having spoken of the honor of God, to unfold our own need, and our own plague. The prayer, which aims to lift us up to heaven, does not accomplish this at once, but we still sink back in our misery—*still on earth!* it therefore sets out again afresh, taking its stand *on earth.* Well might we in the former have essayed—"I would go up to thee in faith!" the attempt could not be in vain and without profit; but its best effect was to strengthen and excite us still more urgently to proceed—"Come down to me on earth in love!" This is the central turning-point of transition between the two halves of this prayer; the fourth petition in the heart of it indicates that transition.

How runs it? Give us this day what we need, the *bread* which pertains to our being and life! *Bread* as such? Poor man in the flesh upon earth thinks immediately of the wants of his bodily life, the supply of which it is not in him to create; he may think of it, for the gracious dictator of our prayer designs not to prevent *this* petition, nay rather puts it in his mouth. Yet is it, according to man's fallen nature, the *first* genuine prayer, with which we all begin, whereas the prayer for God's glory *should* be the first. With a profound reference to our earthly condition and our earthly need, does the second portion of the prayer commence; and sets out afresh, by teaching us, as the first elevation of man's head toward heaven, the table-prayer, as *Claudius* incomparably lays it down: "Man is not a cow or a horse, but he is among cows and horses, and must eat with them; therefore when he is fed, he rightly lifts up his head above them, conscious that he is thus fed and in order that he may never forget that he is." Are ye not, in your heavenly Father's sight, much better than they? They who would altogether take away the earthly meaning of the fourth petition, scarcely know what they say: is it not necessary that they should thus pray, and can we suppose the Lord not to have included so necessary a petition in his all comprehending prayer? In this sense the simple words have a large and profound meaning. It is at once evident that "bread" here means what man absolutely needs, excluding the slightest superfluity, and as opposed to all "not being content;" including, however, according to its proverbial use, food and shelter, in addition to nourishment *sufficient* or *suitable for our subsistence*, (1 Tim. vi. 8). Ἐπιούσιος, *substantial* (improperly "daily" in our version), i. e. ἐπὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἡμῶν αὐτάρκης, ἁρμόζων, *sufficient* or *suitable for our subsistence*, is not the *daily* (Chrysostom ἐφήμερος) bread which is already included in σήμερον, *this day;* hence it is in Luke, το καθ' ἡμέραν, *day by day.* We may not care for the morrow, and never pray into the future. Still less, therefore, is it *to-morrow's* bread, ἄρτος τῆς ἐπιούσης ἡμέρας (as in Gospel of the Hebrews, מחר).*

* Hamann to Herder calls this "*Fiat voluntas tua*" the true *lapis philosophorum* in the Pater-Noster.

* Comp. upon this Delitzsch in the *Luther. Zeitschrift*, 1850, 3, p. 469.

But it is just a translation of לֶחֶם חֻקִּי, "food convenient for me," as it runs in Prov. xxx. 8,* except that here in the Greek ἐπιούσιος, the idea of need is somewhat more prominent than that of appropriateness, proportion and sufficiency. Both, indeed, concur in one, according to the parallel cited by Lange out of the *Gemara:* "To every man what he needs for life, and to every body as much as is needful for it." We are also, in addition to this, reminded by σήμερον, *to day*, καθ' ἡμέραν, *day by day*, of the uncertainty of our earthly life, that we might with every to-day reach the term of our course, and know no morrow: and thus there is even here reference to a need that goes beyond our earthly life. But that we *need* our food for every *to-day*, the ἐπιούσιος, *for subsistence*, boldly acknowledges. The Father *gives* it without prayer, even to the evil, and adds to it much more besides; but his own children may not only thus receive it, they bring with them the prayer to which they are bound as the expression of their *thankfulness*, as acknowledgment of their obligation. They also should remember that God may at any moment withdraw what he has given, and consequently their "Give" includes—Continue to us and preserve! Thus poor and rich are alike petitioners before God's gate, all the care of poverty, and all the security of possession alike dissolved in this daily asking and receiving. Finally, the "our" in this more outward meaning, gives rise to two very important thoughts. It points to necessary *labor*, the true way of asking and receiving according to God's original appointment for man in Gen. iii. 19, independently of which we eat not *our own bread* (2 Thess. iii. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 11, 12) but another's.† Similarly, it points to the obligatory communication and fellowship, since as we in "*our*" and "*us*" pray with and for one another, so we may not hold any thing that we receive exclusively and covetously for ourselves alone. (Isa. lviii. 7, "Deal thy bread to the hungry;" comp. 1 Sam. xxv. 11.)

But with all this it is not admitted, that earthly bread is included in this petition; and by no means, that the children of the Father are not to think of more than this in the word of Jesus. A petition *only* for earthly bread, we insist, would stand alone, interrupting the course of the whole prayer for spiritual gifts; and would neither have connection with the preceding, nor be a fit transition to the following, petitions. What the Lord says in Matt. vi. 33, must be the key to the exposition here: it is in the sense of that saying that he commands us to pray for *bread*. As certainly as the weak beginners begin with the earthly bread, a prayer which is granted to us all; so certainly must the petition have a wider meaning for such as no longer, at least in *many* an "Our Father," care for or ask for earthly bread, because they know that it already falls to their portion. Or are there none who thus petition, and who find out what further the Lord intends, their hunger and thirst after righteousness interpreting the word—Give us the bread of thy strength, the gift of thy grace, which we need that we may live in thee and to thee! To them indeed the distinction between the one and the other vanishes, and this may indicate the truest and most consistent use of this petition; they care only to say, Give us thy gifts, O Father, that we may possess and enjoy them; fill thou all our human need, whether of body or of soul! But as much as the soul is more than the body, we should learn to give the pre-eminence to the spiritual in our thought and in our prayer.*

Thus are we taught by the sacred three of the following petitions, strictly united as they are by "*and:*" they assuredly are designed to give us a more detailed explication, and individual exhibition of the general "*Give us*" which preceded.

This "*and*," which from this petition forwards, unlike the first three, forms a link between each (in the concluding one passing into the still stricter conjunction, *but*), thus appears to have in the first instance a twofold sense of connection, and that whether the one or the other meaning of bread is assumed. If thy thoughts rested simply in the idea of bodily necessity, this "*and*" comes immediately to excite the acknowledgment which is needful in order to the humility of that prayer—But we are altogether unworthy of what we ask, we have not deserved to receive, but must expect it only from thy mercy. Thus the prayer placed in thy lips *constrains* thee, immediately after thou hast paid thy bodily need its tribute, to bring to God thy soul's need likewise: the continuous "and" becomes a self-recollecting "also," penetrating forcibly the heart and conscience. But of what avail—shouldst thou say in thine heart—is the food which perisheth, if thou didst not in *in addition* and *more especially* heal the hurt of my soul, in order to life and refreshment of my inner man? But if thou hast, on the other hand, as a disciple of Jesus, lifted up thy prayer, according to his instruction and exhortation elsewhere, for the "bread which cometh down from heaven," then is the "and" which follows a mere transition to the more express acknowledgment and specification of that which thou meanest, and requirest, and prayest for, and receivest by that prayer for the bread of the soul.

The *forgiveness of sins* is and must ever be the first nourishment and refreshment, the first gift of God's grace even to his children. To them indeed the whole prayer is properly given, for only they *can* truly say "Our Fa-

* Which Meier too (*Die ursprüngliche Form des Dekalogs*, p. 42) has this time rightly seized.

† Man lifts his imploring, empty hands to heaven, and God lays work upon it—Thus hast thou thy bread!

* We cannot understand how, as Alford thinks, this higher, mystical meaning of ἄρτος, *bread*, is excluded by the addition of ἡμῶν, *our*. for it is just the inner man, who prays for himself, even in the case of bodily need.

ther." The first cry and supplication of a returning prodigal son, does not so appertain to the Lord's Prayer as to find its place first of all in this fifth petition. *That* has been uttered *before* and independently of it. I am not worthy to call thee Father! The confidence of an enjoyed reconciliation is presupposed in the invocation, and the first three petitions which are developed from it. He whose conscience is first aroused to repent of and turn from his sins and misdeeds by the fifth petition (though it may, indeed, condescend to the exertion of this influence), has at least uttered all that precedes without sincerity and truth. This itself has added to his sin, and it would have been better for him to have begun with "forgive me" before and in the first "Our Father," in order that he might truly be included in the "our." Hence the Lord does not here say, Our sin and iniquity or our *transgressions* (παραπτώματα, as afterwards in ver. 14); but he uses the much milder expression, ὀφειλήματα, *debts*. We may indeed strictly say that his first forgiveness every man must supplicate alone, for himself (*my* sin, *my* sins!); he may not include his own absolution in the wide and general "our," and should not cast in his sin at once with the petition which the congregation of God's children here present. This refers rather to a daily-recurring need like the fourth petition, and all that daily repentance in order to daily forgiveness which is needful even for the children of God. Here then the prayer comes close home to that which is our own, that evil in us, which the Father alone can take from us, while he imparts to us his own good; for sin is essentially *our own*, and must be considered as *our guilt*, before we can speak of a further healing. Under these "*debts*" is included all that over which the saints have yet to mourn, down to the minutest shortcoming and intermission in doing good and the practice of mercy, down to the most secret defect of unholiness or imperfection in good works. It teaches us to ask forgiveness even for our "secret faults," and for that very reason, *because they are secret to ourselves*. And if we should imagine that overlooking of such infirmity in us is necessarily to be supposed and taken for granted, this petition strikes down all such rising thoughtlessness, presumption and pride at once, by teaching us that the remains of sin in us require the same *forgiveness* through grace that we received at first. Hence the Lord, when in Luke xi., he repeated the prayer, solemnly *explained* his meaning by substituting ἁμαρτίας, *sins*, and it would be well for us sometimes to impress it upon our memory by changing the term: Forgive us our sins!

And now, in the very heart of this prayer for that mercy on which we all daily live, and that acquittal which we all daily need, stands the single *vow*, which the Lord has inserted in direct contrast to all the vain and precipitate condition-prayer of man's invention. It is only in the spirit of gross and presumptuous misunderstanding and perversion that a nameless author (*Die Evangelien, ihr Geist und ihre Verfasser*, Leipz.) maintains that no subtilty can explain away the Pharisaic self-righteousness from this appendage to the prayer. For it is not anything that we bring with a view to merit forgiveness when we say we forgive, but our purpose, and that we are *now willing* to forgive. While in all the petitions such vows lie concealed—We would fain have it so, we will let thy name be hallowed in us, we will do thy will in thy kingdom; there is here, though only here, an openly expressed—We will! That ἀφίεμεν, *we forgive*, is in this place, *first of all*, such a vow, viz., to render the mercy we receive to others, and to do to others as God to us, is quite evident; for who ever forgave his brother from his heart, who had not previously learnt by receiving it, what forgiveness is? But the promise further, even while we are praying, becomes a present fulfillment, in the joyous avowal—Yea, we do forgive. Whoever brings his sins before the mercy-seat of God in genuine contrition, consents by that very act to the death of all his revenge and all his wrath, and is already reconciled to every one, who might be termed his debtor. Here is the root of the Law's fulfillment in us through the power of divine grace entering our souls; this love, thus forgiving, can *do* no evil to a brother which he would have to forgive. This is so entirely and essentially necessary in itself, that it required no express statement or resolution to be uttered, no legal—I will because I should, I will not what I should not. As the first invocation put away all idolatry and image-worship, so is all murder and anger, adultery, stealing, slandering, and whatever other evil to our neighbor there may be, put away from the heart and will of him, who prays the fifth petition, and abides in it.

But that abiding is of the utmost importance, and thus, finally, the added sentence assumes the character of a warning *condition:* If ye forgive not, neither will your Father in heaven forgive! Here lies the emphasis of—*As* we forgive. In this all living, dogmatic theology, which has *faith* in order to justification through grace as its vital heart, and all living moral theology which knows only of *love*, are *joined together and harmonized* in that one word which *the heart utters to the Father in secret*, a word so simple that the weakest may understand it, yet at the same time a word of inexhaustible meaning, the applications of which know no end. Who has sufficiently admired the wisdom of the Lord's love in the placing of this petition? A little child, who has just learned to distinguish between good and evil, and to feel sin in the conscience, may apprehend it; again, the congregation of the saints, having sin and discord within it, needs only to urge the fifth petition in all the fulness of its meaning—peace is re-established, and the sin put away. On the other hand, he who forgives not his brother, testifies against himself that his "as" must be turned against himself into a frightful imprecation—Forgive not

me also! Dares man, then, pray to God: Forgive me my sin, but this man or that, mine enemy, forgive not? If we say: Forgive *us*—we have already included all for whom God's mercy waits, and have therefore prayed for our enemies, as the Lord requires. And should we refuse that love to those, whom we acknowledge to be prepared with ourselves to receive the common mercy of God as his enemies and debtors? It is only, however, in condescension to our estate, that they are regarded as *our* debtors. Sin is not committed against us, but against God alone, with whom forgiveness is; and he who duly remembers this, will only say to his enemy in accommodation for the sake of his importunity: *I* forgive thee—but he must also at the same time say, in effect, with Joseph: Am I in God's stead? (Gen. l. 19). Finally, if thy heart be thus rightly affected, and yet thou art troubled with weakness of faith, doubting whether God will forgive thee this thing or that, then does the fifth petition give thee strong consolation; assuring thee that there is forgiveness with him in heaven, even as there is with thee on earth, and that God's heart is not harder than thine own, which, indeed, his grace only has made so soft (1 John iv. 7, 16).

Have we now reached the end of our petition? We might have put this question at each petition, for every one in a certain sense includes all the rest in itself. We should, indeed, have reached the close *now*, after having received mercy from the Father, and rendered it again in love to our brethren, were it not that sin, as it is guilt, so also is corruption in ourselves and in the world. What lies in the past we have put away, and may forget it, even as God no more remembers it; and so even for the future, we have pledged ourselves to a continuance in the life of love, wherein sin shall no more find place. But, however sincere the heart that has done this, there still remains the sin, harassing us from within and without, so that we may yet again fall into a state of guilt before God, and again trespass against that neighbor with whom we had confirmed our peace before the mercy-seat. We extend our thoughts towards what awaits us in the future, and that same sincere heart is constrained to acknowledge that God's grace alone can protect, preserve and sanctify us. The evil world in which we live is full of *temptation;* the *tempter* is its prince: and in ourselves there is yet the evil concupiscence, the treacherous infirmity, the fleshly susceptibility: should we not fear the world, the devil and ourselves; should we not betake ourselves to urgent prayer for help and salvation? The more fully we experience, day by day, that we yet need the fifth petition, the more fully do we press forward, in watching and prayer, into the realization of the meaning of the sixth.

But how does the Lord ascribe temptation to the Father, who tempteth no man to evil? Partly, because all things which may befall us are under his dominion and permission, and then because he would have the uncontested right to permit our falling, to subject us to tests which we could not sustain, and trials in which we could not stand. This *right* we humbly concede to his justice, but we know, that while we ask according to his command and promise, his *mercy*, the same which forgave our sin, will not leave us to our corruption, to contract fresh guilt. Although he sees fit to prove, to discipline, and confirm his children through conflict with sin, so that we, as his children, may not altogether pray against and deprecate temptation; yet may we say in humble confidence and encouragement—*Μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς, Lead us not* so deeply *into* temptation, that we must succumb to it; not beyond what we are able, so that no way shall be made for our escape (1 Cor. x. 13). (Comp. *ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε,* Matt. xxvi. 41.) And in our thus praying we are secured. This prayer suppresses all that presumption and pride which threaten us, and which would say with Job—When he hath tried me, I shall come forth as gold (ch. xxiii. 10); but it also removes all despondency lest confidence and strength should fail: the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation (2 Pet. ii. 9). Further exposition of this comprehensive and significant petition, would lead us away from our object (which is here only to exhibit the connection and train of thought), into all the depths of the Christian doctrine concerning sanctification and its appointed means. We make only a few further remarks which are obvious, and immediately derived from this petition. He who thus prays, yields not himself up to temptation, but, when it comes, uses the armor which God provides; he who thus prays for himself and for others, desists from all condemnatory judgment of others' sin, since he in himself only too well knows, that the Searcher of hearts alone can estimate the might of temptation.

Thus has the sixth petition at length led us, in language increasing in plainness and significance, to the root of all our misery and corruption, the eradication of which alone will make us perfectly sound, and holy and happy; for the most internal, persistent temptation, without which no temptation from without could do us harm, is the lusting of the flesh against the spirit. Now at last does the Lord comprise in one finished *concluding* petition, which is itself the *sum* of all prayer, our sin and the whole world's, with all its connections and consequences; one great word embraces all—*τὸ πονηρόν, the evil*—and from it we are taught to pray to the Father for full salvation and deliverance.* The *ἀλλά, but,* which closely connects this petition with the preceding (Lead us not *into,* but entirely *out of*), teaches us, indeed, so much as this, that the real evil which is *first of all* referred to, is that sin which is still present in temptation; but it

* Our request to be preserved from temptation *rises into* the longing for full redemption, as Lange well expresses it.

does not by any means forbid us to extend our view further. The Reformed divines, in reckoning six petitions, not only break the sacred number seven which should certainly be held fast, and the yet more express arrangement of the prayer, as we saw above, in relation to the Ten Commandments; but they further introduce an unacceptable *tautology* in making the two sentences one. When, further, they understand τὸν πονήρον in the masculine as *the evil one*, I trace the same lack of *liturgical* feeling and perception which attaches so much in other respects to their church. This is the liturgy of all liturgies, and here it reaches its sublime close, which through the deep lowliness of the believing—*Deliver us!* immediately passes on to the heavenly doxology—Thine is the kingdom! And just at this point must the conqueror confer that honor upon the vanquished enemy, to name him with his threatening power? Are the believing children of the Father, already redeemed, for ever to be subjected to the contumely, at the end of every private and common prayer, of mentioning him? Let him believe this who can; our inmost sense of holy propriety recoils from it. The Redeemer has left his own name unmentioned, though himself the ground, and medium, and end of every prayer; and can he be thought to have expressly mentioned Satan? We may and we must, indeed, have *thought*, as at first, of the Devil's kingdom and will, so now of the tempter and original of evil; but none of this was uttered in *word*. I would suggest to such interpreters: Try the experiment, close your prayer at any time, let it be in the most joyful festival of the divine service and at the sacrament, but uttering in plain words the *cry of distress*—Deliver us from *the Devil!* and would you not instantly feel how harshly that sounds. Further, there is nothing *personal* in the whole of the second part of the prayer, the πονηρόν, *evil*, must correspond with the ἄρτος, ὀφειλήματα, πειρασμός, *bread, trespasses, temptation*. Should we be disposed to understand thus also τὸν πονηρόν, *the evil one*, in John xvii. 15, against the accompanying ἐκ, *out of* (other than 2 Thess. iii. 3), and the internal connection of the discourse in that place? We rather look there for the true explanation of this last petition, as also yet more definitely in 2 Tim. iv. 17, 18, where, according to our conviction, the apostle, just after he had mentioned the raging lion, passes on to the all-embracing ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ, *from every evil work;* and (as the ῥύσεται, *will deliver*, shows) quotes actually and expressly the last petition of the Lord's Prayer with the Doxology and the Amen pertaining to it.*

What is then the *evil* which we finally name? We can only apprehend it in the same way as מָוֶת, θάνατος, *death* elsewhere in the Scripture are understood: it is sin itself and all its consequences, from the first pang that it inflicts, through all the necessities which it creates so long as it remains, to the damnation where it rests for ever; no less than the whole of this combined. Thus it is the fit conclusion and sum of all petitions, and the deliverance which is asked for is a full redemption into the heavenly kingdom (σῶζειν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τὴν ἐπουράνιον). It tells us that only by the taking away of all sin can this evil be taken away (as the position of the prayer after all the others also indicates); it points us most impressively, when the ἀλλά, *but*, is rightly understood, to the fundamental evil of all, bids us think of that, and to ask no other deliverance than the being delivered from *it*. But does there not follow from this the deliverance from all guilt, all need, all care, all strife, yea from every kind of pain and suffering? And could an all-comprehending prayer, which gives a place to every petition of human infirmity, exclude *that?—Make us happy! save us!* Take all need from us, and every plague! This is a prayer equally permitted and equally indispensable to God's children upon earth, as that for daily bread. The natural selfishness and blindness of men lead them to begin with this prayer, without reflecting how and in what way it can alone be answered: in his wisdom the Lord has, therefore, placed it at the close. And as he in the weakness of our flesh used this prayer for the taking away of his bitter cup, so will he give words to his disciples which shall express their weakness, their sighs, and their sorrows. But when a member of the Reformed Church cries to his Father in any lesser, though violent, trouble—Take it away! and finally in the agony of death—Put an end to my pain! where does he find such a perfectly justifiable prayer in his Our-Father?

Moreover, we Lutherans know as God's children the prayer which preceded: Thy will be done! We know full well, that happiness and rest before the time, without the κακία or "evil" of every day (ch. vi. 34), might be an evil, which the Father would not and will not give us, even though in our ignorance we should ask it; that good days may well be more full of *temptation* than evil ones, and we have prayed against all temptation. We do not therefore say: Father, be no Father to us! chastise us not for our profit, that we may be partakers of thy holiness (Heb. xii. 10). We know that external, temporal, salutary evil both is and brings *deliverance* from evil properly so called, eternal evil; and we are able to give such a meaning as this to the petition —Strike hard that we may be saved, give us the cup of our healing which we must drink to the dregs! But this does not prevent us from rejoicing in the prospect of deliverance from all need, leaving it to our heavenly Father's righteous will with perfect confidence; in our infirmity we may with his permission offer it with our thought fixed especially, at some seasons, upon our sufferings; we may boldly give expression in these words of

* Lange has recently very cheerfully and disinterestedly, admitted the interpretation of τὸ πονηρόν which we have espoused.

our prayer to that never-absent prayer of the heart of all, which cries for help, and longs for perfect rest and peace within and without the soul.

Thus have we in the seven petitions—and *not* beginning with the seventh—prayed ourselves gradually up from the depths of our ruin and misery. We ascended at once to the Father in heaven; we further called upon his name, before we spoke of our own sin and earthly need, for the coming of his kingdom and the accomplishment of his will; then first we came down to earth again, and drew down by our supplications the gifts of the Father's mercy—forgiveness, strength and deliverance. If the last petition had been placed *first*, the tone of lamentation—From *evil!* would have predominated; but because it is the *last*, the joyful emphasis falls rather upon the equally confident and humble—*Deliver* us! as if we should say: Yea, thou wilt deliver us! or: Deliver *thou* us in the right time, according to thine own counsel; other deliverance than that we desire not. We acknowledge that evil remains, and that we feel it to be evil, (woe to the man, who is so well with the world and the flesh that he can deride Luther's "Jammerthal," the valley of woe, and dispense with the longing look towards heaven!) we acknowledge also that we neither would nor could deliver ourselves; but we rest upon the prayer which the *Redeemer* himself has given us, and are already saved in hope.

And now, can it be that the *thanksgiving and ascription* which sets the crown upon all prayer, is not genuine, that is, that it was not given by the Lord as he gave the petitions? Euthymius so early was of this view. But if there is anywhere an internal criticism which may maintain its prerogative over the external testimonies of the manuscripts which we have directly received as historical monuments, it is in this place, as similarly in 1 John v. 7. All the orthodox, who, submitting to the apparent results of all external criticism, concede that the Lord did not himself append this conclusion, yet give it place in their exposition as if it belonged there, find it most excellently appropriate, and involuntarily confess how aptly and profoundly it connects itself with the petitions of the prayer. For ourselves we rest calmly in hope, that one day, when all that is lost is found again, and the patchwork of history is a completed whole, it will be made clear how it has come to pass that this doxology early fell away, and was omitted from the manuscripts and the fathers, which now certainly confound us. Then will the verbal correctness of the Peshito be confirmed, and the abbreviation in the *Apostolical Constitutions* be seen to be manifestly an *abbreviation* of the words given by the Lord, just as Paul, according to 2 Tim. iv. 18, received them, and yet does not quite exactly reproduce them. In Luke yet more is wanting, and probably not by Luke's fault; it is at least quite as conceivable that similar causes have been at work in the case of Matthew's Gospel, as it must be in every view *inconceivable* that the Lord actually closed with—Deliver us from evil! "Such a conclusion comes naturally to the praying heart;"* the church has ever possessed it, and will never more let it go; this is to us an irrefragable argument that the Lord has given it to every heart and to the whole church.† If we were disposed to go so far as to say that the Lord had to that end subsequently given it by his Spirit to the church, yet must we pause doubtfully before we hazard such a view. For apart from the question, why should the Lord have left this as an afterthought of his Spirit, we cannot bring our minds to think that he could have given a form of prayer without at least an Amen. (We have previously discovered the Amen of the prayer to have aptly *counted into* the Sermon on the Mount.) But the true Amen, according to the custom of all the Jewish prayers, which found their originals in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, carries with it invariably an *expressed ascription of praise;* similarly, according to the New Testament canon (Phil. iv. 6), no prayer is complete with prayer alone, without giving of thanks. This may be an answer to Bengel, who does not think the thanksgiving appropriate to the period at which the Lord gave the prayer. His prayer would have indeed had its introduction without it, but not its fit issue and outgoing; it would not have been, strictly speaking, a complete prayer, and the joyful concluding petition, if it did not issue in such an Amen, would lose its joyousness again, and *would become an unanswered, resultless cry.* Use the Lord's Prayer thus for a quarter of a year, *evil* being its last word, it will become intolerable to thee, and its conclusion will victoriously force itself upon thee. Yet once more, if such *internal* criticism may not maintain its prerogative, where is its place, and where are its rights? It may be matter for consideration, whether it be only an illusion, that *with* the doxology the Lord's Prayer includes *ten* words; that with it the *us* and *our* flow back again into *thine*, as *thine* flowed from *our;* that only with it the whole is rounded off and finds its true close. It may be asked, whether David's prayer (1 Chron. xxix. 11, 12) was not here by the Lord taken up, and for ever sanctified?

This conclusion manifestly unites the two tables of the prayer, once more presenting the sacred three-number, which could not be varied from. The *kingdom* embraces the first table by that one word which occurs in the middle of it; the *power* signifies the transition which we found in the gift of bread; the *glory* or honor is the end and goal of the fulfillment of the petitions of the second table, the δόξα or glory of God shining from his redeemed and

* Harms, *Das Vaterunser in Predigten.*

† [The author argues as a *theologian*, rather than as a *critic.* The genuineness of this doxology cannot be sustained against the evidence of the MSS. and versions.—Am. Ed.]

sanctified creatures. When all is finally fulfilled, evil, temptation and guilt done away, all desires gratified, the will done, the kingdom come, the name hallowed; then will there remain on earth as in heaven naught but everlasting praise. With this he who prays returns to the first invocation, which included the Amen of all petition for faith, as in the preparatory trusting confidence which said: *Art thou then* our Father? before the particular petition broke forth: *Be so* to us, show thyself to us as our Father! Now again, and with the *fullest* confidence of strengthened faith, it is more openly spoken: *Yea, verily, thou art* our Father! "By this little word *for*, we set as it were, our foot upon one step of the throne, upon which he sits, reminding him of his matter, for it is his, and not ours alone!" *Thine* is, and can and will be in us, too, the kingdom, the power and the glory—will be in us, *if* we in harmony, acknowledgment, and obedience give it to thee, and this we have done in this our *prayer*. So, although we yet see it not (Heb. ii. 8), faith cries in defiance of all evil that yet remains, of all wicked devices and contradictory will: Thine *is* the kingdom even now, as it will be for ever! Thus does the Amen of prayer, every time it is uttered, anticipate *the great universal Amen of all creation*.

After all that we have hitherto discovered, there remains much more. The seven petitions, besides the full meaning of each separately, indicate, at the same time, the progress of *human life* in individual man, and the *history of mankind* as a whole. The child cries out to his Father, and learns his name, that it may be sanctified in him; the kingdom begins to come in him, the will begins to be revealed to him in instruction and discipline, that it may be done; then grows up the adult into life, to eat his own bread, who should not forget, in praying for it, his spiritual necessities—rather should all the more fully discern the gift of God which is infinitely necessary; then follows, commonly, first in the *second* half of life, the thorough seeking for forgiveness, the warfare of temptation; finally in old age the longing, ever-increasing till death, for deliverance from all evil, which is the closing petition of the dying man that emerges into the doxology of heaven. In the history of mankind at large began similarly the calling upon God's name (Gen. iv. 26); then came the kingdom in the beginnings of its preparation, the will was revealed in the law. In the *midst* of the years the Lord revived his work (Hab. iii. 2), when he who once spoke from Sinai came in the glory of his grace, and descended in Christ as the living bread of heaven for the hungering world. Then came the preaching of the word of reconciliation in all the world, then the hour of the great temptation upon all the world (Rev. iii. 10), specially upon the Church of the saints; finally, in the end of days will be the universal, closing deliverance, when suffering and pain and lamentation shall cease, all shall have become the kingdom of our God and the dominion of his Christ, and the glory of his glorifying Spirit shall shine from the redeemed.*

Such views may not be despised, for the wisdom of God exhibits strange phases in the word. We should be disposed, further, to investigate to what extent the fundamental principles of all divine doctrine, especially of New Testament preaching, may be developed from the simple ideas of the Lord's prayer. This would be better apprehended, if we could realize the conception of a people to whom nothing but this prayer had been at first given. Let us be permitted yet once more, and in conclusion, to parallel the *seven petitions* with the *seven benedictions*. The name of the Father is hallowed when the poor and wretched receive as little children the kingdom of heaven as a gift of prevenient grace. The kingdom of the Son, as such, is now made fully known to them, when they as mourners find comfort. The divine will is done already through the Holy Spirit, when the meek know themselves by the will of God to be the heirs of the earth. The bread is given for the supply of all who hunger and thrist after righteousness. The trespasses are forgiven to those who forgive, for the merciful receive mercy. Temptation is overcome by all those, who have no other will than to see God's face, as pure in heart. Evil, finally, is done away, when the children of peace, as children of God made manifest, dwell for ever in eternal peace with him in glory.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT—CONTINUED.

(Matthew vi. 14—vii.)

Verses 14, 15. The Lord recurs now to the subject of the fifth petition, because, as we have already said, the prescribed prayer leads through it to the establishment and fulfillment of the Law. Will theologians never come to read in simplicity, and perceive here a key to the *whole* of it? The *centre* of the Lord's prayer regarded in itself is the fourth petition, as we have seen; but it is in the *fifth* that that fundamental truth, which is its root in the Sermon on the Mount, first finds its full expression. That which in ch. v. 7, 23–26, 44–48, became more and more clearly prominent, and afterwards in ch. vii. 1, 2, is repeated as the head of a new section, stands here, as it were, in the very *middle of the whole discourse*, piercing into and laying hold of the central heart and living source of all true love, disclosing to us that point of union in which "to love as God loves" is seen to be as certainly given to us by his grace as it is demanded of us by his holy righteousness. This saying, which is so perfectly easy in its literal meaning, is at the same time so important and so in-

* Compare Von Meyer's *Blätter für höhere Weisheit*, v. 388.

exhaustibly to be learned anew, that our Lord in Mark xi. 25, 26, when he is speaking of the gift of faith, inserts it again in similar words. But it is also so deeply engraven on the conscience of men, that the son of Sirach, for instance (Wisd. xxviii. 1–5), could expressly say the same thing.* Forgiving on our part is so absolutely an indispensable *condition* of God's forgiveness, that it must not be viewed as the mere fruit which results from it, but rather as indicating the necessary internal disposition and feeling of our heart at the moment in which we actually seek and find his mercy. God forgives us, when we, receiving his mercy, are at the same moment disposed and in the frame to forgive others. Although he, on the one hand, knows before the thoughts of the insincere, and the stiff-neckedness of those who will afterwards fall from his grace (Deut. xxxi. 21, 27, 29), yet, on the other, he says in his preventing and anticipating faithfulness—Surely they are my people, children who will not lie (Isa. lxiii. 8). He intrusts, as it were, the gift of his love even to those who will not retain it, in order that he may justify his own goodness against the unthankful and the evil. From those, indeed, who afterward forgive not as they are forgiven, that which they received shall be again taken away; as the parable of Matt. xviii. 23–35 once more inculcates at large.

Verses 16—18. This has been as a whole already explained and shown in the light of its general connection; it only remains now to refer somewhat more particularly to the details. The Lord by no means rejects *fasting* in itself, the humbling of the soul (עַנּוֹת נֶפֶשׁ, Lev. xvi. 29, xxiii. 27; Num. xxix. 7, xxx. 14) by taming and reducing the body, as an aid to repentance and prayer; any more than he rejects almsgiving as the demonstration of love, or uttered words for the exercise and realization of the inner spirit of prayer. Although in ch. ix. 14, 15, he opposed a new and free manner of fasting for his disciples, to the *fasting oft* not only of the hypocrites, but also of the well-meaning disciples of John; yet did he himself fast forty days at the beginning, as certainly many times afterwards, and recommend prayer and *fasting* for such emergencies as required thorough earnestness for the overcoming of evil spirits (ch. xvii. 21), just as the apostle in 1 Cor. vii. 5 pre-supposes as well known, and confirms, its Christian exercise. The early church laid much stress upon fasting, but should have left it to the freedom of every individual without any ecclesiastical ordinance; we Protestants, alas! have slighted it altogether too much, and have scarcely more than the *name* of our fast-days remaining. The prudence of freedom is necessary, however; hence comes forward the warning again: Not like the *hypocrites!* See it already in the word of prophecy (Isa. lviii. 5). Pharisaism had here also perverted all into a specious external work,* forbidding among the rest any greetings during the time of a fast: with such things in his view the Lord here paints the hypocrites from life, and sketches their whole character by one vigorous trait—They would appear unto men σκυθρωποί, *of a sad countenance*, and therefore disfigure their faces! Such as this in our day is the pietistic sour look, downcast head, and penance-wrinkled face, which, while they mar the shining of the true light of piety before men, also betray too much of the Pharisee remaining in those who make such exhibitions. The Lord unsparingly condemns all *affectation* in its minutest form, and counsels his disciples, in order that they may more securely avoid this sad danger, to adopt as a defence against it, where they have only to do with themselves in the sight of their Father in secret, a certain directly opposite *dissimulation of face.* This, however, is no hypocrisy, but the simplest truth; purer, indeed, in its principle of love than its faint type in the social life of the children of the world, the courtly and gracious external demeanor covering a different disposition within. The children of God should ever through faith rejoice in their God; and it should be their systematic *habitus* to exhibit this pleasant aspect to men. Feelest thou within thyself a necessity and constraint to afflict thy flesh by mortification and abstinence of any kind, do it if possible without any interruption of thine external cheerfulness. Yea, rather than detract in the slightest degree from the reality and the efficacy of thy secret humiliation before God, by any such external evidence of it as but too easily glides into ostentation; thou shouldst with more care than ordinarily *anoint* thine head and wash thy face.† Before trusted brethren thou mayest, even as before God himself, exhibit what thou art secretly aiming at; but *men*, as they are found in general, understand it not, and would only mar thy fasting by their censure or their praise. Finally, let it be well noted, that this rule, in its present connection, is only laid down for an actual, bodily fasting, in the ordinary sense of the word; such as a man himself, though under the influence of the Spirit, imposes upon his own flesh. Quite otherwise is it, when God appoints to us a day of fasting, for the *weeping* of the soul (Psa. lxix. 11, in the Hebr.), when the bridegroom's presence is withdrawn; then we fast in the deepest sense of the word (Matt. ix. 15), and it is obvious of itself, that the stranger in our company must perceive that we are σκυθρωποί (Luke xxiv. 17, in the Greek). In this there lies no danger of hypocritical seeming before men. But if thou hast already oft experienced, that by it he who was

* Yet, indeed, when we look more closely, not without one of those errors in the expression which betray the apocryphal—as if *we* forgive first and *then* should pray.

* See Buxtorfii *Synagoga Judaica*, cap. xxx.

† The Essenes never anointed themselves, which may be mentioned in contradiction of the old folly that would make Jesus an Essene.

taken from thee is restored again, and if thou wilt be perfect, then hold such weeping of thy soul also, through the power of faith, *in secret places* (Jer. xiii. 17), and let not thy countenance cease to be outwardly anointed, or thy mouth to utter peace and love through the whole of that conflict which thou shouldst gradually learn to regard as joy. Thus shalt thou find consolation in thy secret mourning before God, and experience the fulfillment, even in this respect, of the beautiful and pregnant words of the hymn: "A stage of blessedness it is—the secret place!"

"And thy Father, who seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly!" This the Lord utters three times, vers. 4, 6, 18, and designedly indicates in this third instance the similar application of his discourse concerning the three works of righteousness, the uniformity of which the interposed prayer only *seemed* to break. This he does before he begins, by a striking interruption of the external connection, a new line of remark which, however, is internally in strict harmony with it.

Our former general arrangement of the whole has already disclosed to us this internal transition from ver. 18 to ver. 19. The opposition between Christ's disciples and the Pharisees, is closed with that most absolute contrast between the hypocrite who mortifies himself before men and the child of God who humbles his soul in secret—the seeming devotee and the earnestly devout. There now follows (what had been prepared for in the preceding, and was a strict development of it) the second great contrast—*Not like the heathen!* The better kind of Pharisee (or rather the Israelite, inasmuch as Pharisaism took its rise in the true Israelite position), did, indeed, seek at first to establish, like Saul, a righteousness *before God* derived from obedience to the Law; in this there was earnestness and sincerity, and so far this Old Testament preparation led the sincere and upright to the new covenant of grace, even as his almsgiving, fasting, and prayers prepared the proselyte Cornelius for the reception of forgiveness and the Holy Ghost. But *Pharisaism* proper, as it was further developed in the evil hearts of men, performed its works of righteousness only to be seen of men, and *not at all in the sight of God:* thus the Pharisee has inwardly become like the *heathen*, while abhorring him in his pride (Rom. ii. 22); through dependence on earthly good and attachment to earthly pleasure, an idolater as well as he. It will be borne in mind, how often in the Gospels the *covetousness* of the Pharisees is made prominent; and this will help us to understand why it is that with which our Lord begins when he is about to exhibit his own new Israel as in contrast with the heathen. It is not merely the heathen so called among men, who are to form the second link in this present discourse, but also, as is now sufficiently plain, the heathen in Israel (Psa. ix. 5, 15, 17, x. 16).

The discourse now passes more directly to the *internal disposition of mind*, which is at last shown to be the region of separation and distinction. There is now no more distribution of special commandments and good works, classified according to their principles. Yet it proceeds in a *threefold* order, though in a different manner. This is seen in the three leading ideas: Distinguish clearly between perishable treasures and possessions *upon earth*, and the incorruptible treasure of *heaven!* (vers. 19, 20). Seek *this alone*, walk with thine eyes singly fixed upon the true treasure! (vers. 21–23). Thus surrender thyself up to God's *undivided* service and trust, seeking first his kingdom, without care for your earthly need! This has the most extended treatment (vers. 24–34). Herein there is exhibited an *inverted* reference to the three fundamental groundtones of the whole Sermon. The first immediately casts a *warning* glance forward to the test at the end, where all shall be put to shame who have not put their trust in the living God, and all heathens, or *earthly-minded* men (these are in their deepest principle one and the same) shall perish. The second *demands* and urges, a sincere progress towards the goal. The third speaks in language of *promise* and encouragement, presents to faith the internal principle and commencement of a *life not heathen*, and thus most plainly indicates who are the true people of God, who the true heirs of the promised kingdom. But this whole section *carries on* and developes the principle which we have seen in the beginning. For it was absolutely necessary that a firm foundation should be first of all laid, in the right understanding of the Law according to its internal spirit and true meaning; in the full perception that naught would prevail but the strict practice of righteousness before God in secret (Psa. li. 8). Upon this foundation, is now built the *devotion of the heart to God alone*, and then we have further (for the development of the principle makes the principle itself more plain, and at the close the rigorous warning becomes strongest) the most urgent dissuasive from the attempt to join another service with his; the turning away of the heart, and the turning away of the eye from all that appertains to earth, in order to our living for the heavenly kingdom.

Verses 19, 20. A strong contrast is here seized and exhibited in the two words, *earth and heaven.* The Lord is standing in the midst of Israel according to the flesh, and his glance, which penetrates through the *type* into its *reality* and *hidden truth*, discloses to us another and a sure distinction: they who live for the earthly and the perishable, they are the heathen; they who live in faith with reference to the future, heavenly and eternal, are the children of the Father, the subjects and the heirs of the kingdom. In this deep generality, fully set forth at the close in vers. 32,

33, we have the commencement of a new discourse, which unfolds the germ, and includes all the principles of the apostolical sayings in Col. iii. 1–4. It was to his hearers of that time a clear testimony to the character and nature of the Messiah's kingdom, as the *kingdom of heaven*, spiritual, hidden, and looking for a future manifestation; the kingdom which, then only perfected when the seven petitions are fully fulfilled, begins in the heart with the first look towards heaven, and cry to the Father. Now it is before the Father in secret, then will the reward be open. The emphatic expression of this general view is to be rightly sought in the plain words which, for every man's conviction, distinguish between the earthly and the heavenly mind, describing him as *laying up for himself treasures*, possessions, goods, and seeking his enjoyments and happiness either *here* or *there*. In *heaven:* that is, by contrast, as the place and region where the true, eternal riches, the deposit against the day of revelation, are laid up, but also as the place and region, in which the heart that lays up this treasure already lives in heavenly aims and conversation: for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. The better and enduring substance in heaven, we already have in our own possession and in our own hands (Heb. x. 34).

Perishableness is the quality of every thing earthly, hence, as Bengel critically saw, the little word *ὅπου, where*, has a distinctive emphasis as *upon the earth, where* nothing either is or can be other than corruptible. He who heaps up silver as the dust, and prepares raiment as the clay (Job. xxvii. 16), shall find out, that all the earthly and transitory possessions of mortal man pass away as they themselves who dwell in clay, whose foundation is in the dust, which are crushed before the moth (Job. iv. 19). The getting of treasures by a lying tongue is a vanity tossed to and fro of them that seek death (Prov. xxi. 6). The proverbial and popularly used expressions, *moth* and *rust* and *thieves*, men have been disposed to refer to the three main kinds of layed up goods in the ancient world—clothing, gold, corn. They have been referred, also, respectively (as by Braune) to that which is hostile in the inanimate world, in the animal kingdom, and among men; for which, however, a transposition would be necessary. It is only in the former reference that any truth lies; the moth which consumes *garments* is among the Scriptural figures. (See Job xiii. 28; Isa. l. 9, li. 6, 8; James v. 2.) But, as regards the next, the question rises, what *βρῶσις, rust*, is distinctively and to what it appertains. But since gold and silver receive no specific injury from rust, it has been supposed that the thieves (who *διορύσσουσι, dig through* houses [Job. xxiv. 16], breaking through walls) are the enemies of the treasured gold, and consequently that *βρῶσις* must be referred to the granary and full barns (Luke xii. 17), being the אוֹכֵל or "devourer" of Mal. iii. 11 (where the LXX. have *βρῶσις*), *weevil* or some other enemy of the corn. James, however (ch. v. 2, 3), evidently quoting the Sermon on the Mount (as we saw above also, on ch. v. 34), attributes the moth to the garments, but the *rust, ἰός*, to the gold and the silver, having previously used the general expression—"Your gold is cankered" (*ὁ πλοῦτος σέσηπε*). This gives us the right clue, and teaches us that we must not lay so much stress upon the threefold distinction of worldly goods (save that the breaking through may be especially referred to the underground *ἀποθήκας* of ver. 26), as upon the general idea of perishableness which they together convey. *Βρῶσις* is thus simply the *consuming away*, corruption, mildew, rotting of any kind which takes its rise from within the nature of this world's goods, as *σής*, the *moth*, on the other hand comes from without. Then rises before us the deeper meaning—all earthly good is subjected to corruption. It is essentially *perishable*, since either the moth comes upon it as upon a garment (echoing those well known Old Testament passages), or it finds within itself the element of another kind of blight. And what worm and rust consuming from within or without may spare for a while, is still *insecure* in the possession, not guaranteed against the *thieves*, who know how to break through the firmest *defences*. Thus James appropriately laid down his *σέσηπε* first; then he introduces the Lord's words, which he fundamentally explains, while saying in the style of *oxymoron* and in apparent contradiction with the reality of things, that gold and silver are cankered and rusted, by showing that this *rust* signifies in a wide sense that *corruption* of everything earthly and earthen, which like a *fire* shall eat the flesh of the rich men themselves. If we thus expound it, not overlooking the connection of the figure with the reality, yet giving its letter a spiritual interpretation, we may extend its range of application further, and think of honor and human glory (whereof the discourse had been speaking) as having its moth, and rust, and thieves. All this is obliquely aimed at, although the first glance, which gives character to the expressions, turns towards the *Mammon* which is afterwards especially named, and therefore points to earthly treasures in the narrower sense. And how impressive, in this view, is the contrast which is now first instituted between all these and the *imperishable, and secure* treasures of heaven, which are beyond the reach of corruption and the thief! (1 Peter 1–4; Luke xii. 33): *βαλάντια μὴ παλαιούμενα, θησαυρὸν ἀνέκλειπτον, bags that wax not old, a treasure that faileth not.* That first, again, we have *treasures* in the plural, is simply a transition to the next sentence in which it is significantly said —Your *treasure;* for in earthly good there is multiplicity, and variety, the heavenly possession alone and especially is a unity, a great whole (Matt. xix. 21).

Verse 21. What then is, thus considered

treasure in heaven? The future reward from the Father, for this is the whole of vers. 1–18 collected and condensed into one; thus also it is praise, honor, and glory in God's presence, in opposition to all that vain show before man, in which the hypocrites found their reward. That *giving* which was commanded (vers. 2–4), is itself the true *laying up!* So spake, in old time, Sirach and Tobias concerning the fruits of righteousness and good works (Sir. xxix. 14; Tob. iv. 10). We may, moreover, regard this verse under two aspects: Are your treasures upon earth, then will your heart also rest upon the earth. This lies, however, more in the transition from the last sentence than in this passage itself, which dignifies only the heavenly reward and the heavenly good, with the title of treasure, properly so called (Luke xvi. 12, τὸ ὑμέτερον, the true and only property, in distinction from which all other passes away as another's). Alas for those, who become thieves against themselves, to rob themselves of their own eternal and enduring substance! Do not ye so, O men! is the Lord's warning entreaty here. Have ye truly begun to apprehend what and where your true treasure is, then never take away your eyes and your hearts from it again, to turn them upon that which is naught! Ἔσται, *will be*, following ἐστίν, *is*, here, has the force of a contrast, and contains requirement and promise at once in itself, similarly as ἔσεσθε, *ye shall be*, in ch. v. 48. Your treasure *is*, safely laid up, perfectly ready for you, in heaven; *let* then your heart ever more and more perfectly and undividedly be fixed upon it and absorbed with it there! (See the continuation, Luke xi. 35.) Has the kingdom of the eternal inheritance of grace come to you poor, then let your heart, your whole heart, rest *upon it* and upon nothing else with it! That great word *heart* (which in ch. v. 8, 28 was regarded as the seat of holiness or unholiness before God) comes before us now in all the fulness and depth of its Scriptural meaning.* In the heart dwells the individual guiding principle of a man's life; his perception, feeling, and will in their indivisible unity: the heart determines how, for what, and for whom a man is living. Determine and devote your heart towards the measure, the inheritance, the reward of heaven! This most impressive requirement, which in the former part of the sentence (ὁ θησαυρὸς ὑμῶν, *your treasure*) brings with it its own foundation of promise, is in the following two verses more fully established in its principles; in positive encouragement and promise ver. 22, but then ver. 23, in warning contrast, which forms a transition to the subject which follows.

Verses 22, 23. In the heart is the life of the whole body, Prov. iv. 23. But the mediating instrument between the central principle and all-regulating direction of life in the heart, and the outward life of the body, is the *eye*, as it immediately follows in Prov. iv. 25, 26; compare, besides, Prov. xxiii. 26. The body lives and moves according to the guidance of the eye, by its light as a lamp; even as the eye sees according to the desire and impulse of the heart. When Eve beheld the tree, that it was a pleasant tree, the lust after it had already commenced in her heart, and as the result of that, her eye had become a traitor. Hence there might have been interposed between our Lord's former saying and this, the thought—And where your heart is, there does your eye turn also. This is as true with regard to the beginning of every sin, as it is that in its progress, the heart, in return, follows the eye (Job xxxi. 7): the one is tested and known by the other. But such an intervening thought the Lord could scarcely here have more circumstantially expressed; the natural process of his discourse led him, in order to *rivet the awakened attention*, and to excite preparation for his heart-penetrating word, rather to present striking and vivid figures to the mind. First came the very simple saying concerning the treasures in earth and in heaven, the meaning of which would be most obviously apprehended; then followed the equally simple and deeply convincing injunction—If your treasure is in heaven, then let your heart be there also! (which is grounded upon the principle taken for granted, and assented to in every man's breast, that the heart hangs upon that which it reputes its good and happiness.) And now follows the unconnected and emphatic—*The light of the body is the eye.* This indeed is obviously true in external things, but the immediate application which the Lord makes of this to the inner man (he spoke indeed from *the heart*), involves in it profound mystery, which does not instantly yield up its fulness of meaning. Our version has used "*light*" for λύχνος, which signifies the instrument of illumination, as a *lamp* or *candle;* but that does not help the matter, since the Lord presently after interchanges this with φῶς, which means the *light* itself: that translation does no more than carry out the same interweaving of the figure and its meaning which pervades the whole discourse.

The *light* of the world and of each body in it, is, indeed, properly speaking, the sun and its effulgence; but, this shining becomes the light of any individual body, by and in which it may live and move, only through the medium of the eye, formed for the reception of the sun's light. This is its light-organ, not so much here for the purpose of beaming forth light from within (ch. v. 14–16), as for that of *receiving* the light first from above and around, in order that by it the body may be enlightened. Of what avail is the sun to the blind man, the light of day to him who shuts his eyes? Every thing, then depends on the eye, when we speak of light. Even in the bodily eye there lies much mystery, as natural philosophers know full well, to whose researches light is a wonder and an enigma on the confines of the material and the spiritual world;

* Which Beck lately, in his *Bibliechen Seelenlehre*, has plainly assumed.

and so also the interior eye which corresponds to it in the body of the living man, the most perfect mystery of the soul's influence on the mechanical organism.* In the eye also there is an actual inner light which corresponds to the outer: hence its not fully explained glimmering through the material fabric. It is, at the same time, the outshining manifestation of the soul in the body: we read in the eye what no word utters, the hypocrite can only in the least degree, yea, not at all disguise his look; a right confronting glance looks through him. Hence is not this the natural image of the manner in which the inner man is reflected in the outer? The heathens termed the understanding the νοῦς, or *intellect*, the light in men,† as also Solomon more correctly and truly says: "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord, searching all the secret chambers of the inner man" (Prov. xx. 27). In this general sense the expression of Jesus here may well admit of an *application:* If thy understanding receives rightly the truth of God, it will enlighten thee; if thy understanding is unsound, how foolish and ignorant will thy whole being be! Yet we should much mistake in making this our Lord's meaning in its present *connection:* he is speaking, indeed, of the mediating instrument between the heart and the body, or the most internal, fundamental direction of the being and the walk, the life and the deed. Thus the *eye* of the inner man is more correctly that which determines the main scope of the whole section (vers. 19–34), the *practical* understanding, so to speak, which regulates the whole conduct, the fundamental *design* which is kept in view in the most proper sense of the word, what a man *seeks* (vers. 32, 33). The *body*, inasmuch as with hands and feet, and other members it stretches forth, moves, acts and exhibits all the energy of life, is consequently the further figurative expression for the whole *action* of the man. (Just as, according to missionary reports, the same word in the dialect of the Sandwich Islanders, signifies both *body* and *action*.) As thou lookest and towards what object, so will be the act and movement of thy body.

But the Lord, further, with profound discrimination does not say—If thine eye be *open* or *shut:* for this is a point which has nothing to do here with the inner man; and the Lord, as we have already seen, entirely blends together the figure and its meaning in this discourse. The eye may indeed be already, or may be still more, opened in many senses, but here it is not ἁπλοῦς, *single*, that is not sincere, not true, sound, not rightly measuring or seeing, what is in the light visible to it. Seeing is sound, if both eyes (which is also itself a physical wonder and mystery) see together precisely as it is, the one object at once which is before them: hence we say, *the eye*—although we have two eyes. The first note of unsoundness in the eye is the seeing double, or looking athwart (ver. 24), and that leads to blindness. "If we see in singleness, the soul is light; if we double see, we lose our sight." Ah! well it is said—"Sacred simplicity, wondrous grace! Not soon is this perfected in us. Alas! much is required to this, and long, long do we sometimes wait before this is reached!" Ver. 22 contains a description of the goal towards which we must struggle, and not merely a condition and requirements insisted on at the outset. In a certain sense and measure, indeed, must our eye singly, from the very beginning, be fixed upon God, his kingdom, and righteousness, upon the treasure in heaven; but is it not consummate holiness when this is perfectly realized, and there is no oblique or other regard? Yea, by such simplicity of the eye shall the whole body be φωτεινόν, *full of light*, that is not merely enlightened, in the true light rightly living and moving (John xi. 9); but in its inner meaning—illuminated, glorified, all its actions sanctified in the light of God's truth (which is very emphatically expressed in a supplementary manner by Luke xi. 36). Hence, finally, the otherwise dark mass of the body shall in this glorification become all eye. Thus again the ἔσται, *shall be*, is here as in ver. 21. And on the other hand: if thine eye sees altogether falsely, thy whole body *shall be* full of darkness. The Lord sets the extremes in contrast, as they are consummated in perfection, on the one hand, and in entire *blindness of heart* (πώρωσις τῆς καρδίας, Eph. iv. 18: Rom. i. 21) on the other; in order that he may exhort us urgently to seek the one, and warn us against the other; in order to point out to us the way, in which our eye should ever be becoming *more and more single*.

He once more speaks of the eye as the light of the body, in order to indicate the peculiar significance of the image in regard to man's nature generally—*The light that is in thee*, that which should be thy light, indeed in some degree ever is so, that is, in the ordinary, general condition of mankind, before it has become totally darkened. This is not said to the new-born child of God from the beginning of his state of grace (Acts xxvi. 18), but actually in a certain sense to the natural man. For "the natural light extends just so far as to reveal the natural darkness." Even the unconverted has some degree of sincere respect to everlasting good, and regard for that which avails before God; just as the converted man long retains some degree of unsoundness and obliquity in his eye. But if thine eye is *entirely* (this must be our Lord's meaning) πονηρός, *evil*, the light in thee become utter *darkness:* then indeed is the whole body dark, as much so as if thou never hadst an eye, as if it were wholly shut: yea, rather worse than

* Hence recently Hanne (*Vorhöfe zum Glauben*, etc.,) points his rigorously convincing application of the peinciple of *life* in organism, to the formation of the eye in the fœtus.

† Aristotle: "As sight in the eye, so the intellect in the soul." Galen: "Just as the eye in the body, such the intellect in the soul." Philo: "For what the intellect is in the soul, that the eye is in the body." See in Grotius.

that, in the case thou thinkest that thou seest, and reckonest thy darkness for light! Then wilt thou by all means and always err, and go astray, confounding far and near, good and evil life and death, and thus grope thy way into the abyss! Once more we have a mournful *oxymoron:* the light become darkness, just as in ch. v. 13 the salt becomes saltless, to which saying this seems as it were a supplement. This is the condition of *heathenism* at the worst; alas! also of many apostates, who, not advancing in singleness of internal eye, have lapsed through impurity into the opposite ruin. Of this the Lord cries in language of lamentation and terror: *Τὸ σκότος πόσον, How great is that darkness!* what a total darkness of the whole body, if its light becomes darkness! In this there lies yet another specific thought which Luther's "the darkness itself" (after the Vulg.), aptly brings out. *Τὸ σκότος, that darkness,* (with the article) is opposed to *τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοί, the light that is in thee;* and the Lord distinguishes two parts of human nature, which he terms light (at least relatively so), and darkness. As the body viewed as a mass dark in itself, has yet its light in the eye, just so is it with the corresponding sensual animal life of man, which eats and drinks, receives pleasure and disgust in close connection with the lower creation. This dark dominion of the life of man sunk into gross matter, into the *flesh*, may itself, through the seeking after righteousness, through spiritual aims, become spiritualized, illumined, sanctified. But if this light is darkness, how great must then the entire darkness of the sensual life become. Compare such passages as 2 Pet. ii. 12; Jude 10, 19.

It remains that we endeavor to lay hold of the point of connection and transition between this word of warning against total darkness, and what follows in ver. 24. We find it in a partial application of the rigorous word which we have just read, and it is expressed in Luther's translation "ein Schalk," *roguish*, which, however, softens the full and proper meaning of *πονηρός, evil.* We cannot regard the Lord as having designed in his rigid contrast vers. 22, 23, to teach, contrary to all experience, that by an unconditional alternative man must live altogether in light or altogether in darkness, that the eye must be either quite sound or quite evil. It is his design rather to excite men by that contrast to earnest striving after the one, and diligent defence against the other. He proceeds, indeed, to lay down another equally definite and rigid alternative, and testifies: No man *can* serve two masters. But literally true as this must ever be for every individual moment of our internal disposition of mind, and of the action which flows from it and is estimated by it, as well as for the final distinction in the judgment; yet we also know full well that we all are too long tainted with this double-service and doubleness of aim. Thus the expression in ver. 23, standing in manifest connection with ver. 24, likewise includes in itself such a mournful, twilight middle-state, though it only indicates the frightful end of such a state if it be continued in, or, since that is *impossible*, if the by-service of Mammon, instead of being struggled against and given up, issues in entire apostasy from God. He recommends to us, in this manner, the simplicity of the inner eye, and urges us most impressively to an even more and more decided *decision;* not designing to condemn and frighten us back on account of our shortcoming, but graciously and mercifully to pluck us out of a state of wavering and halting between two sides. Such words must *often* be received, and are ever exerting new influence: all is not ended with the first declaration of the great alternative, though it must be uttered every time as if it were so. This is the nature of the word of exhortation which our necessities require.

Give up yourselves then in pure and undivided surrender, with the devotion and trust of your whole heart, to your Lord and God, to your Father in heaven, who promises *to give* you the kingdom and its righteousness, as the food and raiment of your new and inner man. As he gives, so also he exacts. Empty yourselves, and he will fill you (Psa. lxxxi. 10, 11). The fundamental promise—I am the Lord thy God! bears with it the fundamental command —None other shalt thou serve! Neither *can* this be otherwise, whether in respect to God or to man: the majesty of God, which will not tolerate any rival near him, demands the whole heart as its due; and again the need and the desire of the human heart can only find satisfaction in the simplicity and purity of dependence upon the highest, perfect, and only Good. This section (vers. 24–34) which as part of the greater one beginning with ver. 19, has in it the emphatic tone of *requirement*, will nevertheless, as we saw above, lead us back to that of promise, and set forth the *first* commandment of the *first* table in the spirit in which it was given to Israel—*Thou shalt not!* but based upon the foundation of that redeeming, condescending, prevenient—*I am he* (just as we saw in our earlier expositions of the individual commandments of the second table). Again we perceive a threefold division in the discourse which thus leads back towards the promise. First is the commandment itself in the testing, *warning* expression of its exclusiveness; but even here the—"Ye *shall* not" assumes the gracious form of—"Ye *cannot.*" However dexterously, and with whatever subtilty ye may act on the persuasion which you may reach, that God will tolerate somewhat *beside* him, on which the heart may hang and which the life may serve—it must ever remain a thing impossible. *Idolatry*, which Pharisaical Israel abhorred in its external forms, is shown to be present in their hearts. The service of *Mammon*, in other

words, is the most universal note of true and proper heathenism, and that service is nothing else than the devotion to *earthly good* and *earthly enjoyment*.* Then follows a transitional paragraph, which enters more into the spirit and detail of this, for the *poor* to whom the Gospel is now especially preached: Take no thought for life and the body (vers. 25–30). Thus the language of *requirement* leads on to that of encouraging *promise*, which assumes its full tone in the concluding words (vers. 31–34).

Verse 24 contains a fundamental declaration, which is as deeply rooted in the context here, as it is again at Luke xvi. 13, where the Lord repeats it after a parable concerning the children of the world who live for the earth, and the children of light who care for and live for the eternal, with application to the covetous Pharisees. In this passage we have the basis of all our catechetical instruction on the first commandment. Comp. Col. iii. 5 (there as here it is after the general distinction laid down in vers. 1–4). Matthew has prudently left מָמוֹן or מָמוֹנָא, *Mammon*, untranslated; a word of obscure derivation in the later Jewish language, which is not found in the pure Hebrew of the Old Testament, but is used in the Targums for בֻּצִּע, *lucre*, כֹּפֶר, *ransom*, שֹׁחַד, *gift*, הוֹן, *wealth*, equivalent to riches, possessions, money. When our catechists tell our children that the name was derived from a Syrian god of riches, they say what is not historically true indeed, but would have an appropriate sense; for *the Lord* designedly makes the word *the name of an Idol*, giving it a personality in contradistinction to God, in order that his words to the hypocritical Pharisees might have this force: Ye are verily idolaters, ye serve another besides God—will ye hear his name? It is *Mammon!* And as the truth and justification of this personification, there lies in its back-ground an allusion to the Prince and God of this world, the false god who is concealed in the enticements and deceitfulness of the creature. בְּלִיַּעַל, *Belial*, has a similar allusion in the Old Testament. The discourse very strikingly begins with a simple proverb, which is exalted to its most elevated meaning, that the wisdom of the sanctuary may be illustrated and confirmed by the wisdom of the street. Whether men may ever be obliged or be able to serve many masters at once, is not the question *here*. That proverb, universally used where the true devotion of the whole service is meant, finds here its highest truth. (The Chinese even have their sayings: Lay not two saddles on one horse; A true subject serves not two sovereigns; A virtuous woman takes not a second husband.) Here that which is taken for granted as an essential truth, admitted in the proverbs of all, is urged in its highest application; viz., that individual actions flow from the *character*, from the inner *disposition of mind* of the entire man, and receive *from that* their value as actions. Hence there is no such thing as an undefined "freedom" of determination by which a man may turn now to the right, now to the left, or *could* depend upon and serve at one time this master and at another time that.* An emphasis of deepest meaning is in *master* and *serve;* but the *two* following sentences of alternative are by no means tautological, nor is the distinction between them, properly speaking, to be sought in the advancement from loving to holding to, from hating to despising (which is only an explanation of the former, by a deeper disclosure and more convincing enforcement of its meaning in the latter); but in the alternative itself, which indicates, by the transposition of the two expressions, a changing of the persons served. Either at any one time, in one course of conduct and action, in one performance of service to hate God and love Mammon, or at another time again, to hold to God and despise Mammom. This gives us, without affecting the permanent, inmost condition of the heart generally, a *softened* sense of the word to suit the exhortation which follows, to the people, the children of God: Ye are not like the Gentiles! This is the exhortation to those who halt between two opinions (1 Kings xviii. 21; 2 Cor. vi. 14). Here we have the deep significance of עַל-פָּנַי, *before me*, in the first commandment, literally, "*over and above me.*" For every thing *out of* God is a "besides me" which he will not tolerate in his presence—yet finds he much of that idolatry even among those who address him with Our Father.

Verses 25—30. After such severity the discourse now turns to a most gracious appeal: Act not thus, for your God and Father is essentially enough for you, and will give you all you need! This exhortation, which convinces and puts to shame, stands first (ver. 25). Then follows the proof of the Father's care of his children's earthly need, derived from his providential care, as their Creator, for the lower animals around us; just as in ch. v. 45 his love was proved from his general benefits in nature. This is shown according to the order of the two leading words—*soul and body*, where the soul in the body signifies, according to the correct language of old times, which did not give it two meanings, the sensitive, earthly *life* in the body.† Verses 26, 27 treat of the

* "The fundamental characteristic of heathenism is the living for the present." Tholuck quotes this expression of that great heathen in Christendom, Göthe, but without noting how beautifully it illustrates our Lord's sermon at this place.

*. Compare Jul Müller. *The Christian Doctrine of Sin* (in Clark's *Foreign Theological Library*).

† That is, according to the natural language of the sensualist, which the Lord adopts; as if the soul were not much *more* besides, as if to care for the soul must not necessarily lead to the caring for the higher life, the ζωὴ ψυχῆς or *life of the soul.*

life and its *nourishment* (Psa. lxxviii. 18, אֹכֶל לְנַפְשָׁם, "meat for their lust," lit. *food for their soul*); verses 28, 29, of the *body* and its clothing. Whence we directly gather the only true signification of ver. 27, according to its necessary connection, in opposition to a false reading which has closely adhered to it.

Thus is this the plainest and most popular part of the Sermon on the Mount, just where it goes into the depth of the heart: there is endless matter of preaching here, but little of exposition. Once more we hear the lawgiver's emphatic—*I say unto you!* of former sections, which seems, as it were, to have its faint echo in ver. 29. It is not found again, not even at ch. vii. 12, where the exposition of the Law is closed in one final sentence, still less at ch. vii. 7, where the decisive concluding promise is given—it is reserved in this discourse to mark the requirements of his laws as he teaches them. I say unto *you*—that is, to the disciples of the Lord, the children of the Father, with all, who by his instruction, would become so. *Nourishment*, τροφή (all that is included in eating and drinking together), and *raiment*—the two main necessities for the life and the body; see Gen. xxviii. 20; (so that it almost seems a redundancy, if the apostle, 1 Tim. vi. 8, includes in his σκεπάσματα, *covering*, the shelter of a dwelling, as well as the defence of raiment.) Any one who is disposed to look for its inner meaning, may understand without exposition what the *thought* is, which is forbidden; inasmuch as it *divides* and distracts the soul (as μεριμνᾶν etymologically shows), while thought and prevision without care are not forbidden. The best interpretation of it is found at Luke xii. 29: μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε, let not yourselves be restless, driven, wavering hither and thither. There it is the antithesis to the soul's rest, here the contrast is with the soul's unity of aim, for only in unity is rest.* Just as evident and convincing is the sense of the two question-positions: Will he who gave life and body as the greater gift, keep back the food and clothing which those gifts need?

The birds of heaven, the flowers of the field—how simple, how beautiful this contemplation of nature, as Adam before the fall beheld it in Paradise! A single eye thus beholds the creature as bearing evidence of its God; the evil-eye, on the contrary, perverts all it sees to its own lust. Bird and flowers agree together harmoniously, though they are distributed between heaven and earth. The birds of the *heaven*, עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם, often referred to as such from Gen. i. 30 downwards, unsubjected and free (like the flowers of the *field*), for whom no man generally cares, in their pure life and song have more affinity with heaven than the flowers, point more directly than they, *above*. Sowing, reaping, gathering into barns: the three main points of *husbandry*, which is to man in a state of nature the immediately appointed *labor* (Psa. civ. 23, עֲבֹדָה, "work," as also Neh. x. 38; 1 Chron. xxvii. 26). The fowls of the air are not *like you:* in which words, to avert all misunderstanding and perversion, labor for man is manifestly enough confirmed as his lot. *Your*—not the Father of the fowl: which forms a transition to the question that follows—Are not ye, even as men, as the lords and laborers of the earth, especially as children of the Father, much *better* than they? Toil then according to your human dignity; be not, however, contrary to that dignity, subject to care, but know, that without the gift of God all that you can do is in vain. Of what avail would food be without the life? Do ye suppose that man lives of bread, if he have enough of it, and that he will live longer for the forethought that he takes? As God gave you life at the beginning, must not he also, in whose hands your breath is, preserve it to you by his care? Is it in your power, with all your forethought, to *live one moment longer than God wills?* Thus verse 27 fits well here, and connects itself with verse 26 concerning the nourishment of the *life;* verses 28, 29 proceeding with the clothing of the *body*. This decides the meaning of ἡλικία, which certainly here means *length of life*, as in John ix. 21, 23; Heb. xi. 11;* not the body's "*stature*," as only in Luke xix. 3. (For at Luke ii. 52; Eph. iv. 73, stature and life are comprised in one.) The common translation introduces something altogether inappropriate, and even monstrous into the plain, well-arranged discourse of our Lord; so that one is tempted to ask in reply to it—Whoever took thought about such a thing as that, to add a cubit to his stature? To change the color of the hair (ch. v. 36), or, at most, to think of growing an inch, would be another matter. The stature of the body is altogether unsuitable to the meaning in Luke xii., for in the supplementary explanation the addition wished to the ἡλικία is termed ἐλάχιστον, *least*, though to add a cubit is so monstrous, in

* The common interpretation, which Luther also adopts, is false; viz., that proud exhaltation, presumption is intended, as 2 Macc. v. 17. The idea of restless tossing is not only found in Wisd. xxvi. 9, ἐν μετεωρισμοῖς ὀφθαλμῶν, *by ogling eyes*, but also among profane authors, *e. g.* Thuc. lib. 2. μετέωρος ἦν ἡ Ἑλλας, *Greece was in a troubled state.*

* Theophylact, in his time, on Luke xii. has rightly: ζωῆς μέτρα παρὰ μονῷ θεῷ, καὶ οὐκ αὐτός τις ἕκαστος ἑαυτῷ ὁριστὴς τῆς ζωῆς, *the measure of life is with God alone, nor is any individual the determiner of his own life.* Many exegetical writers have always been of the same mind, and among our more recent practical expositors, Von Gerlach, Richter, Braune, whom Alford has not reckoned. Lange is disposed to mediate between the two opinions by ingeniously uniting them both into one: ἡλικία neither age simply, nor stature simply, but "the full unfolding of every individual in *every* respect according to its capacity—the mature manifestation of itself in general." We much doubt if this popular gnomic saying will admit of so deep a meaning.

the proportion of human stature, that it is a very rare thing for a fool to lift his wish so high. The Lord must be supposed to signify some *common* matter of care to the children of men, and what is more frequent than the vain wish of the dying to protract their lives, at least a little longer. Is it thought that *life* should have come after cubit? our answer is, that it is omitted just as *distance* in John xxi. 8; and in this most natural image πῆχυν ἕνα, *one cubit*, stands as if we should say—a few paces, a span longer—and as in Psa. xxxix. 6, a handbreadth.*

And *now first*, as the newly commencing *and* indicates, the discourse turns to the *body*, to which the ingenious structure and growth of the flowers correspond, and to which the clothing belongs. Καταμάθετε, *learn*, this second time is stronger than ἐμβλέψατε, *behold*; look attentively, study diligently! No species of fowl was mentioned (as at Luke xii. the ravens, and Matt. x. the sparrows), but now the emphasis is more specific—the *lilies*, which name, proverbial already in the Old Testament, embraced many kinds of white and colored flowers, and was specially connected with the crown imperial. Lilies *of the field* (not of the garden), growing of themselves, innumerable as the birds of heaven, like the *grass* (to which they belong, ver. 30), little regarded, blooming but a brief space, presently withered away and burned. For that reason overlook them not. See how they grow up without your aid to their slender height! They *toil* not. Agriculture was referred to before, as the fundamental toil of men; now a glance is cast upon that further toil of man in *art*, which provides for itself out of the material of nature.† Further, there lies in the words *toiling* and *spinning* a reference to men and women respectively;‡ the former (κοπιᾶν) is rather every kind of energy put forth in acquisition, the latter (νήθειν) naturally has a specific reference to clothing. The lilies have leaves and texture so finely spun, as no human cunning can counterfeit; and yet they spin it not in human fashion, but are clothed therewith by God. In the *growing* spoken of previously, there is hinted a question concerning the body corresponding to that in ver. 27 concerning the age: Who among you can by any care or effort of personal will grow a fingerbreadth higher! Not the slightest stalk can man raise up!

But this is passed over unsaid, in order that the words may go on to rebuke the vanity of man, who makes out of his clothing, which is, properly speaking, the mere modest covering of his nakedness, matter of personal ostentation. *Solomon's glory* was in the Israelitish proverbial language the ideal of magnificence in apparel; but why is this not like the beauty of the lilies? The Lord leads us by the last λέγω ὑμῖν, *I say unto you*, to a profound thought which we must not fail to discern in it: the flowers *grow* directly with their essentially connate, not merely put on and *invested*, clothing (περιεβάλετο, *arrayed*, is in slight contrast with ἀμφιέννυσιν, *clothe*); this is the beauty of nature and innocence, which in the slightest object shows more beautiful than the most magnificent array, that must be fastened on. "Thy lily belongs to the paradise of God, Solomon's glory to the hothouse of art" (Kleuker). O that men would understand what is signified in this! O that they would learn from the flowers, the beauty of growing silently, by the internal law of their nature operating through God's gifts and power, up into a full preparation for that blooming in future glory, which is set before us as the goal of our glorification!

When man is once more elevated by the words πολλῷ μᾶλλον, *much more*, above the grass and flowers of the field, which to-day *are* and to-morrow are cast withered into the oven, we discern in this a sublime appeal to faith, inasmuch as, to all appearance, man's sensitive, earthly life is *just on a level with* the withering grass. The Lord literally refers to Psa. xc. 6. And here he makes the transition to the full *assurance and promise* of eternal life in the kingdom of God, by that henceforward oft-recurring, and graciously admonitory—*O ye of little faith!* קְטַן אֱמוּנָה or אֱמָנָה, *little of faith*, was also an expression of the Rabbies,* but what power and significance it assumes in the mouth of our Lord, requiring only *faith* and yet again *faith*, great faith, large and wide as the grace and goodness of God himself! Here this once in the Sermon on the Mount does the Lord *touch lightly* that great word, and that in the right place and with deep earnestness.

The end leads us back to the beginning, in order to embody in most clear and simple expression the whole of what has been meant from ver. 24, nay from ver. 19. The commandment is once more repeated, but now most plainly: Seek ye obediently, undistractedly and *trustfully* the kingdom of God! Trustful for what? The general and inviting *promise* is given of the supply of all earthly need, as being necessarily included in and added to the promise of the free gift of the kingdom of heaven. The contrast with the heathen or

* In Stobæus (xcviii. 13), from Mimnermus: πῆχυιον ἐπὶ χρόνον, *for an ell long time*; in Alcæus (Athen. x. 7): δάκτυλος ἁμέρα, *a finger-length day*.

† By spinning men *supply* what the field may not give—Hamann writes his pithy application to his friend Herder about his winter-study: that he would take in the summer, and repair by *spinning* what he may not have been able to get by sowing and reaping.

‡ With far greater propriety may vers. 26, 27 be attributed to the men, who till the field for the sustenance of the household; and vers. 28, 29 to the women, who particularly provide for the clothing.

* *Eg.* Rabbi Elieser the great: He who has a morsel of bread in his basket, and asks—"What shall I eat to-morrow?" is one of the men of little faith.

Gentiles, which has been contained in this whole part of the discourse, is now fully expressed; but we find it at the conclusion, not as in the contrast with the *Pharisees* (ch. v. 20), where *their* description came first. For the Pharisees, so terming themselves, were visibly before his hearers; but the internal heathenism of the heart must first be detected and disclosed. Here again, as always, we have *three* positions. The first reiterating at the conclusion: Therefore *take no thought*, for thus do the Gentiles! The second: For ye are God's children, his people, the chosen heirs of his kingdom! The third, once more: *Take therefore no thought!* Yet with a weighty qualifying reference, appended to the promise, to the indispensable and wholesome necessities of every-day life even in the case of the children of God.

Verses 31, 32. The οὖν is not simply such a *therefore* as we had in ver. 25 (διὰ τοῦτο), but it is a very emphatic *deduction*. Else this is a repetition of ver. 25, with a strengthening addition of *saying* to taking thought;* and this is connected with the saying—For after all those things do the Gentiles seek; which has a very comprehensive reference. For it means first, that in God's presence there is such a distinction: Ye are not as the Gentiles! Then, with reproachful test, reversing the words—Who seek after these things are Gentiles: therefore, should ye not be like them! Will ye then retain heathenism in your hearts? Finally, it is a gracious exhortation, which becomes a permission: Leave all such care to the Gentiles, who have no Father in heaven; who know not, that they have a Father! *For your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things;* an intenser repetition of what had been preparatorily uttered in ver. 8, following ver. 7. The stress of emphasis falls upon the *knoweth:* Ye have *a living* God, *who knoweth!* But in addition to his knowing, his willingness is already secured in the name of Father; so that we may say, every single word in the whole sentence utters a ground of assurance and strong consolation.

Verse 33. This is the middle one of the three great fundamental laws of the Sermon on the Mount. The first (ch. v. 48), pointed up to the *Father* of love in heaven. This second bears witness to, and assures us of the descent of heaven to earth in that *kingdom*, which is already come, and is open to violent entrance. But it adjoins the condition of *seeking* in order to the laying hold of the treasure held forth (Phil. iii. 13, 14), namely, through the *righteousness* of God which alone avails in his kingdom, the actual having and performing of which remains ever the straight gate of entrance to it. This paves the way for the *third* great law (ch. vii. 12). Let us observe and weigh well the retrospective view, comprehensive and concentrated, which is taken from this vantage point of the discourse! The *kingdom and righteousness* together remind us of the petitions, ver. 10. The *kingdom* of God embraces the entire introductory ch. v. 3–20, where at first the kingdom of heaven came down to the poor and remained at last only righteousness. God's *righteousness*—comprehends all from ch. v. 21 to ch. vi. 18, with especial reference to ch. v. 48 and ch. vi. 1. For ch. v. 48 closed the first part ("Not like the Pharisees") by way of anticipation just at the point where the induction of the commandments ceased; and found in the following chapter only its further development: Before the Father in secret.

It has been made matter of wonder that the Lord only says "*first*" and not "*alone*"—exclusively. He says, indeed, elsewhere—One thing is needful; and in its profoundest principle this πρῶτον, *first*, is also a μόνον, *alone*, But here we discern a certain softening of his gracious utterance at the outset; experience will bring out its rigorous strictness afterwards. Only begin to seek the kingdom of God *first;* and ever let it be first! If thou hast ever thought in thy heart that when thou art fully furnished with this, every thing else will be superadded, it will become evident to thee in due course that thou canst never be thus fully furnished. This one great concern will so fill up the heart, that no room will be left for aught else. The righteousness of *God* is to be understood here strictly according to its subsequent Pauline use, as indicating both that which he requires and which alone avails before him; and also that which he *imparts*, since he himself feeds us with the establishment of his will in us, as with the true bread (ver. 11; Rom. xiv. 17).* In Luke's repetition of the discourse (ch. xii.), the express promise is connected therewith: Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure *to give you* the kingdom—with the righteousness which appertains thereto. Which promise is here included in meaning and probably, as Matthew does not record absolutely every particular, might have been uttered by our Lord on this first occasion also. Is not this heavenly *feeding* more than the earthly, even as much so as the true, eternal life of the soul is more than that of sense? Is not this *clothing* of the inner man more than the covering of the mere body? Consequently, further, in the highest application of the former conclusion: Will he who gives you the eternal good, suffer you to lack that which is tempo-

* The Lord forbids two things: taking thought—and then saying, giving open utterance to the same; because the taking thought weighs down and dispirits the heart of one only, but the saying infects others also with despondency (Zeller, *Monatsblatt*). Or is *saying* here only a Hebraism for *thinking?*

* Thus much, at least, as Roos remarks, is now clear, that man must not make for himself a righteousness, but by hunger and thirst *seek* it; and that such a righteousness as will cause him to be reputed, not only by the council-chamber of his city, but by his God, a righteous man.

ral? Faith answers this—*Προστεθήσεται, it shall be added.** It is only the wantonly presumptuous who, in mockery of God, would reap without sowing; and seeking first the perishable riches of earth, fondly imagines that the eternal good will be added to him over and above.

Verse 34. This closes once more with the original word (ver. 25). All undue care goes over the immediate present into the future; but we can only be said to be assured of *this day* (ver. 11) in this uncertain life, and for *to-morrow* have so little to care, that it is not included in our prayers. That applies even to the spiritual life: be only every day faithful, obedient and righteous, no more is wanting. How much more for the earthly life, as the daily manna in the wilderness daily sent foreshadowed. You might lose the very last day of your time of grace, taking anxious thought about a morrow that is not to be yours. If the morrow comes, it will provide for its own. Are we to understand that God, who sends the day and all that it bears with it, arranges all things rightly and forgets not one of its necessities? This is in part the meaning, but the words go further and are still stronger: Let *the morrow* care! Further does not the Lord refer to a *care* of every day as it passes, and with the same expression (*μεριμνήσει*) which has hitherto denoted the forbidden anxiety? Assuredly, and this forms the transition to the final saying, containing allusion to that necessity of human life which, for sin's sake, even the heirs of the kingdom will not shake off till the days have reached their end. The word is thrown out, as it were, enigmatically, as we here find it; probably the Lord added some further elucidation and development of it. We catch its meaning in all its depth, with the progress of the inner life. *Κακία*, "*evil*," is in general just what *τὸ πονηρόν, the evil*, is in the seventh petition, and serves for its interpretation; the evil and the trials of life upon earth, the ills and infirmities of the body in the flesh, all troubles external and from within. So that this evil must be taken into the account with the daily bread of the body and the soul, and is equally with that your *need*, better known as such to your heavenly Father than to you, and may in no case be put away by taking thought! Be not so foolish as to double and multiply your plague and disquietude; every day's evil is *enough* for itself; will you add to it that of to-morrow, and the third day, and yet further? But the more fully we learn to cast away that *μεριμνᾶν*, "*taking* [*anxious*] *thought*," for earthly things which is conceded to the weakness of *to-day*, and give up all disquietude about all that pertains to eating and drinking and clothing, health and sickness, and all things bodily and of earth—so much the more does it become impressed upon us that there is a deeper, unexplored meaning yet in the Lord's utterance. That very seeking God's kingdom and righteousness, that ever-new devotion and sacrifice of the will to an entire obedience, must be to the children of God, while they live in the flesh and in the world, the trial of every day, the daily cross of self-denial (Luke ix. 23). With this we are *content;* we would not presumptuously burden ourselves beyond the will of our Father in heaven, nor throw off any of his load. This is the perfect spirit that should be aimed at by all who are pilgrims to the kingdom, till they finally enter it (Acts xiv. 22).

Ch. vi. 19 showed an apparent break in the discourse without any expressed connection, and this is much more the case with the beginning of the seventh chapter. It appears, indeed, as if down to the fourteenth verse, it was composed of successive, unconnected fragments; and hence many, who are incapable of tracing the mind of the Spirit and of supplying what is left to be understood, are rash enough to say that all connection is here entirely lost, and that the Evangelist has undoubtedly only strung together the sayings of various times. Yet as the connection has not hitherto eluded us, we shall find it still even to the end. Let our preliminary view be brought to mind, which laid it down that after the two contrasts—Not like the Pharisees · Not like the heathen! were exhibited there followed a third, viz., Not like those of *my disciples*, and those of God's children, impure and imperfect, who instead of carrying on in their own inner life the pursuit of God's kingdom and righteousness, and regulating their outer life in accordance with that pursuit, fall back into that Pharisaism again, the roots of which were not eradicated, and thus either unrighteously judge or improperly proselyte others! Is not this the last and most stiff-necked Pharisee remaining yet in the Christian man? Yet let it be observed whether the statement (vers. 1–6) concerning censoriousness and desecration of that which is holy, does not perfectly adapt itself to the natural progress according to which the delineation of the perfect righteousness of a disciple of Christ is yet to be completed. Are they not half-disciples (we know not how better to term them), who act thus in a manner against which the Lord warns, and who thus are in

* What Braune advances is superficially correct, but goes not to the depth: "How is that? Quite naturally. For they who seek the kingdom and the righteousness of God, are not careless, thriftless, idle, spendthrift people," &c. Certainly, but the meaning goes far beyond that labor, and thrift, and economy which save God's people from want. An apocryphal saying of our Lord extracts its meaning more fully: *Αἰτεῖτε τὰ μεγάλα, καὶ τὰ μικρὰ ὑμῖν προστεθήσεται. καὶ αἰτεῖτε τὰ ἐπουράνια, καὶ τὰ ἐπίγεια προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν—Ask the great things, and the little things shall be added unto you; and ask the heavenly things, and the earthly things shall be added unto you.*

danger of relapsing into mere hypocrites, mere *Pharisee-Christians?* And does not the law of Christ for his own people rise into its most rigorous and *restricting* expression, in these *warnings* which follow, in harmony with the internal progression of the Sermon on the Mount in its dealing with the needs of man's life?

We must look closer, that our observation may be both developed and confirmed. The *goal of discipleship* which, as we advance towards it, rises ever higher before us, is after all that has been said, no other than the perfect righteousness of *pure and unselfish love*, as it will be announced in ver. 12. This goal of *pure* love is now indicated by means of two warning opposites; it is love as *humble* as it is *wise* (vers. 1–6). These together form the first part of the section. And as to the *way*, or rather the ever-repeated beginning, by which this goal is to be reached—what is it, as we have already seen, but *prayer* to God for his grace to that end? This is, therefore, rightly the *second* part (vers. 7–11). And what may and must be the *third* (for every where we find triplicity), but the condensed compendium of the whole great middle portion of the Sermon, containing all that is made obligatory for fulfilling the law, as we find it in the last all-comprehensive *requirement: Therefore walk in this way to reach that goal!* which is the actual and literal meaning of vers. 12–14? Let this be pondered well, and it will be found that it is not an imposition of ours upon the text, but an exposition of it.*

That the Lord's requirements should now be indicated by *warning contrasts*, we have more and more prepared for since ver. 19, and indeed it naturally corresponds with the character of the close as containing the rigorous exclusion of all the impure and imperfect. Thus through the opposite error is first discriminated that *pure love*, in virtue of which *every* disciple of Christ is according to his capacity to become a peacemaker, a witness of the truth and ambassador of the kingdom (ch. v. 9, 13). This is first exhibited as an altogether *humble* love for the salvation of others, *after and in connection with a thorough judgment of self.* We should assuredly judge, but only for others' benefit, from a principle of love, not in the spirit of condemnation, and never forget ourselves in the same regard. Whether we can do this in general is first of all and most rigorously to be tested and proved *within the circle of discipleship:* hence the mirror is here held up for the relation of *brothers* to one another in a more restricted sense. First, the fundamental principle itself, expressed almost as an absolute *prohibition*, yet with some slight recognition of the opposite and not excluded duty of the disciples—Judge not! (ver. 1.) Then follows the ground and confirmation of this warning, which at the same time encourages us to mete with the right measure, that of mercy (ch. v. 7), and thus to the judgment of charity, which tends to amendment, like that of God's mercy. In ver. 2 this prohibition or command is yet more clearly placed upon its true foundation, in the intuitively *convincing explanation* of ver. 3–5, which presses home with *thou* instead of *ye*. Here again we have *warning* first, then *requirement*. The warning (against judging without humble charity) puts two keen *questions:* Is not the principle of such censoriousness, that thou forgettest to judge thyself? (ver. 3.) Comes not hence the *utterance* of it, thy proud and presumptuous *saying*—Let me pull out? (ver. 4.) May we not then point out and correct a brother's fault? Certainly, but only after and with a searching judgment of ourselves. Thus there now follows the *requirement* of a true exercise of our brotherly obligation, the *pulling out the mote* (John xiii. 14), not merely the seeing it; with the necessary *title* to do so added: First judge thyself; *after that* with *wisdom*—look well, how thou *pullest it out!* (ver. 5.) Here we may narrowly observe the transition which is interwoven in these words, to the following remarks concerning the *wisdom* of charity.

The Lord's discourse suddenly turns from the most *internal principle* of the sincerely seeking, faithfully devoted heart, the clear and single eye, to the *external deportment*, and—inasmuch as we have only to do with God or with men—to our deportment when we are constrained to see around in our fellow-men and our own brethren, imperfection and sinfulness. Did the Lord orally interpose, at such points of transition, any words of connection? we have a right to presume generally, and a comparison with Luke, whose report of so important a discourse the Spirit could never have left open to falsification, drives us to the conclusion, that our Lord uttered more than is recorded here. But it may very well be doubted whether any additional words would take the form of *our* modern way of discoursing, which takes care to show the process of the thought, and aims to lay it bare in its internal arrangement. This is opposed to Orientalism generally, and to the genius of the Hebrew in particular, which, as it exhibits but little conjunction of individual sentences, so also it has but little expressed logical connection of its discourses as a whole. It is opposed, also, to the necessary, and more highly natural character of prophetical utterance, that language of the Spirit, as is meets us every where in the Old Testament, even where the discourses were written by the prophets themselves. This manner of speaking, indeed, as it came down from Solomon's original use of it, to the Rabbinical style of teaching and laying down their sayings as the Lord found it, is essentially the natural and universally human method. The thoughts of the teacher who speaks from the fulness of his heart, when art (or artifice) has

* That holds good for New Testament criticism also, which the departed Drechsler so keenly and clearly laid down against "unscientific treatment:" The great problem is to perceive the object of what is transmitted and testified. But here the authenticity and *unity* of the Sermon on the Mount is the before-attested object which we have to discern.

not yet learned to adjust them to the limitations of words, flow forth livingly in their own simplicity, and are bound by no obligation to give a strict account of their sequence and order. And, finally, *such* discourse is more likely to be understood by the right kind of hearer, for it makes a rigorous claim on his attention, it excites his own thought and keeps it on the stretch. As a book exacts something from its reader, and leaves something for him to supply, so also does a discourse require something from the hearer. Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount presents in this respect a reproving example to our occidental and modern style of sermons.

In consistency with this our Lord at ch. vi. 19 assuredly did not say: "The Pharisees, as it has been shown, are in their hearts before God no better than Gentiles; therefore I say to you further—Live ye not after the manner of heathens an earthly life, but deposit it before all things in your hearts, as a fundamental principle, and in order that your righteousness may exceed theirs, that ye must depend upon God supremely, according to the first commandment, and seek only the treasure and reward of his kingdom." We feel how human and unlike himself such explanations and deductions would be in our Lord's lips. Consequently he does not say here: "And if ye are now decided and entirely devoted, determined for yourselves to seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness; see to it that ye do not blunt the keen edge of your self-judgment and self-renunciation, and finally altogether lose it, by hasty and unholy, that is, uncharitable judgment of those without you, by censure and correction of others, seeing that not only in the world but among your own brethren, sin and shortcoming enough will obtrude itself upon your notice and be your temptation. The more clearly you see this, the more earnestly guard yourselves against sacrificing your charity; for if ye would be my *perfect disciples*, then must your righteousness, as perfect love, be ever humble in bearing and forgiving, wise and thoughtful to heal and take away the sin that it sees." That we rightly seize the connection in this place, we are additionally assured by an explanatory saying of our Lord recorded in Luke (ch. vi. 40) similar to this but more detailed. But we may be assured that the Lord did thus unconnectedly set out with sudden appeal—Judge not! just as Matthew has abruptly recorded it. He spoke indeed not for his disciples and that people, then on the mountain, but for the Church of all ages, which should afterwards investigate his words. But even a hearer of that time, who should recall to mind those words, which from their proverbial form would cling tenaciously to the memory, would well understand how they were intended.

Verses 1, 2. It is in consequence of the evil-eye of the natural man, that he ever prefers to apply the rule of right, which he perfectly knows, to that which is without rather than to that which is within, himself; that he seeks out and bemoans the sins of his neighbor instead of thinking upon his own; and thus losing his charity towards his brother, loses also his humility and sincerity before God. Every one knows, and vindicates for himself, *what men should do to him:* and so far this beginning is internally connected with the concluding word at ver. 12. Further, to judge others and not ourselves, is the spirit of *Pharisaism* as developed from this natural principle of evil, the spirit of that misapprehension and misuse of God's law which the Lord had before disclosed, and against which his whole discourse, even in the second and third contrasts, which only more fully removed the mask from what was the *Pharisee* still, had from the beginning been directed.* Read Rom. ii. 1–3, 17–23. The Pharisee, himself at heart a heathen, would yet condemn all the world; himself no better than a publican, would yet uncharitably censure and cast from him the poor people around him. And this Pharisaism pursues the disciple of Christ, adheres to him long, even as worldly care and the worship of Mammon do. Therefore: Would ye be perfect, then put this utterly away! The very perception and experience which the new man has of the evils of his old heart brings with it a revived temptation and tendency to such an evil: hence censorious judging, as the usual transition-weakness of the new-converted, breaks out now though it may not have been manifested before.

In vers. 1, 2, then, as a maxim expressed in general terms, the object of this censorious judgment is the whole evil world without us, from whom we feel ourselves to be separated as the children of the kingdom; but in ver. 3 there is a manifest restriction of the reference to our *brethren* in a narrower sense (to whom in ver. 6 those who are without stand opposed). For otherwise we should not hear of *motes* in the eye, but of a more entire blindness and wickedness.

That the Lord in this prohibition of *judging* refers to a disposition and posture of the heart, and not to the utterance of it as such (as previously in ch. v. 22), is obvious of itself, especially since he has (in ch. vi.) penetrated so deeply into the heart's sentiments. For we are, as the witnesses and ambassadors of his kingdom, to preach his truth, which condemns the sin of the world—his Gospel, according to which unbelievers stand condemned before God. But it is one thing to testify as his

* Generally speaking, as Braune says, the judging others is the foul stain of social life. Hence the otherwise innocent expression "jemanden *bereden*" ("*to speak* of one") has come to mean "to speak ill of him." For the *falseness* of all men (Rom. iii. 4) reveals itself, at the same time being uncharitableness, in their intercourse with one another.

humble ministers the Lord's word in Mark xvi. 16, and altogether another thing to say presumptuously, yea even to think in our hearts: This or that man is condemned, or to address to him the direct appeal—Thou art condemned! This is ever forbidden to us on the simple ground that we can never say, as searchers of the heart: Thou believest not, thou wilt never believe, though the love of God by us or by others may continue to strive with thee. Sin itself we should term such, when we perceive it and where it concerns us, as well for our own sake as for the sake of others; for the Lord also requires of us, that we judge righteous judgment (John vii. 24), and the apostle says: He that is spiritual judgeth all things (1 Cor. ii. 15). But this ἀνακρίνειν or *judging of* is very different from that κατακρίνειν or *judging against*, which belongs only to God (Rom. xiv. 4). We, who are sinners and expect ourselves the judgment of God, may not judge *before the time*, until the Lord come, who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness in us and all the world (1 Cor. iv. 5). Let us only be ourselves doers of the law, the Lawgiver himself will be the judge, according to his own supreme authority and righteous distribution (James iv. 11, 12, which is again an inwardly and spiritually apprehended general citation from the Sermon on the Mount). What is then in itself, as the prohibition stands in its literal severity, the judging that is forbidden? The Lord pre-supposes the cognizance in our own minds of the sin which is to be condemned, but it is his will that in all the judgments which we pass upon it, we should not *condemn* the individual for the individual's sake and as such, that is, that we should not regard and deal with our fellowmen and brethren *independently of the forgiving love of God*, which is free for them as well as for ourselves, so long as that goal is not reached when he will say—Depart from me! (ver. 23). Beware of men, beware of false prophets, yea, of dogs and swine (ver. 6); that is judgment severe enough, and yet which involves no judgment unto condemnation, out of our own assumed authority, no rejection on our part, as if we already were assessors with him upon his judgment seat, and the final separation were already come. *This* sense of his words our Lord himself has more fully explained in Luke vi., since there he adds as an an epexegesis—*Μὴ καταδικάζετε, condemn not;** and then lays down the opposite—*Forgive* rather (ἀπολύετε) and *give*, that is, out of the treasure of grace which is in yourselves: and Luke in his epitome wisely puts this in close connection with the preceding—Be ye therefore *merciful*, as your Father also is merciful! For does not the Lord here actually point back, though according to Matthew he had said much else in the interval, to ch. vi. 14, 15 and ch. v. 42–48? Is it not his purpose to teach just here in all its fulness that *perfection* of pure *love* which he had there enjoined upon his disciples?

That ye be not judged! as in ch. vi. 15. The fundamental principle of this is here pre-supposed: As ye have not been judged, as ye have been forgiven, and as ye are ever being forgiven. But in addition to this there is the threatening of the withdrawal of the mercy which had been received, as had been already gently intimated at ch. v. 7, in the opposite case (James ii. 13). Consequently the requital here referred to signifies of course requital *from God;* although its type and beginning, the *measuring again on the part of man*, is by no means excluded, nay, rather, is used for the sake of founding upon it a convincing warning. That sinful man should requite upon his fellow man the evil that he has done to him, is in itself *sin* (ch. v. 38, 39); and yet this right of retaliation thus wickedly arrogated, is but the utterance and reflection of that eternally valid principle of justice which the Lord God has given to those who are judges in his name, and which he himself observes. So that he who unrighteously judges another in his own name must, when he is thus judged in return, reflect in his conscience: This injustice of man is only my due in the sight of God, and one day he who has the right to do so, will thus deal with me! The maxim which the Lord lays down in ver. 2, is a *fundamental law*, so universally recognized, so fully exhibited in the perverted estate of the world, so well known in man's natural conscience, that all the heathen express it in the same way; it is found variously laid down in the Old Testament, and even the Jewish Talmud, in other respects the very perfection of perversion, has retained it as an indelible proverb.* But when our Lord takes it up, an dsays: Ἐν ᾧ κρίματι, ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ, With what kind of judgment and measure—he gives us, in transition, to understand that we should indeed judge with right judgment, and measure again with the righteous measure of truth in the spirit of love. For the κρίνετε, *judge*, which is admitted in ver. 2, has manifestly another and a wider meaning than that which is forbidden in ver. 1. Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven: give, and it shall be given unto you.

Verses 3–5. This more specific figure of the *mote* and *beam* the Lord found also ready prepared, as we see it in the Talmud in the form of a Rabbinical מָשָׁל or "*parable.*" He whose word of truth gathered to itself all the anticipatory, preparatory truth in the world and especially among Israel—he, who in all things came not to destroy but to fulfill, disdains not, in his holy love and wisdom, to speak sometimes as a Rabbi what other rabbies had spoken. He after their fashion constructs his

* Not, indeed, as a climax, according to Alford's still more subtle distinction, who concludes that κρίνειν in this passage of Matthew is by no means fully equivalent (according to generally-received opinion) to κατακρίνειν, but that it is forbidden, in general, to form *authoritative* judgments of others.

* Countless times we have במה שאדם מודד בה מודדין לו or the like.

own parables and figures—*new*, intelligible to the people, and taking fast hold of their minds. This he could always have done, but he rather condescends sometimes to use their unsavory similitudes of beams in the eye, and camels through the needle, in order that his word may enter their minds, and direct the fools to the yet extant remains of their own wisdom. How does the great Teacher put to shame us the under teachers, who must fain speak in original, and elegant and characteristic words of our own! Yet the old becomes new in the lips of our Lord, and the extant words of man are replenished with a higher spirit. Thus here the beholding a *brother's eye* derives a profound meaning from its reference to what had been said concerning the eye in ch. vi. 22, 23. An entirely single eye has no mote, no beam in it; in the eye are to be sought the peculiar faults both of the judged and of the judging brother. The Lord reproves such *beholding* another as is proved to be wicked and severe, by the very fact that it does *not* see what should first have been seen, personal evil in self. (See Luke vi.) *Βλέπειν, to see*, and *καταvοεῖν, to perceive*, are used together with their distinction. One *sees* without himself the mote in the brother's eye, but *marks* not the beam in himself, which lies nearer to him, and is even to be felt. (*Καταvοεῖν* is to be cognizant of, to observe accurately, rightly to take account of.) A keen and critical eye for the veriest mote, the slightest trifle, in the brother's eye, where (which the Lord leaves unmentioned) there may be no mote present; but the same eye, so keen in looking without itself, is obtuse and insensible for self-scrutiny! The gnat is strained at, the camel swallowed. Is it not so? *Is it not made manifest* that it is so too often among brethren? This is the meaning of the convicting *or*, by which the discourse passes from the principle to its exhibition; comp. the subsequent ver. 9. If it were not so, how *couldst*, how *wouldst thou*, whom I now signify, and with whom it is thus, proudly and imperiously and dictatorially say: *Stand*, and *let me* pull out the mote out of thine eye? I will do it and I can; I demand that thou submit obediently *to me!* Why else is the appearance and language of such assumption? Yea, the *beholding* was already a blamable, unjustifiable thing: thou shouldst first have cast thine eye inwards, and *beheld* what thou in thy blindness hast overlooked; *the* beam is in thine own eye! The definite article is used in each case in connection with mote and beam: the existence of *the* mote is not denied—but what is *the* beam? Just what thou now so actest; thine incompetent, hasty, uncharitable, assuming judgment is this beam. Let this be well noted in opposition to that superficial exposition which supposes that in order to lie under the sentence of this saying, one must have a great failing in himself, and know himself to be guilty, in a higher degree, of the sin which he condemns. Rather the supposing that I am in this matter better than thou, and therefore may bear myself reprovingly towards you—is just what is here termed a beam. The figure goes enormously beyond actuality, but the Lord retains it, for it suits excellently well the idea of *proportion* which he designs to give.* In Luke vi. 39, *blindness* is spoken of, and certainly a beam in the eye makes blind. But if the blind man will yet lead others, and will keenly think to search out motes, then is he more than blind (John ix. 41). Hence: *Thou hypocrite!* This is cast into the face of the disciples, much more severely than in ch. vi., where it only stood—Be ye not *as* the hypocrites! The disciple of Christ, so far as he is in this sad state, again becomes a true Pharisee. The *πρῶτον, first*, in part reminds us of that great *πρῶτον* in ch. vi. 33. First become thyself righteous before God, stand *thyself* sincere and lowly before the judgment-seat of God (Sir. xviii. 19; Gal. vi. 3, 4). Art thou so well able to pull out little motes, use thy skill upon thine own greater ones! But it may be said, in what sense can our Lord ascribe to us the purifying our own eye? We answer, that he is not here speaking to the merely natural man, but to his disciple, who, as such, has the requisite grace, though he will not use and seek its increase. It is no other than if He should say: Let me pull out, first, the beam out of thine own eye!

Καὶ τότε—and then comes the time to discharge the brotherly duty of rebuke for amendment. That duty is imposed by love, only that it may be effected in love, with spiritual authority, yet in the spirit of meekness, so that he who has been overtaken in a fault, may truly be restored (Gal. vi. 1). Now comes out first the deep and hidden significance of the figure that has been used. As the beam in the eye is found in the internal sight and direction of the heart, not in this or the other manifest vice; so also we should there seek out and find the motes and beams of our brethren. Seneca (*De vit. beat. c.* 27) addresses the censorious thus: "Papulas observatis alienas, obsiti ulceribus," *You observe others' pimples, yourselves covered with ulcers.* This is directed to the outward appearance, though well intended: but the disciple of Christ must not, in his neighbor's case, and especially in his brother's,

* Braune: "Mote and beam, are of one matter and of one kind; the one is not a precious metal: the only distinction lies in the greatness." That is, not that the censor has the same fault *greater* in himself, but, first of all, he has only such acuteness in detecting the failing of another, because he knows it well from the monition and sting of his own conscience; and then, again, it becomes to him a greater fault, a beam, *inasmuch* as he "would appease his own conscience by censorious judgment, and repel the word of God, which comes to his own heart, as the cold rock gives back the echo." Alford further observes upon men's false estimate, who would discover in others beams only, in themselves only motes. Daub, again, differently: "The perception of a mote is rendered more acute by the feeling of a beam" (*Judas Isch.* ii. 349).

look at the external countenance, mien, and appearance, at the movement of hand or foot, and applying the standard of his own deportment, pass judgment upon his brother for differing from himself—dictatorially saying: This man *acts* thus, and consequently his *heart* must be evil, acts differently from me, he must be wrong; for the outward appearance deceives, and there is much variety of manner, as there is much variety of circumstance, to be considered in judging of the actions of men. Look with a single eye *into thy brother's eye*, that is in a brotherly spirit, and if thou canst not but see a mote there, help him from it! Here our Lord's commandment (Matt. xviii. 15) out of the Law of Moses (Lev. xix. 17), is placed in its true light. Τότε, *then*—all before this is also *before the time*, before the Lord's coming in judgment to thyself. But τότε διαβλέψεις, *then shalt thou see clearly*, not properly speaking, as a command, but as a *permission*, as is sufficiently obvious; a permission, however, further accompanied by *promise:* So wilt thou, with purified eye, see clearly and rightly how the matter is. (Διά, in composition, literally *through*, is intensitive, but not in the sense of an artificial carrying out of the figure, such as Bengel's: "Thou wilt see through, after the removal of the beam that intercepts." But see what? Merely the mote? But the true discernment and wisdom lie not in that, though many seem to think so, and consequently lay more stress upon the *saying*—Let me pull out! than upon the actual pulling out itself. And yet this latter is the main concern. Luther's interpretation, seizing the spirit in the letter has it: Look, *how* thou pullest it out! For the ἐκβαλεῖν or *casting out* the beam, the thing successfully, tenderly, and prudently accomplished, is now the real object of the διαβλέπειν or *seeing clearly*, as previously τὸ κάρφος, *the mote*, was simply of the βλέπειν or *seeing*. He who lives by the grace of God in the continual exercise of self-judgment, he who has retired from the footstool of mercy, delivered from the old and evil beam, knows well how tender an operation such purification of the inner eye is; and it must be attempted by man with such exquisite delicacy that the diseased brother, marking the hand of God, may submit without any command of thine; that thus the evil may not be increased by unskillfulness on thy part and opposition on his, for the one, alas! provokes the other. Begin not at once with that *saying;* the surgeon only does this when he is obliged: help thy brother rather, if possible, from his mote in such a manner that he may not discern *thy* hand and will; *say* to him afterwards what thou hast to say, or not at all. But if without thy bidding him, he will not submit, take good heed, that in thy bidding no little mote of pride may glance upon him from thine eye, but the pure light of love beaming upon him from a brother humble before God. Is not this certainly the highest and severest test of the spirit of a disciple, only to be demanded within the narrow circle of brotherly fellowship? If the children of God thus acted always in relation to one another, the motes and beams would finally be all for ever done away.

With this the transition is made to the other main property of that charity which would compassionately save the world and the brethren from their sin; to that *wisdom*, which accompanies humility. But *on that account* the mirror is held up to the disciples in their relation to those that are without (Eph. v. 15; Matt. x. 16). Within the circle of the disciples themselves friendly correction takes place according to and in connection with a thorough judgment of ourselves; in our intercourse with the wicked world, however, the opposite test is brought in as to whether we can also keep silence, or can speak, exhort and rebuke under proper restraints, according to and in connection with a *true perception of susceptibility in others and calling in ourselves.* Then follows, again, a severe prohibition of the contrary, exhibited in most mischievous and striking examples.

Verse 6. Bengel says quite correctly: "Here comes in the other extreme"—but this observation must be more strictly defined. The Lord here turns from the brethren, in exhorting whom, the more lovingly it is done the more effectual it is, to the dogs and swine, who only repel the mild words of love. These are to be first rebuked and disciplined to repentance, by those who are called and qualified from above so to do; and the Gospel is not to be directly thrust upon their acceptance. To do this by misapplied and inappropriate preaching of it, is the general error of the newly converted, inclined as they are to a too easy and unwise proclamation of it to all the world. It is by no means contrary to humility, but only righteous judgment, when we discern how *evil* the state of mind of the wicked is, and regulate our deportment towards them accordingly. There are to be found *dogs* and *swine* among men; this is the Lord's own assurance even in the midst of his gracious preaching; and he gives us his injunction to mark them and distinguish them, between the warning against censorious judgment and the encouragement to prayer. Dogs in the East are not esteemed as they are among us, they belong with swine to the unclean and contemned animals (2 Peter ii. 22). It was a proverbial way of speaking among the Israelites (and is now among the Turks), that those who are without are dogs; and this is referred to its right meaning in the New Testament (Matt. xv. 26; Phil. iii. 2; and, finally, Rev. xxii. 15). Thus the sense is: Such as in their present condition are unsusceptible of good influence, grossly sensual, proudly contradicting sinners. What then is meant by *that which is holy*, and which is not

to be *given*, nay, not to be *offered* to such people, remaining in such a state? It is essentially explained by the opposite: Give that which is holy to the holy, or at least to those who acknowledge its holiness, and accept it as such. But this apparently abstract expression must also have here a sensible foundation, which will make it appropriate to the *figure;* just as the holy flesh of the offering (Hag. ii. 12; Jer. xi. 15), was not to be cast to the dogs, but to them was to be thrown that which was carrion, or torn of wild beasts (Exod. xxii. 31).* The saying blends profoundly the figure and its signification: hence *pearls* are introduced, with a latent allusion—These are not acorns for the touch of swine. The *holy thing* is God's, and that it may not be desecrated, preserve it from the profane! But it has become also *our* treasure and property; hence it is added in the second place, *your* pearls, partly in the same sense as ch. xiii. 45, 46, partly with a specific design in the plural form. So act for the sake of God's honor that the holy things may not be despised; take care that your treasure and the good that is in you be not evil spoken of (Rom. xiv. 16), for your own sakes; exhibit your special experiences, the precious things of your inner life, before God, and not before such people as understand no more about them than swine do about pearls. This warning of our Lord thus condemns many things in one word, with an advancing meaning and heightening application. It forbids, first of all, the imprudent, unprofitable, yea, injurious preaching of *the Gospel*, where the law and its discipline are first required; it further goes on to condemn all reckless pouring out of the secrets of the life of grace before the world, without discriminating reference to time and place, with all unseasonable relations of conversion, and confessions, and experiences, and colloquies of the devout. The latter, however, is *less* referred to since it is the practice of the *hypocrites*, with whom the preceding—*Thou hypocrites!* already connected them. This vilest mockery of devotion our Lord leaves unmentioned, just as before the seeing of motes not existing: he pre-supposed, there, the presence of the mote, and here that they are *our own pearls* which are in our hands.† But he warns against that thoughtlessness, which is rebuked by its consequences; the evil that is done itself crying out—Fool, thou shouldst have thought that this was not appropriate here! He tells us this, in his wisdom, in order to anticipate and prevent the evil.

A wise man's heart discerneth both time and judgment (Eccles. viii. 5), and doth not instruct a fool, when his incorrigible folly refuses instruction (Ecclus. xxii. 5–7; Prov. ix. 7, 8). Many of the children of the world remain altogether thus till their hour comes, many at least are such at times. Who would preach the Gospel to a drunken man, or make the gentle appeal to a man raging with the frenzy of wrath, and *ask* him to be reconciled to God? There is much that is analogous to this, albeit in cases not equally monstrous, and the spirit of wisdom must decide them as they occur. The mournful results show us that there are more dogs and swine than we had supposed, and this should ever teach us the lesson of prudence. The figure has been further interpreted as if the swine more particularly trod thoughtlessly the precious things under their feet; the dogs, on the contrary, turn again and rend us. In this case the former would be the worse; but the latter would indicate, as all opposition does, that there was some understanding of the thing rejected. But in 2 Peter ii. 22, the dogs are regarded as unclean inwardly, the swine as outwardly unclean; a distinction which the Lord does not make.* In the concluding sentence he adheres only to the swine and the pearls (as the αὐτούς referring to μαργαρίτας shows), and his twofold saying concerning trampling under foot, and rending (for the swine may be as ferocious as a dog) contains something much more important for the meaning of the whole—They despise and destroy both the precious *gift* and the well-intentioned imprudent *giver*. Ye have then needlessly handed over the holy thing to prostitution, and exposed yourselves to mockery and persecution! Finally in the στραφέντες, *turn again*, which is certainly not the mere finish of the figure, lies the inmost point of the discourse. They would have remained at rest, had you left them alone; but you have *provoked them* to sin against God and man, ye have through imprudence multiplied offences, whereas they ought to have either been silently tolerated, or more wisely attacked.

This word of our Lord therefore puts, as it were, a limiting *restraint* upon the universal zeal of our charity, which would without further condition be disposed to let the sun of grace and truth shine upon all the evil; so that it is also a limitation of the law given in ch. v. 48. It is not for us, indeed, to do as men, what God in Christ has done. Luther, in answer to the warning—Give not that which is holy unto the dogs! cries out *Atque, O Domine, jam habent!* (But, O Lord, they now have it). And Zinzendorf thinks that the Father in heaven has himself given that which is holy to the dogs, and cast his pearls before swine, in surrendering his beloved Son into the hands of sinners. That is true, but hence

* Alford reminds us of the primitive Christian use of the expression τὰ ἅγια to denote the elements of the Eucharist.

† Lange's interpretation of the hypocrites, who thus desecrated the good things of the Church in their dealing with them (iii. 85), is a more widely extended application, true enough in itself. The Lord, however, speaks to his own actual disciples, when he says: *Ye* shall not do in like manner, as the Pharisees! ye with *your* pearls!

* That the dogs (according to Lange) signified the "untrustworthily servile," is quite opposed to the *fidelity* universally imputed to them.

came the world's redemption, and the sanctification of the Father's name through the determinate counsel of the highest wisdom. Therefore says also the Lord—who exposed his own silent meekness to the contempt of the soldiers and his bitter cry to the scorn of the bands of the wicked—*Ye* shall not do thus, for ye are not saviours of the world. But though in a certain sense the children of the world are dogs and swine, yet no man is to be given up by us, and cast out as reprobate; and it is, indeed, clear that they who sometimes fall under the application of this prohibition, yet may have the holy things offered them through the grace of God, and that we may be required to offer it to them, we who are never directed, in unconditional rejection of any fellow sinner, to retain *our* pearls merely for ourselves. Thus this prohibition touches rather the time and manner, than the testimony of the truth itself, which we are ever bound by obligation to all men to utter; the emphasis lies upon the inconsiderate, indiscriminate *giving* and *casting about* of these treasures, in such manner as itself to hinder their being accepted. But wherever we find susceptibility, our duty is to utter the —"Peace be to this house!" (Matt. x.; Luke x.). And at all times should we speak God's word, as sinners are able to hear it (Mark iv. 33); yea, our enforced silence bears in it a concealed love and mercy, of which in due time they may become sensible. That Pharisaical perversion of this word, which makes hypocrites keep the holy things so entirely holy and hidden, that there is no place in the wicked world, as they term it, and no time found for offering them to any, was at the utmost distance from our Lord's thoughts.

Have we been cast down by this paragraph (vers. 1–6), and driven almost to the anxious question: How shall we poor Christians attain such perfect humility and prudent love, as to hit the precise and narrow way between the evil judging on the right and the squandering of blessings on the left, among our fellow-disciples and in the evil world; how may we, without exalting ourselves over our brethren, yet put them right, and while not provoking the dogs and the swine, yet take all stumbling blocks out of their way? The Lord answers the question with his never failing grace, and calls upon his disciples once more to *pray*, to petition! This is the open way to the goal of perfection, unbelief and lethargy in prayer are the one only secret of our unperfectness. This gives a supplementary illustration of the sense and meaning of the prayer (ch. vi. 9–13); this gives the beginning of the discourse (ch. v. 3–6) its full explanation, and brings out in its clearest expression what was intimated there. *Persevering prayer* will assuredly conduct every one who has begun in sincerity, through this way of earnestness, to perfect righteousness and wisdom.* First, there is a general promise, which follows in strong contrast with the rigorous law, vers. 7, 8 (and, indeed, ver. 7 is *requirement* with promise, ver. 8 conversely is *promise* under the condition of the asking which is enjoined). Upon this we have, once more (just as vers. 3–5 followed upon vers. 1, 2) a *convincing analogy*, which pointing to *our own love even while evil*, by the highest possible elevation of the argument forbids us to doubt the all-perfect Father's willingness to give, vers. 9–11. Who among you repels his asking child? How much more will the Father in heaven *hear prayer!* There is much that might be preached to the heart from this word of our Lord, so transparently clear in its overflowing grace and condescension, but there is little room for exposition to the understanding We might, indeed, have said no more upon it, but that there is much misunderstanding which needs to be rectified, and the profound meaning of every one of the plainest sayings of the eternal Word in this so entirely human discourse requires to be pointed out.

Verse 7. Most sublime is the simplicity of this repeated—*Ask* (not like James i. 8). *Whom* we are to ask is self-understood—him, who knoweth all that we have need of (ch. vi. 32. 8). The Father in heaven is first mentioned at ver. 11. Neither do we hear at once *for what* we are to ask; that being obvious in itself—for the grace needful for righteousness, for the good gifts of the Holy Spirit (Luke xi. 13), that we may attain to this humble and prudent and sincere love. This great utterance was not given in the foregoing chapter, where the discourse was of *earthly* need, but was reserved for this place. It is understood, moreover, that having now received it, we may apply it in all its universality (as Mark. xi. 24) with every other reference besides that which it has especially here; as for instance, in the case which we have before us, when we pray for those wicked men (ver. 6), to whom we are not able to give more than our prayer. The Lord gives a *threefold* encouragement and promise: there is the one general strong assurance first, and in the subsequent *seeking* and *knocking* there is no heterogeneous element introduced (as seeking in the Scriptures, &c.), for the similitude that follows unites them all in *asking* simply. The three expressions refer less to three distinct apprehensions of our general need (although that has its truth*), than to an *advancing*, *persevering* asking, which makes

* This is the profound *connection* here, and it is the only one. Alford exhibits in a very strange way: that we should not be terrified as if God would keep back from us in our impurity and unworthiness his holy things, but should *ask* in full assurance.

* Menken: Ask what ye need and have not; seek that which is lost and hidden; knock, ye that are without. This last is scarcely expressed aright, for so viewed it should have been placed first. Somewhat better is that of the Reuggener *Monatsblatt:* He who has not should ask; he who has had, but has lost again, should seek; he to whom the way out or in is shut up, should knock. But *seeking* (ch. vi. 33) does not signify just what has been lost *again*.

it a *labor*, to the process of the internal wrestling (comp. Psa. xxvii. 4, שָׁאַלְתִּי and אֲבַקֵּשׁ). The *seeking* points back to the ζητεῖν of ch. vi. 33, and reminds us of that fundamental promise to Israel: Then shall ye find me, when ye seek me with all your hearts (Deut. iv. 29). The discourse has all its significance in the *seeking* generally, in the seeking again of the highest good which was lost (as Lange says): as to the *opening* to those who knock, who seeking already have come *nigh*, we have it fully disclosed afterwards at ver. 14; and it is the appointed gate of life, the entrance into the kingdom of heaven, the strait gate that is referred to. Our Lord's teaching knows nothing of that Quietestic abandonment and stillness which finds rest in God before the time, without asking and seeking, as having already entered and no more needing to knock; the injunction to *ask* goes forth over all the way of life, unrelaxed and unceasing prayer is itself alone the way to that high end. The promise stands fast: Ask, and it *shall be given* you—though it be first but the impulse and power to inward *seeking!* Seek and ye shall *find*—first, it may be, only the strait gate to knock at!

Verse 8 seems to be a repetition, but adds much to the strength. The πᾶς, *every one*, is designed to encounter the specific unbelief, by which men may except themselves and their own present prayer. It leads further to the following similitude, inasmuch as that is made to concern all men, even the wicked. Hence in Luke xi., it is placed between two parables, showing how importunate petition, and the prayer of children, avail *with men*. It is very needful that men should be exhorted to give to those who ask (ch. v. 42); they do not always do this; but in most cases the defect lies rather in the lack of persevering urgency in the *asking*. "Asking wins" is in things generally a proverb of encouragement to persist even among the children of men.

Verses 9—11. *Or*, is it not so? Is not that true? The same turn to the discourse as in ver. 4. Alas! proud men are not disposed to *ask* and ask much, in the full sense of what we mean by asking; but children, at least, feel not thus, the τέκνα of ver. 11, *they* ask. *What man* is there among you, who would not give to his son (or daughter) who asks him? that is, if there be such, he is not to be called man. With special graciousness does the Lord work out the moving similitude, but there is not a touch or a word, that is merely pictorial and without its spiritual meaning. *Bread* and *fish* are taken from the Galilean manner of life (Mark viii. 6, 7; John xxi. 9). The bread is unconditionally necessary for their hunger, the fish is the additional good which the children's confidence asks. (In Luke's repetition of this, ch. xi., the children venture to go further, and would have an egg, as it were for gratification.) Will the father, instead of bread, *reach out* (ἐπιδώσει, give away) a *useless* stone, similar in appearance but uneatable, or the *serpent*, resembling the fish, but hurtful? (Yet stronger in Luke—Instead of an egg, a scorpion!) What man would thus bitterly and unfeelingly mock his asking children? Thus ye *know* how to give good gifts unto your children; οἴδατε, equivalent to—You have learned it from the instinct and impulse of nature, implanted in you by *God;* ye are *able* thus to treat them, comp. Phil. iv. 12. The ostrich, which is hardened against her young ones, as though they were not hers, is also without the wisdom of animal instinct (Job xxxix. 16, 17). There is more, however, in this, inasmuch as it contains the *transition* of the reference to God: Ye know how to distinguish good and evil for your children, so that you freely give, and indeed only *good*, gifts, which only are truly *gifts*—how much more your Father in heaven! This has a deeper significance than might first appear. The not hearing, and not giving, might at first have seemed to be analogous to the offering stones and serpents; but now the *wisdom of God's love* does not always give that which is *asked*, for his foolish children often ask, in matters pertaining to the soul, what would be only the stone and the serpent—and should the Father answer such prayers? He no more does this than a father upon earth would in such a case, which is lightly hinted. He gives us always ἀγαθά, *good things*, the true bread of the soul, the only wholesome food to accompany it; and were it to assume a form of scantiness, this must be steadfastly believed. He gives to *them that ask him!* not merely the words which would have corresponded—*to his children*, or *to you;* for his Father-love extends so far, that every one who prays to him is by that circumstance as a child in his regard. Consequently, from this there arises the great conclusion, the strong argument and assurance: He who thus gives, is *your* Father, and if *ye* ask him, shall it be in vain?

But the inconceivably important ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὄντες, *you being evil*, comes into strong contrast with this address to the disciples as distinguished from others. The praying children of God are, as to their nature, placed among the ἄνθρωποι or *men* generally, and, in the midst of his most affectionate tenderness, he testifies to them, that they are in themselves *evil* and *niggardly* (for *good is communicative*), and thus that all natural goodness and love are only the contradiction which an equivocal instinct makes to the corruption of our ruined nature—and not genuine and pure love. Thus, as was before said, our own *evil* love (which in children loves only our own flesh and blood), is merely a *figure*, which through the *antithesis* of πόσῳ μᾶλλον, *how much more*, points to the pure love of God. Was it possible to bind together the testimony to God's mercy and the essential testimony to our own utter *corruption*, more expressly and emphatically than is here done? Thus does the Most Blessed, with all his grace, yet speak concerning *us men*, concern-

ing our human father-and-mother love! This word cuts deep and inexorably into all the beautiful soft sentimentality which talks about "good men;" yea, this word appears to me the most rigorous *dictum probans* in all Scripture,* for original sin; and, at the same time, one of the strongest testimonies to the superhuman dignity of our Lord, who, excepting himself from the whole race, can say to all mankind: *Ye* being evil! (John viii. 23, 24).

From this point let a general view be taken of the manner in which the person of the "Preacher on the Mount" exhibits itself and bears its own witness, in ever increasing majesty throughout the whole discourse, so that all that the Lord afterwards uttered concerning himself (Matt xi. 27, 28), and all that John has recorded from his lips, seems already involved and asserted in this sermon. Its first words distribute blessedness, impart the kingdom of heaven. Who is he, that hath such authority? He says in ch. v. 11—*For my sake*, as quite one with—*For righteousness' sake*. He calls his disciples the light of the world, the salt of the earth—what must he be, their Lord and Master! He begins in ver. 16 the oft-recurring: *Your* Father in heaven; but he avoids, here as well as throughout all his discourses in the Gospels, placing himself by any—"Our" in conjunction with them, before the Father. It is only—Pray *ye*—*Our* Father! He remains the only One who can, by his own high authority, give them this command. He is come, to *fulfill* all things; he utters his testimony as no prophet had ever done—*Verily, I say unto you;* he knows what will take place till heaven and earth pass away, who shall enter the kingdom and who shall not, who shall be called great or small therein; he opposes his own—*But I say unto you*, to every other saying; he knows the entrances to hell, and the laws of the everlasting prison house; he lays down requirements which enter the heart, and go far beyond man's ability whether to do or to bear, while he gives corresponding promises of grace from his Father in heaven, which embrace the whole heart and the whole life, all time and all eternity. He gives (ch. vii. 7) full assurance of the answer of every prayer; remains, while among men in most gracious condescension alone, above, and apart from the whole of humanity, being evil; testifies, as if he saw at one glance the whole of mankind as viewed by God, how *many* are in the way of perdition, how *few* are in the way of salvation. He arrogates, finally, to himself the right to receive the name of *Lord* from men, and presents himself as the *judge of all the world* at last; who will *at that day* utter the words of final decision for eternity, even as he now utters his present words that, hearing and doing them, men may not fall into fearful, irreparable ruin. O ye Rationalists, who take so much complacency in the morality of the Sermon on the Mount, *hear* and appreciate its dogmatic teaching too!

Or will ye have nothing but its pure *ethics?* Then here you have it at once *in nuce* (ver. 12). It appears a very simple saying, and yet the Lord cries: *This is the Law and the Prophets!* But the same Lord requires also hearing *and doing* for this his so ethical, so intelligible saying. Be it so—*do* ye it in very deed? O beware, ye false prophets, of the false prophet in your own evil hearts, of the arch-liar, who beguiles you into the deluding supposition that you do this, that you can do it—without *Christ*, without the righteousness of God, which comes through faith in Jesus Christ, as it was before testified by the Law and the Prophets. The Lord places this great requirement, so well understood by all, yet only through him by any to be fulfilled, between that one word—*Ye* men *being evil*, and that other—Here is the *strait* gate, the *narrow* way: it is here that asking, seeking, knocking avails.

This is, as we may see, the distinctive and comprehensive final expression of the *law of Christ*, which perfect love imposes upon us, who even in our love are evil (in our love as parents, ver. 11, as brothers, and as enemies, ch. v. 46, 47); but only through the life-giving grace which is both promised and imparted. This is the concluding requirement at the close of the whole great section of the *requirements: Walk in this way towards this end*, the only way, narrow but sure! The goal is contained in ver. 12, the way thereto in ver. 13, 14. The Lord here lays down in the simplest manner the *substance** of the law of perfectness in regard to our neighbor; for it is only another expression of the Mosaic command—to love thy neighbor as *thyself*—passing from the *love* itself to the confirmation and approval of it in *deed*. It embraces in one the whole second table of the decalogue (as that from which all the rest proceeded, ch. v. 21); in the same manner ch. vi. 33 embraces the first table; and ch. v. 48, both in their central unity. It is uttered with respect to the outer and the inner life (for, as we saw in ch. vi. 1, the Lord accounts no doing of the law as genuine but that which is internal), for the greatest and the slightest cases in which the general law

* And, indeed, as a matter of pre-supposition, and not now to be first asserted and maintained! (Comp. 1 Kings viii. 46.) The same who were before directed to say *Our Father*, are in themselves evil children, though themselves fathers. Chrysostom in vain denies, that the Lord speaks this as *διαβάλλων τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν, κακίζων τὸ γένος, accusing human nature, depreciating the race* and in vain would merely understand it of the *ἀντιδιαστολὴ τῆς ἀγαθότητος, interval in point of goodness*, between us and God: for *πονηροί, evil*, admits of no *ἀναθότης, goodness*, at all.

* The particle *οὖν, therefore*, on which much exposition has been expended, is just the indication of the result of all, summing up what had gone before. In this sense it does not merely connect the sentence which it begins with the immediately preceding, but takes a sweeping retrospect of the whole.

becomes a specific commandment. It refers to our *own self-loving sense of duty*, in which that which is most difficult to do is yet easily seen to be right. It is the expression of the *third fundamental law*, which points us, and urges us to that *self-denial* which can only be attained through the grace of God, to the deliverance from that internal, deep-rooted *self-contradiction of evil human nature* which would desire from others what to others we deny. (See Lev. xix. 18, in its connection with this.) And it is just at this point that the great—Enter ye in! (ver. 13), is attached, embracing the promise of the opening of the gate, nay, the assurance that it is already opened. And immediately upon this, as the ground of that solemn and simple sentence which had just been uttered; *for* there is no other gate, no other way, all beside this is the broad way that leadeth to the wide gate of *destruction!* (vers. 13, 14). This immediately paves the way to the remaining *third main division* of the Sermon, which draws the final limits between the good and the bad, setting forth the great tests and separation at the end of all.

Verse 12. Is this any thing *new*, to *teach* which, as a higher and more perfect morality, the Lord must come down from heaven? By no means, rather is it the primitive commandment, extant among all nations, by which every man who sincerely looks within his own soul, must utter his own condemnation. It is found in the Talmud: for example Rabbi Hillel thus speaks to one who would become a proselyte: "Whatsoever is hateful to thyself, that do not to thy neighbor: in this is the whole law, all else only comes out of this. Go and be perfect." We find it in Sirach: *Νόει τὰ τοῦ πλησίον ἐκ σεαυτοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ παντὶ πράγματι διανοοῦ*, "Judge of thy neighbor by thyself, and be discreet in every point" (Ecclus. xxxi. 15), and in Tobit: *Ὃ μισεῖς μηδενὶ ποιήσῃς*, "Do that to no man, which thou hatest (ch. iv. 15). In Isocrates we find: *Ἃ πάσχοντες ὑφ' ἑτέρων ὀργίζεσθε, ταῦτα τοῖς ἄλλοις μὴ ποιεῖτε*, "Whatever things you are angry at experiencing from others, these do not to the rest of men!" But the tendency of our *selfishness* to extract the keen severity from the testimony which it is constrained to bear against itself, is betrayed in this, that in nearly all cases the negative only is seized: What thou wouldst *not* have thyself, do not thou to thy neighbor! The Lord on the contrary fetches it up from the depths of conscience as an inexorably *positive* demand: "*Whatsoever* ye would that men should do to you, *do* ye also to them"—as unlimited a requirement, therefore, as the will and the desire of self-love itself. We said rightly: our own self-loving feeling of duty—although this is just as much a *contradictio in adjecto*, as our own love, being evil, in ver. 11 was. It is, as it were, the theoretical and practical side of that self-contradiction, which is our natural condition. With strict propriety has Luther said: "Here Christ lays the Bible upon thine own bosom, and so clearly, moreover, that thou needest no gloss." But to how many limiting, *apologetic* glosses and imaginations has natural conscience resorted, to silence, in unrighteousness and self-delusion, the great *accusing* gloss: I am not thus! I cannot do this! Selfishness perverts the relation between me and my neighbor, so that, notwithstanding all, the most-loved *I* comes before and comes after my neighbor, and remains above him. Why am I to do good to my neighbor? That he may do mo good in return—this clings to the evil heart. So runs the common proverb: First comes myself, then my neighbor, then myself again—or more plainly: By my neighbor I mean only myself. The Lord refers not to this perversion, but to the great truth that lies at its foundation. He goes back to the Mosaic כָּמוֹךָ, *as thyself*, in unconditional equality without any before and after; confirmed as it was by an אֲנִי יְהוָה, "I am Jehovah," for in the sight of God no *self* of the creature can have place.

The Lord's meaning is not that which a superficial misapprehension of his keenly penetrating rule would make it—as if he only spoke "of the external, material, obvious actions of life," and consequently "had not in his purpose to set up a principle of morality" (Neander). The Lord, in all that he lays down, will be understood according to the internal principle, and never gives "external tests, merely, of character and life." He neither acknowledges nor alludes to any other act than that which is truly such, springing from the heart. It is his aim, that the consciousness of equality and of mutual need (as Braune better says, though without fully reaching its depth of meaning) should exhort and urge us to the practical love of our neighbor.

In this *πάντα ὅσα ἄν*, *whatever*, is included and summed up with most significant definiteness every individual case that could prompt the question: What is here my duty to my neighbor? It is this—Let the relative position be changed, conceive thyself in his place, and he in thine! That fellow-feeling and sympathy which naturally is excited by the sight of another's sorrow, which may be almost called the conscience of our physical nature, will show me the way, since it makes me feel as if I were in his place. Then do to him, what thou wouldst desire him to do to you, were you in his case! But who is there that does not stand mid-way, instead of going the whole way and entering through the door—*who doeth this?* Who doeth it *before* God, as the genuine and true acting of love, which would do no ill to his neighbor, nay, not by the omission of any good that he might and ought to render him? He who *thus loves*, has fulfilled *the Law*, the whole Law, for the fulfillment of the second table is only possible through the fulfillment of the first—who can love independently of the love of God? The commandment requires *love* out of a pure heart; a pure heart comes only through a good conscience, and a good

conscience through a faith unfeigned—in the fulfilling grace of the great Fulfiller in us (1 Tim. i. 5). Hence the Lord does not merely say: This is *the Law* (of both tables)—but in addition: *and the Prophets!* In the same sense, that is, as ch. xxii. 40. For he means to tell us that all the preparatory, prophetic Scripture which pointed to *him* who was to come, took its rise from the requirement of the Law, and is one with it: he refers back to ch. v. 17, and all which that word disclosed to us; his design is that we should now at the close connect with it the beginning and understand: This is the Law and the Prophets, *to fulfill which* in your righteousness, *I am come.*

Verses 13, 14. By a false disposition these verses are generally placed at the beginning of the subsequent paragraph; whereas they only form a transition to it, and are in themselves most distinctively a *conclusion*, which plainly enough refers to the parallel conclusion of the first division (ch. v. 20). Now is that righteousness, which must be better than the Pharisees', exhibited; now it is said, Receive it, that is, Seek for it in prayer with full earnestness of spirit, and *thus enter into* the kingdom of heaven! Through the *strait gate?* Yes verily, for your *knowing* all that is in ver. 12 will avail nothing; that *I point it out* to you and *teach* you, will avail nothing: but your own prayer and your own laying hold must proceed from self-denial to self-denial, until the whole of perfect righteousness is established within you.

How then are the *way* and the *gate* related to each other in the following discourse? The late Von Meyer thought this an idle question, inasmuch as the figures are here not connected with each other, but *parallel:* I cannot, however, agree with him. It is an error all but universal to understand the Lord, because the strait gate emphatically stands first, as having placed a *strait gate* of conversion, or however else it may be expressed, to be pressed through *before* the way is entered on. Thus do most preachers apply the spirit of the text. But this entirely contradicts the simple character of the figure, the connection of the whole sermon, and much other illustration of the Lord's own meaning? *Doors* lead not to *ways*,* but a way leads to the gate of the town or the house whither I would go: when I reach the gate I am at the end of the way.† If I have entered through the gate, my point is gained definitely, I am either in security, peace, and joy, or—in the prison of eternal ruin. The narrow way is that which the whole sermon has pointed out, the *gate* or the door (for πύλη is a general expression, which includes, as here, the widest gate and the straitest postern) is no other than the entrance into the kingdom of heaven, which as the close and crown of all their struggles and endeavors, is thrown open to those who knock; see vers. 7, 21; ch. v. 20. Thus does the Lord explain himself (Luke xiii. 24, 25). So also he speaks again of the needle's eye (Matt. xix. 24). In the preliminary εἰσέλθετε, *enter*, the Redeemer has certainly *brought near* to us the gate, as if it were directly before us, but only in the same sense as the future kingdom of heaven is come nigh to us, in the same sense as we now continually stand knocking at the gate of heaven, as we are now already *saved* through the asking and receiving of prayer, which brings heaven into the heart. The Lord, to be more particular, includes in his invitations the way and the gate, in one; since the way is already the gate to those who, walking in that way, are sure to reach that gate. When he would summon us to walk in the right way, he prefers at once to take his language from the decisive goal to which it leads: *Enter ye in!* For all our walking in the way is but the beginning of our final entrance. And in this lies the truth, and the justification of our customary way of speaking about the strait gate. It would be even exegetically right, if it were simply derived from the first part of the verse, and confined to it; but if the remainder is thus read, and the gate is placed *before* the way, it is at least exegetically incorrect, and would be inapplicable in speaking and preaching about the inner life. This exegetical error, alas! may become the occasion of much misapprehension of the plan of salvation, both in theory and in practice. The Lord acknowledges those who are entering, who are struggling to enter, but none as having entered till the end comes. And what then would become of the *wide gate*, through which the children of the world would have *already* entered; since *in their case* there is no distinctive beginning or passing through a gate, no passing out from any state whatever into the broad way, in which by nature and by their birth they walk. Rather is the wide gate the gaping pit of hell, opening her mouth without measure (Isa. v. 14; Hab. ii. 5; Prov. xxx. 15, 16)—into which men walk, and dance and stagger and fall by crowds.

The Lord lays down the eternally decisive alternative and contrast—damnation or rather *destruction* and *life;* this great antithesis, and the others connected with it—wide and broad, strait and narrow, many and few: he further strengthens the whole, however, by the words which we must not overlook. Many there be which *go in therent*, few there be that *find it.* Εἰσερχόμενοι δι αὐτῆς, *which go in thereat*—it may be asked, whether ὁδοῦ, *way*, or πύλης, *gate*, be signified. Obviously and primarily we are to understand as the word itself and the previous εἰσέλθετε show—Who go through

* As we see it figured, unnaturally enough, in old books of devotion.

† Thus quite appropriately in the passage of Cebes (quoted also by Olshausen): Θύραν τινὰ μικρὰν καὶ ὁδόν τινα πρὸ τῆς θύρας, "Some little gate and a road before the gate." Lange's reason for placing the gate first, that the fundamental idea is that of a departure from a city, of decision in the choice of the right way, is quite opposed to the letter of the text, which rather speaks of an entrance, and of a way leading to *this.*

the wide gate into hell; yet Luther has understood it of the way thither, and rightly so far as the Lord includes this likewise. The ambiguous δι' αὐτῆς, *thereat*, most significantly confirms the view we have given above. The Lord's glance beholds the way and its termination as inseparable, and the many who walk in the broad way, he warningly and lamentingly describes as *entering in* to destruction! This "going in thereat" is sorrowfully, catachrestically spoken; as if they were entering into their own eternal house, instead of entering into life! (which is lost in Luther's text). To this is opposed in solemn tones of exhortation, the εὑρίσκοντες, *that find*, for to this *seeking* is first of all needful. The broad way to the wide gate no man needs to seek; it is broad as the world (εὐρύχωρος marks rather a great country than a way); thou standest and walkest upon it already: thou canst not fail, swim only with the current, live only according to thy inherited custom and after the impulse of thine own nature; the gate of hell will then receive thee, to which all ways converge as if one single broad way by the side of the one only narrow way. But this narrow way and this strait gate must be perseveringly sought, till it is *found throughout and to the end*. It is "a mountain-path, narrow, insignificant and not obvious to the eye" (Tholuck). Few there be that attain to its end, for even to those who are seeking to pursue it there are by-ways issuing from it to the right and to the left (Isa. xxx. 21; Deut. v. 32), and many who have come near to the gate, fail of it at last! (Luke xiii. 24). What the Lord here says of the many and the few, is similar to Matt. xx. 16; xxii. 14. Only the *doing* of the divine will leadeth unto *life* (afterwards, ver. 21); for the word of Moses (Lev. xviii. 5) still holds good, and the grace of our Lord establishes and fulfills it in us. *Life* and *destruction* are set before us. Who regards the way, its agreeableness or its difficulty, when his eye is on the goal? Who would be guided by the *number* of those who walk in any way, instead of thinking *whither* they tend, and whither himself? The foolish world, indeed, "loves the wide, and the broad, and the numbers"—delights in the majorities! But who ordinarily investigates the door, its width or its straitness, instead of the place *to which* the door conducts him who enters? Look only at the goal and the end! This is the emphasis of the twice-repeated ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα, "the way that leadeth [away]," instead of which Luther has constructed another antithesis which is not in the words; the one *leading away* to destruction, the other *leading to* life. Could the Lord then have meant to speak of a *leading away* into life (conversely as entering *into* destruction); and how might this be taken? It would be hard to find a meaning: we should have to understand it as leading away from all need, from all evil and danger and temptation into perfect security; as in the other case from all pleasure and security into everlasting torment. But then the emphasis is alike in both, and it simply denotes the *eternal decision*, the sure result. Bengel seizes the meaning exactly in his pregnant—ἀπάγουσα, *ex hac brevi vitâ*, "from this short life" Then there is no middle-path, thus there is an irrevocable and fixed alternative! Tholuck seeks in one of his sermons over-critically to soften this; as if the Lord says nothing of the eternal fall of these many, but speaks now only of their *present walking* in the wicked way that leads to it—many of them might yet turn aside from it. Assuredly they *might*, but the ἀπάγειν, *leading* [*away*], signifies the complete result, the εἰσέρχεσθαι, *entering*, is not their present *walking*, according to the weakening translation of the German Bible.

We have now to give our view of the remarkable reading: Τί στενή, *how strait* is the gate! for which certainly the external evidence of manuscripts is favorable, whence even Von Gerlach declares it the true reading. We cannot, however, agree with this: and if Tholuck with a delicate and true perception says: "Wherefore so strait?" would be a human, sentimental pathos which does not accord with the whole discourse; we also say the same of the wondering appeal—O how strait! The Lord is here speaking in a tone of simple assertion and keen testimony; the τί, *how*, by no means suits that tone, and must have originated from the transcribers, who understood not the point of the second striking ὅτι, *because*. This is justified by internal criticism, but what is the meaning of the expression as here used? We should expect a simple "and" of contrast, as Luther has translated it; at furthest a "but" or "on the other hand." Yet ὅτι can be made to mean none of these, by any art. We understand it that the Lord has the former injunction—Enter ye in through the strait gate! still in his thought, and connects with that the two sentences which follow, as if it had been in each case repeated—"*Enter ye in! for* wide is the gate—! (once again: *Enter ye in!* being understood), *For* strait is the gate—!

And yet it is and must ever be a *gate*, which is not shut, but stands open and wide enough for ever for those who would enter it by the right way. "The narrow way to life is broad enough, for men who carefully, gently, evenly walk in it." That is the *consolation*, which even this rigorous saying contains. What more is wanting than a way wherein I may have room, and a gate that will let me through? To this end the Lord stands in fulness of truth and grace, calling and inviting us with all earnestness: *Enter ye in!* meets us, as it were, with "Enter in" before we knock—prays us that we ask—commands us to seek, encourages us himself that we may knock; Connect with this his other great word: I am the way! I am the door! and thou shalt in thy experience learn to unite Matt. vii. 13, 14, with ch. xi. 28–30, and find that both are truth, that both sayings are essentially one in his meaning.

The *requirements* which are enjoined upon us, on the foundation of a promised grace, are now ended, being condensed into that one appeal: *Enter ye in!* This speaks as encouragingly and graciously of a free admission, as its appended statement speaks severely of all that belongs to the *successful prosecution of the way till the final entrance.* It is through the *strait* gate, the straitness of which is previously proclaimed in the narrowness of the way that leads thereto. Its meaning is just what a later explanation of it says: Ἀγωνίζεσθε εἰσελθεῖν, *Strive to enter in* (Luke xiii.)—addressed to those *especially* who already walk in this way, to the disciples, who would be and who may be perfect. Whether they shall *find* the way directly to the gate, the "few there be" makes matter of solemn thought. This of itself is a warning appeal: Beware! and thus the discourse passes over to its conclusion, showing the dangers of the way external to ourselves, and lifting the curtain from before the final judgment-seat.

The *third division* of the Sermon, as it was defined in the distribution which we made at the outset, may not appear to correspond immediately with our preconceived expectations of what it would be; yet it will exhibit itself to a closer observation as quite consonant with the nature of things, and the whole course of thought throughout. Its beginning seems to fly off abruptly from the subject which had been treated, the way, namely, of a progressive advancement towards the goal: but it is not so. For just because at the close of the whole of the *requirements*, the "Enter ye in!" had been so closely connected with a strait gate, and the bye-ways to right and left of inward unholiness which leave the narrow way, had been so fully and clearly disclosed; on that account the section of *warning* was not required to make any distinctive and express reference *to the internal state.* But this did not render unnecessary a glance at the dangers of the way which rise from without, through the false teaching and guidance of a specious deceit. Thus the *introductory* warning against *false prophets*, is first introduced strictly in its right place (vers. 15–20); with which, nothing now being withheld that is requisite for distinguishing the right way, the discourse has free scope to pass on to the remaining fundamental *warning* (vers. 21–23) of the final judgment, in which no evil doer will be able to stand. We are wont to preach about the false prophets in ourselves, and that application is indeed permitted, yet it wrenches the passage from its place in this connection. The Lord simply means such *prophets* as are the opposites of those mentioned in the beginning (ch. v. 12, and again v. 17, vii. 12); so that the beginning and the end agree in one. According to Luke he had previously cast a side-glance upon the *false* prophets. The reference in the discourse *to ourselves* is to be sought not in this, but in something else, namely, in the specification of the *fruits* as marks, not merely of the office of prophets, but as the judgment-day presently shows, of *discipleship* generally. It is a perversion of the sense to regard these fruits, as is commonly done, as the proofs by which true guides must legitimate their claims; the *fruits* are, as the reference to the Baptist's words in ver. 19 shows, no other than what the common usage of the Old and New Testament understands by them. In the whole section vers. 17–20 those fruits, by which the Lord will distinguish his own, are *at the same time* demanded of all his disciples, and, as befits the tone of this concluding division, with all severity; though the first tone of *promise* is once more gently heard in the reference to the good tree which bears those fruits—a tree planted in us by the grace of God. Whereupon, secondly, in ver. 21, *the doing of the will of God* is *required* of us in the final utterance of law; and finally at the minatory conclusion the *warning* against not doing it is heard in the last stern tones of all. Thus we find that the fundamental principle of trichotomy, as we laid it down at the beginning, is preserved and justified down to the end.

We subdivide vers. 15–20 thus: 1. The simple appeal—Beware of false prohets! 2. The detecting reference to the contradiction between appearance and reality—Wolves in sheep's clothing! 3. The laying down of a *mark* to distinguish them, which, however, is and can be no other than the *same* which will avail *us* now and ever before the Lord—the fruits of righteousness, the fulfilling of all the commandments from that new nature which grace creates in us. Let it be observed how that which is here said was foreshadowed in ch. v. 19. This further resolves itself into, (*a*) The general position: The tree is known by its fruit; put in ver. 16 in a convincing manner in a double similitude of natural and Scriptural symbolism. (*b*) An emphatic *repetition* of this, which however in its generality now includes the disciples generally, and the key-note of *promise* is heard in the "good tree." The good and the corrupt tree are contrasted; twice positively (ver. 17), twice negatively (ver. 18). Conclusion of both: the corrupt tree is cast into the fire! (ver. 19), which directly leads over to the *judgment* that follows. Yet to complete the organization of the discourses, (*c*) we have *once more the truth repeated:* Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them? (ver. 20). That is, at the same time, according to the intimation that lies in the words (in accordance with the πᾶν, *every*, of vers. 17 and 19): By the same mark will *ye* be known, as ye know others. This is the *verification* of discipleship before *men* in the time of *the present life* (the shining before men, ch. v. 14, 16); and with it the transition is strikingly made to the impressive sequel.

In vers. 21–23, follows the approval of their

discipleship in the presence of God in eternity, or rather *on that day*, which divides time from eternity, and the days of grace in the way from the goal of eternal decision and doom—*the judgment*. And now we find not —Before God; but—Before *Me*, the Lord, the Judge! Not—Your Father will know you; but—I! The same who at ver. 11 excepted himself alone from the whole evil race, now in language simple and sublime, presents himself as *the Judge* at the end of the way, even as he now exhibits himself the *Lawgiver* in the way. Presumption, if he also belonged to the men who are evil and to the corrupt trees; quite natural and necessary, however, to this testimony of truth, from him who may speak to us from the judgment-seat and say (as it now *for the first time* breaks forth in majesty)—*My* Father, as the eternal Son, the *Lord*. All this is but the consummation of what had been prepared for in ch. v. 22, 25, and still earlier in ver. 20. He determines now, for the first time, who shall enter the kingdom of heaven, and who be cast into prison. The end goes back to the beginning; the whole sermon is a building, of which every stone, from the first to the last, is laid in its place according to a pre-arranged and wonderful order. It says already, as the beginning of sermons, what every other discourse proclaimed—*I am He!* for the conviction and assurance of every one who hath ears to hear, though without specifically and in so many words proclaiming it.

His words are now more closely compressed, as their force becomes more solemn. They lay down *three* positions. The *first* (ver. 21) begins gently with the mere—"Not every one," and mentions, affirmatively and with a tone of promise pervading this *last* requirement, the "doing of the will" as the sure and certain way into the kingdom of heaven. In this is embraced, as in the *most simple possible* compendium, the whole middle division of the Sermon, from its preface (ch. v. 20) down to its close (ch. vii. 14); particularly the three critical precepts (ch. v. 48, vi. 33, vii. 12), as they are condensed in that central *petition* of ch. vi. 10. The *second* sentence (ver. 22) strengthens the negative—"Not every one" by a threatening "many"; the third (ver. 23), is the inexorable conclusion: *Depart from me!* although the "then" leaves us a period of grace for the doing of those sayings, which we now *hear* from the lips of the *Lawgiver* who came to fulfill them, and will come again to be our Judge. Thus—He who hath ears to hear, let him hear! Let him who is a hearer, be also a doer of the work! (John vii. 16, 17).

Then ends the mighty Sermon with a cry of *most direct and urgent warning*, with ἐξουσία (authority) seizing the heart and conscience before the judgment-seat of God: *Whosoever* heareth *these sayings of mine* and doeth them not, is a *foolish man*, has his own destruction to impute to himself, because he has not received and applied my gracious—Enter ye in! my faithful—Beware! It is in gracious condescension from its highest dignity, a *winning* tone being mingled with the *threatening*, that even such a conclusion as this takes the form once more of a popular *similitude*, the balanced and contrasted members of which bring directly home to us the great alternative of everlasting decision, exhibiting the final judgment in warning preparatory judgments, and the test of the last day in manifold tests, which are applied upon earth, and within the day of grace. For *this* alone is the true meaning of the figure (vers. 24–27), which generally and indefinitely comprehends in one the approval of the house (before exhibited) *in time and in eternity*; in strict conformity with the apostle's meaning—*The day* shall declare it, time present and future (1 Cor. iii. 13). In many cases the morrow, but in every case the last day! The reference to the *wise* man who built securely, comes graciously first; although no longer (for every turn of the word and thought is significantly adjusted) in the form of an express appeal and injunction, but with a decisive—*Whosoever* thus heareth and doeth! The last appeal to the warned occurred at vers. 15 and 20, but in ver. 21 the warning and threatening remain only in the third person, just as the discourse, in its great promise, had commenced (ch. v. 2–20). The fearful fall (ver. 27), preaches *condemnation* at the close, as blessedness had been announced in the beginning.

Let the process of our Saviour's preaching and teaching according to the Evangelists be compared with the process of the Sermon on the Mount; and the procedure which is marked out here, will as a whole be found reproduced throughout. We refrain from this comparison in detail, and will only exhibit the analogy, as it is strikingly shown with respect to the conclusion. The warning against *false prophets* recurs at the end of his ministry for his disciples and the people, in Matt. xxiii. (comp. Luke xx. 46), for his disciples particularly in Matt. xxiv., as also at the close of the New Testament, in the epistles of Peter, Jude, and John. The *fruits* are demanded at last (an evidence this, also, of the soundness of our exposition here) in Matt. xxi. 34; John xv. The *judgment*, the rejection and casting out, is threatened in all the final parables to the disciples that we know of, in the last discourse to the people (Matt. xxv.), as in the Apocalypse we find it closing the whole New Testament. The reference to the word of the future Judge, *heard in order to be done*, is found also in John xii. 47–50; compare, for the disciples particularly, John xiii. 17, and the final *conclusion of the whole Bible* Rev. xxii. 6–21.

Verse 15. The Lord here bears witness to *himself* as the true *Prophet*, who should come into the world (John vi. 14; 1 Macc. xiv. 41, προφήτης πιστός); the whole series of heralds and witnesses of God from the first prophecy of Moses downwards, converging into the one, last, perfect utterance of God's

will, through him whose prerogative it is to say—"My Father," and concerning whom the Father responds—*Him shall ye hear!* even as Moses in the beginning had testified (Deut. xviii. 15). *Hear*, and bear well in mind, what I now say unto you: After me will *many other voices* speak to you; beware of them all. In this lofty generality his warning is to be understood; and what the Lord declares for the hearing of all ages, must not be shrivelled into a narrower application to this or that emergency, to any present or following time. It is altogether the same as if he had now also said—All who come besides me, not genuinely in my name, all who shall teach anything other than *I say to you*, are thieves and robbers, whom the sheep may not hear (John x. 8). As comprehensive as was the word in ch. v. 12, concerning the true prophets of former ages, is the contrast to them in this passage—as universal as that contrast had been already exhibited by the Lord himself in Luke vi. 26; with this let Matt. x. 41, xxiii. 34 be also compared. For the sake of the people and the disciples, who then heard him, the scribes of ch. v. 19, 20; Luke xx. 46, are first of all intended; but then all are included, against whom Matt. xxiv. lifts up a warning voice, from the last days of Israel to the end of time. It may be taken in connection with the words which had just preceded; and they are then false *guides*. This must not, however, be restricted by a one-sided limitation to those who would make the narrow way *broader* to you; for there are false guides who would make the narrow way, apparently at least, narrower than the Lord has made it.* They *come* to you—there is a slight contrast hinted in this; they come though they are not *sent*, by their own authority: thus pointing to such ancient warnings as Jer. xiv. 14, xxiii.; Ezek. xxxiv. God sends them not, but he permits them to come, for the trial and confirmation of his people (1 Cor. xi. 19; Deut. xiii. 1–4).

What then is the *sheep's clothing;* does the genitive προβάτων mean—with ἐνδύμασι; Clothed *like sheep*, as if they were sheep, or —With sheepskins? Men contend about this with idle pains, for both are one and the same; and the word is chosen for its twofold reference. It is assuredly clear at once from the simple tone of the words (especially with reference to the Old Testament warnings against false pastors and prophets, which is connected with the discourse), that it should mean: They demean themselves as guides and shepherds, going before you, as if themselves belonging to the flock; but it is only a counterfeit and mask, for they are not sheep as ye are, to whom they come. In this we have a prelude to what is more strongly expressed soon after in ch. x. 16; it is an early note of our Lord's manner of describing his own as his sheep, as it appears in John; a usage which is rooted also in Matthew, as we see in such sayings, derived from the prophetic style of language, as ix. 36, x. 6—and in the shepherd-similitudes (ch. xviii. 12, xxv. 32, 33). But this alone does not exhaust the expression as used *here;* for these first hearers were not sufficiently prepared for this view, and there was yet needed some intermediate point of connection. This lies certainly in the ἐνδύμασι, *clothing*, which to Israelitish ears would immediately carry a reference to the *prophet-costume*, known to all of them, in their proverbial language, and of late brought before their very eyes by John the Baptist. That this included also sheepskins, μηλωταῖς, we are taught by Heb. xi. 37; comp. 1 Kings xix. 13–19 (in the Sept.). If it is asked, whether the sheepskins and goatskins, the rough leathern garments (שֵׂעָר, 2 Kings i. 8) of the prophets, were the symbol of innocence and the natural character of sheep, we answer by again asking—May not the Lord give the figure this application, and extend it from its historical use so far? His word is certainly directed to this point, that the prophet's garment is made a pledge and pretence of an honest design, and thus their lie is cloaked under the appearance of truth and sincerity; just as the prophet has it (Zech. xiii. 4). We thus see that the Lord comprehends in their inner unity the symbolism of nature and the Bible, combines the Old Testament phraseology (even in the Rabbinical which sprung from it) with the well-understood usage of the Gentiles, so that his words are equally intelligible to the Scribes in Israel and to all people who dwell upon the earth even to the distant אִיֵּי הַגּוֹיִם, "Isles of the Gentiles." The Æsopic wolf in sheep's clothing, and the Jewish perverter in the garb of a prophet, are united in one similitude which comprehends the idea of both, and combines what had been true as a historical fact with the common truth of nature. The ἅρπαγες, *ravening*, added to λύκοι, *wolves*, does not merely strengthen the figure, but makes emphatically prominent the destruction and ruin of the poor, deluded ones; as subsequently in John x. 10, 12, and again by the apostle (not without reference to our Lord's word), Acts xx. 29. How, then, shall we strictly define the *sheep's clothing?* A *fair show* generally, as far as it is a mere ἔνδυμα, *clothing*, striking the eye of those who are said ἔξωθεν εἶναι, "to be without:" then, further, it includes on the one hand the specious *discourses* (πιθανολογία, Col. ii. 4; κενοὶ λόγοι, Eph. v. 6; χρηστολογία καὶ εὐλογία, Rom. xvi. 18) of an attractive doctrine and counterfeit orthodoxy, and, on the other, the simulated *walk* of righteous and devout spirit, μόρφωσις εὐσεβείας, "form of godliness" (2 Tim. iii. 5). Although in the latter case the deficiency of the δύναμις, "power," is perceived by those who look searchingly, and it is scarcely possible (as Nitzsch preaches) to counterfeit the stamp of godliness to the eye of those who are well-grounded in the experience of Christian self-

* Indeed only *apparently;* for the heaviest yoke of human impositions is always lighter to us and more agreeable, than the true and narrow way.

denial. As manifold as is the form which their hypocrisy assumes, so comprehensive is the Lord's meaning with regard to them. It must be observed, however, that what it is attempted to impose as pure and true doctrine, must bring with it also false doctrine and error, else how were they *false prophets?* And further, that what appears to be a righteous and blameless life, can be no genuine fruit of righteousness, else how could the Lord have specified fruits as the tokens by which they should be known? With the most perfect propriety of truth, he places *fruits* in opposition both to the word and the work of these hypocrites.

Verses 16, 17. Once more a universally appreciable natural emblem, which at the same time finds its deep significance in the symbolism of Scripture; for the Bible explains to us from its rudiments the book of creation. (James cites once more the Sermon on the Mount in ch. iii. 12.) The fig tree and the vine, the noble productions of the Holy Land—the vine, indeed, the noblest of all lands generally—are in the language of the prophets, the emblem of Israel; thorns and thistles indicate (rather under a theological than a physical presentation) the weeds of sin which have sprung from the curse, as may be seen particularly in 2 Sam. xxii. 6; Mic. viii. 4. What, then, are the figs and grapes, the good fruits? So far as the reference is here especially to the prophets, certainly *not* pure doctrine simply as such; as an exposition would maintain which springs, however unconsciously, from an evil principle: for that would contradict the whole consistent usage of the Scripture when speaking of fruits, and especially the words of the Baptist, to which the Lord here refers, and which must have occurred to the minds of all his hearers upon the Mount. If appeal is made to the context and connection of Matt. xii. 33, 34, with equal appropriateness at least may we refer to the disavowal of the mere *saying*, Lord, Lord, afterwards in this same discourse (ver. 22). *Confession* alone, *doctrine* however pure, is by no means a decisive mark, may be no more than a hypocritical pretension, which itself must be brought to the test. Still less may we, further, limit the words, as has been done, to the fruit which the false teachers may produce *in their disciples:* Look well, what kind of people they create out of their adherents! Although this view is not altogether excluded; as in John xv., among the much fruit of the disciples, their so-called ministerial fruit must be included with the rest. But still this refers to the teachers and guides themselves: they cannot make their disciples what they are not themselves. Thus is it the *life* of these prophets, by which we are to take knowledge of them? Certainly mainly this: for while they for the most part speak fairly, their error is manifest enough in their life; their sheep's-clothing is mostly woven of *words.* Yet there are, again, though not in such numbers, deceivers of an opposite kind, who come the more boldly, the more they appear to be authenticated by the well-ordered, decorous, resplendent character of their deportment. Hence the Lord's words must be rightly understood, as fastening upon these likewise: we are not to look only at the *superficial* cast of their words and works, their walk and their teaching, which is far from a sufficient test, but *we are to learn by it to distinguish*, what are *genuine* grapes and figs, from the thorn-sloes and thistle-heads which might, whether nigh at hand or far off, be mistaken for them. This is the inmost point in the meaning of the Lord's words, this is the only true sense of the καρποι, *fruits*, in which he by no means lays down a merely preparatory, external test, while John afterwards goes deeper into the matter (1 John iv. 1–3);* for though John refers there to a fundamentally sound doctrine, yet this note itself requires, in order to its not deceiving, the complement to it which is here given: *Fruits* and *work* decide alone at last unerringly.† But let this be rightly understood! The question might be put in reply: But, O Lord, thou who speakest of fruits, how should we then distinguish the fruits, the true and the genuine, such as thou callest such, and as will avail before thee? For there is many a vine of Sodom, which produces its grapes and wine, but gall and poison are therein (Deut. xxxii. 32, 33). And this question he has already answered in the whole sermon, in which he has defined the fruits of righteousness so clearly, that we cannot err therein. He who lives and acts before us after this standard, can be no false prophet, can be no corrupt tree. The *criterion* is an *objective*, absolute moral law; not as if, in entire *perversion* of the order and relation, "the peculiarity of the individual" should be the measure and standard of appreciation, according to the crafty Wallenstein: "Let me first search out the nature of the man, and I will tell his will and his deed." Who can search into that, but from without inwardly? although it must not be forgotten that a sound eye is requisite for rightly seeing what is visible before it. If we ourselves stand in the living apprehension and inward experience of the Sermon on the Mount, *then*, but only then, *can* we be on our guard, and discern all the counterfeit of hypocrisy. The ἐπιγνώσεσθε, *ye shall know*, repeated in ver. 20 is less imperative than a *promise: Ye shall* know them, that is, ye who are my disciples, who live and abide in my words. For, as we saw above in our general glance, the *fruits* which are want-

* So Olshausen in his frequently overbold manner.

† In which we are not misled by the strange assertions of Löhe (*Von der Kirche*, p. 93) who, relying on Luke vi. 45, would actually have all otherwise illusory holiness of life tested by doctrine and confession alone. A sad misunderstanding, exposed to yet sadder abuse! If possible stranger yet is the well-intentioned explanation of the *Baggener Monatsblatt*—that the fruits are the aim and tendency of their actions, since we have regard to the fruit in the planting of a tree. Who can discern *that*, and use it as a test?

ing even to external observation in the false teachers, as certainly as they are inwardly evil, are the same which the grace of our Lord produces in all his disciples, and which therefore the judgment of our Lord will exact finally from all his disciples, sheep and shepherds alike. Such a general meaning is rendered incontrovertible by the sequel.

Verses 18–20. What in ver. 17 was expressed with *πᾶν, every*, as a natural law exhibiting itself in things generally—that the inwardly good man bringeth forth truly good fruits, the evil man on the contrary, evil fruits (in which the *ποιεῖν καρπούς*, עֲשׂוֹת פְּרִי, of the original brings out the doing of the work more fully than we can express it, see for example Psa. i. 1, 3)—is now confirmed by a negative *οὐ δύναται, cannot*. He who is born of God cannot *commit sin*, according to John's meaning (1 John iii. 9), although he hath sin and weakness arising from within him and from without. But the natural, sinful man, ver. 11 above, cannot do any thing good, in the sense in which grace only is effectual, however much he may simulate it; they who are living in a state of grace can well distinguish it. It is indeed possible for a while that the wild tree should be graffed into grace through faith (Rom. xi.), but there follows a judgment which finds the tree as it then is. And this is said here equally for the good of the disciples themselves. We have this same expression of the Lord in Luke (ch. vi. 43–45), independently of any connection with the warning against the false prophets, but in the closest connection with the reference to the pefection of the disciple (vers. 40–42), as also with the judgment upon all who call him Lord without obeying him, and hear him without doing his words (vers. 46–49). In this Luke, though in a briefer extract, has rightly seized and preserved the leading idea of the discourse. But whether the Lord actually then upon the Mount uttered what Luke appends in ver. 45, or whether it was transposed from the repetition of the Lord's discourse in Matt. xii. 33, 37, where regard is rather had (after the precedent of Ecclus. xxvii. 6), to the *words* as springing from the heart, we venture not to determine. But as this particular reference to words can scarcely be made to suit the sermon according to Matthew, either as a mark to distinguish the prophets, or as to the *doing of the will* (ver. 21), we might be led to suppose that in this instance Luke, standing at one remove from the event, has slightly departed from the original text and its meaning, which would, in that case, be the only instance of the kind in his exhibition of it.

The being "hewn down and cast into the fire" is literally according to the words of the preacher of repentance in ch. iii. 10. From which we may perceive that the fruits demanded by the Lord are no other than the *fruits meet for repentance* required there in ver. 8 (*καρπὸς ἄξιος τῆς μετανοίας*). But what *μετάνοια, repentance*, in its full and ever-deepening sense is, the Sermon on the Mount, as the development of that compendious announcement of ch. iv. 17, fully expounds to us; and in such a manner that this first requirement must always recur, whether it be at the close of the sermon or the close of life—or to speak more definitely, whether it be at the close of the Gospel, or of the life of grace. That which as a legal threatening and before the consolatory message of grace, impelled to a first repentance, afterwards impels with all the might of the Gospel to the perfecting of holiness. It is a fixed decree—the Lord utters it as strongly as it could be uttered—God wills inexorably the *doing* of his will: I am not come to relax the Law, but **to** fulfill and establish it. In the judgment there is no respect of persons; the *tree* must bear its *fruit, each one*, be he whom may! If he produces *not good* fruits, then must he assuredly produce evil fruit; this follows as a necessary conclusion from vers. 17, 18. But that only the lack of good fruit is expressedly mentioned (just as ch. xxv. 42–45), has its severe meaning for the wilful blindness which asks: What evil can I do, that deserves damnation? Finally, in these sentences we have a criterion indicated for the two most obvious classes of false prophets: the one speaking of fruits without planting the tree, the other speaking of the tree without its fruits. As for that most dangerous middle-class between these two extremes, including those who teach faithfully the fruits of the tree which the Lord plants, and also seem to possess such fruits, not merely in saying, Lord, Lord, but in mighty works and deeds; for them the Lord's word, with *ἄραγε, wherefore*, emphatically repeated, has its keen force: By their fruits ye shall know them, namely, by those same proofs by which the Lord knows you yourselves to be his own, when you walk sincerely before him, and for the lack of which he will judge you in common with all who persist in wanton self-blinding.

Verse 21. Let it be carefully observed, for this alone gives the conclusion of the whole discourse its true meaning, that the Lord designedly interweaves together the judgment upon the deceivers and the judgment upon all generally who cannot then stand before him. He continues to speak in vers. 21–23 of false prophets (yet not now as known hypocrites and wolves, but by a transition as self-deceived); but generally also of all who know, proclaim, and call upon his name. *Κύριος, Lord*, is here, as it mightily announces itself to be, infinitely more than the usual title of reverend men (John xii. 21; Acts xvi. 30); he who now in the highest and only sense arrogates as befitting *himself* the name of "Lord," never from sacred propriety bestowed that title on any one in the inferior sense, even in his lowest subjection.* To call *me* Lord in

* Ipse neminen, ne Pilatum quidem, Dominum vocavit, "He himself never called any one Lord, not even Pilate" (Bengel).

life, to call *me* Lord in the day of judgment—is the claim of him, who now at the close of his sermon, every word of which (even in Matthew) is strictly measured, pronounces that great and all-comprehensive—"My Father." That perversion of the Lord's words in the mouth of the Rationalists, which represents him as laying no stress upon the calling of him *Lord*, or on the honor of his own name, provided only the doing of God's will is secured*—is the most wilful perversion that can possibly be imagined. Does the Lord, then, lay such emphasis upon the contrast between the saying, Lord, and the doing the will of the Father? Assuredly not, he only says: Not *every one* that *saith* unto me, Lord, Lord (however earnestly and repeatedly he may say it, to hide his deficiency, as the repetition of the word indicates), *if* it be no more than *saying*, if the evidence of the sincerity of this profession in holy life is wanting. Moreover, he expressly exacts in John xiii. 13, at the moment of his deepest humiliation, not merely the slighter Rabbi, but the full and unlimited "Lord." When he prophesies in Matt. xxv. of such among the nations of the earth as shall stand before his great tribunal, on the evidence of their works of mercy, without having lived in the conscious knowledge of his person, he yet represents them as addressing him at the last with nothing less than "Lord." His Spirit testifies afterwards in the apostle, that every tongue shall confess that he is Lord (Phil. ii. 9–11)—as also that to call him Lord is precisely the same as to belong to him, and possess his Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 3). Only, however, when this profession is a reality of the heart and of the whole life, the serving, depending upon, and obeying him as the Lord, in the absolute and most distinctive sense of the word, as it was found above in ch. vi. 24. Hence the perfectly appropriate *question* (Luke vi. 46), which was probably added by our Lord (between ver. 23 and ver. 24 of Matthew). With such generality is the saying of Lord, Lord, laid down with reference to the *semblance of discipleship*, which may deceive many, even as many deceive themselves; and now comes in for the sake of the reality of that profession the simple—*He that doeth the will* of my Father which is in heaven. Which indeed does not merely mean—He who keeps the Ten Commandments—but the commandment of faith, the revealed will and council of the Father in the Sermon (John vi. 39, 40; 1 John iii. 23) is essentially included in it. Not otherwise does the Lord speak elsewhere, when he is defining the limits of his own, as for example in ch. xii. 50; and his Spirit in the apostles similarly promises eternal assurance and salvation, the final possession of the promised kingdom, only to such doing of God's will (1 John ii. 17; Heb. x. 36).

* Fichte led the way by maintaining that "if Jesus should only find obedience and fruit, he would ask very little about the connection which his name or his person had therewith!"

Verses 22, 23. The concrete individuality of the preceding οὐ πᾶς ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν, *not every one but he that doeth*, is now followed by *Many;* which introduces in its sad and warning severity, a more convincing application of his words, and lifts, as it were, already the curtain of the judgment-seat. *Many* again, as in ver. 13, but still more definite and strict; not merely the many who run with a wicked world in the road to hell, but many even among those who appeared to honor me, to walk as mine in words and works, who thought themselves to be such! *In that day:* according to the exact language of prophetic Scripture, the so frequent בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא. The worst development of *hypocrisy*, the result and judicial self-punishment of deception, is at last seen in the deluded belief of its own lie, *self-deception* become hardened into reprobation. Hence the Lord represents as the extreme contrast to those who stand before him accepted in judgment, those who at that day will *vainly imagine* that they also shall find acceptance.* For *that* is indeed all that is meant by the saying to him; and of course not any actual so speaking. There is a self-deception which holds out to the end; a frightful truth, of which the Lord once again reminds us, in the discourse Luke xiii. 25–27—a discourse closely related to this. We ask in our curiosity—Is there then a self-deception *which continues through Hades*, even to the last day? The Lord's word answers, Yes; but we dare not ask further how that may be. The word of Revelation does not lift the curtain from this intermediate state. We may forecast and anticipate, but nothing certain is told. Theosophy alone teaches and understands (although with no small danger of being overwise) the continuance in the empire of the dead of the errors carried thither.

The threefold progressive exhibition of their word and deed, upon which the evil-doers relied, advances, according to their conception, from the less to the greater; but in reality and in the Lord's estimation, the progression is downwards, and the order must be reversed. Δυνάμεις, wonderful works or *miracles*, are the least of all attestations according to the general doctrine of Scripture; there are many signs and wonders ascribed to the false Christ, and the false prophets (ch. xxiv. 24). More plausible are *profitable* miracles, by which the *devils are really cast out*, as we find the Lord himself evidencing by them, in ch. xii. 25–28, the divinity of his miracles. Yet it is requisite, in order that this token may not deceive, that the accordant, confirming evidence of all the works which spring from an inner life, *good fruits*, should be added; the spirits are subject to the name of Jesus even when pro-

* They are as thoroughly assured of their righteousness and salvation, as the Pharisee, Rabbi Simeon, in the Talmud, who says: "If there are only two righteous men in the world, my son and myself are the two; if there is only one, it is I myself!"

nounced by such as have not their names written in heaven, though it be by Judas found among the twelve. It is indeed a kind of *faith*, by which they are produced, but not the faith which saves and sanctifies the soul (1 Cor. xiii. 2). Finally, the most specious is the first mentioned *προφητεύειν, prophesying*, not merely the revealing futurity, (which belongs rather to the *δυνάμεις* or *miracles*), but according to the use of the expression in the Old and New Testament, the speaking and teaching from inspiration. But there is even an *inspiration*, which consists in the being transitorily *possessed* by the Spirit of truth, without penetrating to the regeneration of the heart and will. Alas! how many a powerful preacher of Christendom falls into this condemnation, that of preaching thus to others, himself remaining or becoming reprobate!

There *is* such a self-deception which continues to the end, but it is *detected* at the last; and the detection is as righteous as it is fearful, for this self-deception is only hypocrisy made perfect in its own guilt. If then—for this is the conclusion which the Lord designs to produce in the minds of his hearers—such as can point to the evidence of prophecy and miracles are *rejected;* how much less will the unfruitful trees of a commoner kind be saved from the burning! If even their thrice-protested—Lord, Lord, *in thy name!* is insufficient for *their* salvation, how much less will the saying Lord, Lord, with their lips only, avail for the multitudes of the utterly idle and unprofitable, in the day of his wrath! Let it be observed how significantly the Lord maintains the honor of his name, by thus declaring that it is not a mere empty external honor that it requires. Let our hearts *feel*, without many words, the inexpressible *ἐξουσία* (*authority*) of the judicial *τότε ὁμολογήσω, then will I confess*, which scattering to the winds the delusion of lies, pronounces the *truth* against all imaginations and self-delusion! There is no *Ἐγώ* prefixed, and yet in these most simple words it is most solemnly implied—*I*, the Judge, will say unto you; I, the Searcher of hearts, will reveal to you your long-hidden heart and conscience, will only confirm to you what you should have known, and must now know. If all the world, if all God's children have held you for my people, *I never knew you*, that is, as truly and effectually mine: the words say nothing more, that is enough. It is remarkable that in pre-announcing his final judicial sentence, the Lord appropriates a word of his great ancestor and type, King David; and not any such royal utterance as is found in Psa. ci. 3, 4, 7, but that which occurs in Psa. vi. 8; which was given to David after he had cried in deep, personal, most lowly penitence—Rebuke me not in thine anger! This is intended to intimate (for it cannot have been chosen without signification) that *whoso hath not learned thus to speak with David*, will be constrained to hear it from another mouth. From the mouth of him whose Depart from me! (ch. xxv. 41) is cause enough for condemnation; of him, who needed to have said nothing more, yet in his righteousness makes the explanatory addition: Ye *that work iniquity!* This is, further, a solemn expression taken from the Old Testament, פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן, *workers of iniquity*, as for example, in Psa. v. 6, xiv. 4, xxviii. 3, xxxvi. 13, xcii. 8–10, xciv. 4–16, ci. 8, cxxv. 5; Job xxxiv. 8–22; Prov. x. 29, xxi. 15 (1 Macc. iii. 6, comp. Luke xiii. 27). Ye have named my name, but ye have not departed from iniquity! (according to 2 Tim. ii. 19, where there is manifestly an echo of the Sermon on the Mount, whether by the conscious design of the apostle, or by the inspiration of the Spirit). In *τὴν ἀνομίαν* of the Greek expression (literally, *the* [i. e. your] *lawlessness*) we may detect the great truth—With all your other appearances, your life and work, judged by its internal principle, was one great *ἀνομία*, nothing but unrighteousness, lawlessness and transgression in my sight.* Whether the Lord did thus keenly express his meaning is questionable, on account of the Old Testament פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן, *workers of iniquity.*

Verses 24–27. From his utterance at the day of judgment the Lord suddenly turns to what his lips, *the same* lips now utter, in the day of grace, and with the judgment yet in the future. *These sayings of mine:* these words, utterances, testimonies, as I have now given them in one entire and perfect harmony of connection. This requires us to regard *τούτους, these*, as implying a fundamental sermon of peculiar solemnity; and it forms its sublime conclusion as such, its direct and authoritative *dixi*, by which the whole discourse makes its appeal to the conscience as the word of the future Judge even before its *λόγοι, words* have ceased to be spoken.† It is with the *hearing* of these sayings as with the saying Lord, Lord; it avails not of itself, but must not be omitted. The *hearing*, indeed, is the first necessary condition; for faith and supplication, asking, receiving, obeying and doing, come all from the previously received and accepted word of grace and truth, Heb. ii. 1, xii. 25. Yet compare with this Rom. ii. 13; James i. 22–25. Again there is the concrete antithesis: a wise *man*, a foolish *man;* as in vers. 17–19, tree set against tree. The very popularly conceived and condescending similitude that follows, is found in similar terms, though more superficially, in Sirach (Ecclus. xxii. 16, 17), who points, as the Lord does here, to passages in the prophetic Scriptures; to Isa. xxviii. 16–18, namely, where the great foundation is more especially referred to, and Ezek. xiii. 10–15, where the falling of the untempered wall as well as of the whole

* Hence Lange would translate boldly—"Ye who pursue lawlessness as your calling.

† *Τοὺς λόγους τούτους, these words*, seems to bind together the Sermon, and preclude, as indeed does the whole structure of the Sermon, the supposition that these chapters are merely a collection of sayings uttered at different times (Alford.)

building, is threatened in similar figures. Ezekiel may rather refer to the temporal judgment (comp. Ecclus. xlix. 11), Isaiah to the final fall into death and hell. Our Lord's words here embrace both, as we showed above. The *house* which a man builds for himself as a secure abode, as a defence and protection against wind and weather, signifies the abiding and standing before the judgment of God both in time and eternity, the salvation of the soul into perfect security: in this sense Solomon also says—The wicked are overthrown and are not; but the house of the righteous shall stand (Prov. xii. 7). If the house falls, which thou hast built for thyself, then wilt thou thyself be overwhelmed and buried in its ruins. The Lord speaks not directly concerning those who think nothing about all this; who have no concern where or how they shall stand; *who built not at all:* their fate is understood without being mentioned. They also who, having laid the right foundation at first, yet have neglected to build fast and firm upon that foundation, will find their condemnation in the simple word which afterwards makes prominent the extremest contrast of folly, with those, namely, who seem to think mere *hearing* without doing to be foundation and superstructure enough. (As before in ver. 22, the uttermost extreme was contrasted, designedly to embrace all else.) If, however, we look narrowly and hear attentively, we shall find that all are actually included who fail in the persistent doing of the will of God; for *these sayings* speak directly *of this*, and require of all, who hear and do them, perseverance and consummation of their holiness: and we might add, taking this similitude generally to ourselves, that a foundation is not itself a dwelling, there must be something built upon it. This, however, is contrary to the close connection of the figure with *all these sayings*. Rather the Lord regards the entire and full performance of his whole will as itself the *foundation of rock*, on which all depends; the superstructure thereupon is understood without any specific mention, in both cases alike.

A house must be built with direct reference to protection against wind and weather, for *the* rain, *the* floods, *the* winds will not fail or cease: this is the significant meaning of the article here designedly used. Specially does this apply to eastern countries, with regard to the physical character of which this figure is chosen, where these commotions are more sudden and more violent than ordinarily in our own land. The rain descends from *above* (*κατέβη*), the floods come side-long, washing their way to the very foundation *beneath;* when in addition to all this the winds blow and violently *beat upon* the building, none but a foundation of rock can sustain the whole. This has been pursued into more exact detail, as referring to the sorrows and afflictions which God sends from heaven like heavy rain; to the current of the spirit of the age, of temptation or persecution, which presses around and shakes the foundation; to the additional storms or marked judgments of God, in which he blows with his breath, to separate and make manifest what is only flesh.* We leave this to the judicious application which every word of Holy Writ will easily admit; but the generality of the final tone of the whole discourse will not permit us to deduce such specific views from the text. In Luke, where the whole reads somewhat differently in the freedom of the variable letter, the winds and the rain are wanted, a simple *πλημμύρα, stream*, is all that is spoken of. On the other hand he brings into more prominence the *fundamental idea* of the parable, which is the firm foundation—He *digged deep*, till he could lay his foundation upon a rock. There, further, our Lord's first *ὁμοιώσω, I will liken*, is made strongly emphatic, in entire harmony with Matthew's meaning: *Ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν τίνι ἐστὶν ὅμοιος, I will show you to whom he is like.* For the sovereign authority of the Master employs here, as emphatically as condescendingly, a customary mode of speaking among the Rabbies, comp. Mark iv. 30. In the second member of the sentence it is merely *ὁμοιωθήσεται* or *ὅμοιός ἐστιν, he shall be likened* or *he is like.* The conclusion, with its solemn tone of threatening, is the same in both, though expressed in different words: a manifest token that we have in Matthew and Luke one and the same discourse of our Lord, pursuing its course of instruction from the same beginning to the same end.

Matthew conclusively and irresistibly confirms this by the postscript (vers. 28, 29), which points back to the superscription in ch. v. 1, 2, and we, for our part, can never accede to the position that this is a collection of sayings uttered at various times. How mischievously a hypothesis may beguile is shown by Olshausen, who finds clear evidence of Matthew's having formed such a collection in his expression *τοὺς λόγους τούτους, these words*, since a connected discourse could only be spoken of as *λόγος*, or *word*, in the singular; while the *συνετέλεσεν, he had finished;* which contradicts this supposition, is altogether passed over. As if Matthew had not received this very expression, which he designedly repeats with great emphasis, from the Lord's

* Braune's interpretation is just like this, so far as concerns the first reference; but when the *winds* are made only human temptations attacking us sideways, and the floods of the ocean, "the ebb and flow of the despairing and then froward heart," this seems to us to be more subtle than skillful. Father Zeller, of Beuggen, speaks again of the heavy rains and floods of revolutions, the wind of false doctrine, *storms* of the "judgments of God," agreeing in this last point with what we have given above, which is the best exposition, after all, if we must make these distinction.

own mouth in vers. 24 and 26! *Οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι, these words*, cannot there be "extracts from several discourses," but have the same meaning as *τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάλημα ὑμῖν, the words that I speak unto you*, in John vi. 63, and *οἱ λόγοι μου, my words*, in Matt. xxiv 35.

What the apostle remarks of the impression of the discourse upon the *ὄχλοι*, or *multitudes*, *appears* to be one of those unfrequent reflections of his own which he inserts in the simple narrative; but it is evidently, when closely examined, itself only *narrative*, a record once made in the most appropriate place, just as Luke afterwards says the same thing (ch. iv. 32). Indeed, what Matthew says in ver. 29 may be almost received as the actual expression of the people's feeling, as an epitome of all their sayings concerning it; just as in a similar manner he gives in ch. x. 36, a word probably spoken by the Redeemer himself.* This was, in any case, most naturally the necessary impression upon the minds of the multitude, whether they thus uttered it or not; this was the inward ground of that outward *ἐκπλήσσεσθαι, astonishment*, of which they were thoroughly conscious in themselves. *It was so:* the apostle himself remembers it well, for his own emotion at the first hearing was living yet in his soul. *Not as the scribes!* In this is summed up yet once more the great contrast which pervaded the Sermon from ch. v. 20. But alas the mere *ἐξεπλήσσοντο*, in which the whole terminated with regard to most (Luke ii. 18, 19), transmits to us a melancholy example of that *hearing* and not doing, with warning against which the Sermon closed.

LUKE'S SUMMARY OF THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

(Luke vi. 20–49.)

We have already shown, in passing, that Luke's report of the Sermon on the Mount perfectly agrees with Matthew in every thing essential, that there is not only no contradiction between their several statements and view of it, but that the comparison tends to their mutual confirmation and elucidation. Luke gives an *epitome* of the Sermon, like Matthew; hence it is natural that each gives something which is wanting in the other, even in the case of Luke, who gives a much more *concise* presentation of it. What we read as given by the apostles and ear-witnesses, was brought to their remembrance, selected for them, and set in order by the promised Spirit (John xiv. 26, xvi. 14); the historical writer Luke, who derived his information from the original witnesses, and whose testimony (in relation to John xv. 26, 27) is humanmediate, although he is not without the spirit of truth, yet may naturally be supposed not to have caught so central a view, and to have spread out the whole amplitude of a long discourse, which was poured forth at once in such depth and fulness. For as the syanagogue admitted degrees of inspiration in the Old Testament, so we must allow in the New, a difference even between Matthew and John, and how much more between both these and the two other Evangelists. All proceeds *naturally* with each, in the miracle which yet approves itself as nature; how otherwise would the higher and lower nature come together as a true and living reality?

Here we are constrained in a second edition more decidedly to oppose a view propounded in Lange's *Leben Jesu*. That excellent man having thoroughly entrenched himself (his work is pervaded with it) in the notion at first broached by Augustine, and since his time sometimes emerging into notice, of two discourses delivered at a short interval, endeavors to convince us that there was a sermon on the mountain-level in addition to the Sermon on the Mount, a platform sermon besides the hill sermon, a sermon for the people after the sermon for the church:* but few we think will concur with him. The reasons which are adduced, more confidently maintained than well-grounded against the long prevailing view, are indeed actually very weak, and provoke our instant opposition. Apart from the ingenious turns of thought and forced interpretations which Lange in this as in all his hypotheses has abundantly at command, the arguments for this view are reduced to these two positions: that the Evangelists themselves indicate separate localities and circumstances, and that Matthew's discourse could not from its intrinsic nature have been openly and publicly delivered.

We are to understand (Matt. v. 1) that the Lord at the sight of the great multitude of people, retired into the narrower circle of his own disciples! But what man in his senses and not already pledged to a hypothesis, can fail to see that the connection with ch. iv. 25 will not allow of a retreating from the crowd, but rather requires that that crowd is itself taught? (comp. ix. 36, xv. 29, 30, xix. 2) Thus the disciples are either those who in a narrower circle more immediately surrounded him; or more generally and in a wider sense, all who were disposed to hear him and followed

---

* Roos: *ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων*, "as one having authority," one who was, though *incognito*, the *King* in his kingdom! Chrysostom earlier: *Πανταχοῦ ἑαυτὸν ἐνδεικνύμενος εἶναι τὸν τὸ κύριος ἔχοντα*, "Everywhere showing himself to be the One having the dominion"—on account of the "I say unto you," and the assertion of the judgment at the close.

* Since the Lord, in contrast with the second and more bare redaction of the law by Moses (!), reduces the first form of the Sermon on the Mount which only his *devoted* disciples could apprehend; and in tender consideration of the people's weakness, gives a second, more concrete, and easily apprehended. Against all such distinction see the testimony of John xviii. 20.

him for that purpose. This is rendered more certain by Matthew's own declaration (vii. 28) that the ὄχλοι, *multitudes*, were hearers of this discourse! Further, the ἔστη, *stood*, of Luke vi. 17 is not to be pressed (as Braune takes it) to mean, that Jesus delivered *this discourse standing* upon the plain, but it simply signifies as coming after the καταβάς, *when he was come down*, that then he *stood still*, *halted* at the place which he would choose for his sermon. The τόπος πεδινός, or *plain*, the "high or mountain-level," a platform of the ὄρος, or *mountain*, was naturally selected as adapted for the gathering together of the people.

But the very doubtful exegesis in favor of distinct locality is supported by an internal criticism, which comes to its aid with the bold affirmation that Christ could not have delivered the Sermon on the Mount to all the people indiscriminately! It cannot receive a view which would indiscreetly put to the utmost peril its whole design, for this discourse has altogether an esoteric and confidential type!* The common people were not yet ripe to receive such an illuminating criticism upon the precepts of the Pharisees! We appeal against this to our whole exposition, which has seized and exhibited the spirit of the whole discourse as a public programme of doctrine for the whole people. We think we can decisively overturn this whole position by three brief questions. First: did not the discourse which the Lord might utter before his formed circle of disciples (which, however, could not possibly be a closed circle, since whosoever would might go up to them) instantly and necessarily and always become *public*—especially a discourse so strikingly delivered as this? As to its being confidential, a mountain in the very sight of the following crowds would not have been chosen for a discourse which was to be withheld from the people. *Can* we suppose the Lord to have commanded them to remain below, until he should come down and speak also to them? Secondly: where do we find in the Gospels the slightest trace of any such delicacy and consideration, of any such disposition to spare the Pharisees, in the first period of his ministry? Finally, was John the Baptist's public and unsparing and severe opposition to the Pharisees in the presence of all the people an imprudence, which the Lord can be supposed to have desired to repair, or to have been in a condition to do so?

Enough; no further detailed refutation is necessary. *We*, at least, observe not in Luke any such "dim and exhausted representation of the discourse" as the supposition of its identity is thought to involve: he gives another extract of it, and indeed each Evangelist can be supposed to have given the longer discourses of our Lord only in such extracts. But we hold it a far worse evil than even a dim presentation at a second remove by a collator, *if* such language may be used; yea, we reckon it the worst possible evil, and one that decisively condemns and overthrows the whole hypothesis of Lange, that *untruthfulness* is thus necessarily imputed to an *apostle* and eye-witness. Is it said that by his "inexact concluding words" concerning the astonishment of the *people*, he has in some degree weakened his own first "more exact statement" in ch. v. 1? Assuredly not; he tells us only at the close himself, how his words at the beginning are to be understood. It is said that "he has allowed the sermon to the people to mix with the sermon to the church;" nay, that "minute transpositions from the one sermon to the other may have taken place through evangelical tradition." We have a quite different opinion of Matthew's Gospel, and of his narration, so simple in its truth, and exhibiting so entirely as it does the marks of an eye-witness. He is said, finally, to have taken the popular and lucid similitude at the conclusion of the exoteric discourse, and attached it to the esoteric: but what assertions, what imputations are these! and *how*, then, did the Lord close his confidential sermon? Was it not also with the rejection of the workers of iniquity, ch. vii. 23? And how did the fit and appropriate conclusion pass into oblivion, the other taking its place? Then must the wisdom of the Great Teacher, which led him to deliver two sermons, and which *could* not have spoken the Sermon on the Mount to the multitude, have remained hidden from the Apostle Matthew as well as from all "evangelical tradition," so that they mixed together in early times what it was left to *our* later skill to discriminate. Against all these absurdities we have our consolation, reading the sermon to the people even in Matthew's account; and regarding it as returning to us again abbreviated in the derived Gospel of *tradition*. "Devoted" disciples—how became these such so early? were they not rather made so by this sermon, which was designed to call out and to separate those disciples from the mass of the people?

Luke hands down what his sources gave him,* and arranges more after the manner of human skill and wisdom the words which his reporters had seized and preserved as then spoken by our Lord. Thus *in his case* there may be something of that which is improperly imputed to Matthew, a working up, if we may so call it, of his materials. He constructs out of the details a whole of his own, and in doing so we must suppose that the original letter may have been departed from in some cases by his vouchers, as well as that he may in some cases have departed from it himself, just in order to give it more closely. He gives his own spontaneous expression sometimes so as to make his narrative move

* It is even said that in the midst of a gathering of thousands of people Jesus could not have preached *sitting*, "tarrying so patiently and composedly."

* Not, however, just a "postscript"—as Schleiermacher once said, as if talking about his Berlin sermons!

more harmoniously; generalizes the concrete, for instance, in order that it might lose any fragmentariness or indistinctness, being conscious in himself that in some cases he had not received the *ipsissima verba* of the Lord. We concede all this, for it lies before our eyes; and yet we, on our side, maintain with equal confidence, that Luke could not in this manner incorporate any thing of his own, or any thing that by others before him had been falsely attributed to our Lord. For that the Spirit of Truth miraculously guided him also, preserving him from all essential error in the matter of his Gospel, is most evident, however more or less conscious his Proœmium shows him to have been of this. It is manifestly stamped upon the very character of his whole Gospel, and is proved by the many discourses of our Lord which he alone gives in all their self-evidencing truth. Consequently we have in the Sermon on the Mount even of Luke nothing but the *Lord's word* actually spoken by himself: even where *for once* he may be thought to have transgressed the bounds of his own faculty by introducing a saying from another place (ver. 45); yet even this is a saying of our Lord, actually spoken on another occasion.

The more closely genuine criticism examines the contents of the two Evangelists, laying them side by side and subjecting them to a comparative exposition, the more incontestibly does Matthew's evince itself to be the original, according to which Luke's is to be understood. For what the latter gives us, bears the natural character of having been transmitted and derived from hearers at a second remove.* To make this the proper original, and Matthew's a deviating and expanded collection and compilation, is not criticism but folly, which heedlessly and superficially talks about what has never been thoroughly investigated. This is our avowal and testimony; the detailed grounds of which appertain not to this book, though we hold them in readiness.

Let the entire arrangement, closely compacted as it is in Matthew, down to its slightest details, be now surveyed; and let the elements of the discourse as given by Luke be assigned to their place in it. The commencement and the conclusion fit well together, although the great bulk of the expansive middlepart is wanting. Of the *first main division* we have the *benedictions*, apprehended in their starting-point and in their essence, and illustrated by distinctive contrasts.† Of the *second* part we find little, yet that little is well-ordered and correct. Of the first contrast as opposed to the righteousness of the Pharisees, we have the *commandment of the love of enemies* which annuls their wicked gloss upon the falsely interpreted law; as well as the accompanying reference to the perfectly merciful benevolence of God. The express polemic against their apprehension of the law in individual precepts is wanting at the beginning, as also that against their specious corformity to the law in alms-giving, prayer and fasting. The whole of the second contrast as against heathenish care is pretermitted, *probably* with the Evangelist's knowledge and design, certainly under the Spirit's direction, since the Gospel (ch. xii. 1) contains a record of it afterwards as having been spoken by our Lord. The third contrast, on the contrary, as against *judging* and *mote-seeing*, comes forward with tolerable fulness, even enlarged upon the main idea. On the other hand the profound observation directed against the imprudence of charity in exhorting and preaching, is wanting; and so, indeed, is the whole close of this division, viz., the injunction to *prayer* and to enter through the *strait gate*, but only for the reason given above, that both are to occur in a later repetition (chs. xi. and xiii.); as well as the preceding Lord's Prayer. Finally, in the *third part* of the discourse, only the warning against false prophets is passed over, as before the general controversy with Pharisaism. Instead of this the requirement of the *fruits*, the exhortation to *doing*, and the warning against *not doing*, follow immediately next, in strict harmony with the fundamental course of thought. And now we ask any man whether, in Luke's extract also, the *characteristic* element of every section is not preserved; the heart of the *promise* at the commencement; the point of the *requirements* in the middle, piercing the heart of every hearer who keeps them not (in ver. 40 these requirements merge into that of a *perfect discipleship*); and finally the conclusion with its no less emphatic and solemn *warning*. We have fresh evidence in this, that we have rightly seized the course and order of the discourse in Matthew, since it is not contradicted here but confirmed. We find a reason and justification of Luke's omission of the reference to the Law and the Prophets (Matt. v. 17–19), as well as of the subsequent controversy with Pharisaism upon its interpretation of individual commandments, in the relation which his Gospel bears to the first: he has less directly than Matthew a Jewish interest and aim, but the Spirit uses him as a witness for the Greeks and the Gentiles.* Thus in the marvellous domain of inspiration, where human consciousness and divine direction most wonderfully unite in concert, even deficiencies approve themselves as parts of a well-ordered arrangement.

* Not, however, in the sense in which Schleiermacher says, "that the reporter had a more unfavorable place for hearing."

† Not as if (according to Schleiermacher) the reporter *appended the woes*, in order to fill up a gap which he felt, but knew not how to complete! but in the sense in which we shall afterwards explain ourselves.

* Von Gerlach simultaneously concurred with me in this reason for regarding Luke's discourse as "without doubt the self-same" which Matthew gives more in detail.

Verses 20—23. In the benedictions as here given according to the conception of a less immediate report, we do not find recognized Matthew's internal progression through the number seven into its close and confirmation in the eighth, and the complete systematic view of the inner and outer life of discipleship which he has stamped upon them. Hence not only is the second part (Matt. v. 7–9) quite wanting, but also the previous benediction of the *meek*, as it stands at the turning-point of the development. But so much more sharply comes out in striking paradox the *contrast* between the promised blessedness and the present external circumstances of the disciples, as Luke's main point of view: Blessed are ye who are now miserable, needy and persecuted! In *this* view the transposition which places those who hunger before those who weep, is fully justified; and thus viewed the benediction of the persecuted and separated ones (vers. 22–23) was all the more indispensable. It is in harmony with this point of view, further, that the discourse just here assumes the direct address of *Ye* (which in Matthew first begins at ver. 11); and the preceding observation that the Lord thereby signified *his disciples*, is so entirely correct, that we cannot but suppose in connection with Matthew's form of expression such a direct turning of the Lord's eye upon his immediate and near disciples. To give this idea, as a human illustration which, however, is faithful to the true reference of the discourse, νῦν, *now*, is now appended: for if a present internal satisfaction and consolation are promised to those who hunger and those who weep, yet does the full *contrast* as here viewed stretch its *futurum* onwards to that time of which such a passge as Rev. vii. 16, 17, speaks. Then will the *consolation* which now begins be consummated in *laughing* in its highest sense (Psa. cxxvi. 2).

But here a false criticism and exposition—even that of Neander,* to our great regret—will have it that the Lord's word is misunderstood, as if he had spoken of the physically and externally hungry and poor. Assuredly it is not! Let it be observed narrowly and it will be seen that as in Matthew the אֶבְיוֹנִים, *needy*, are by transition included, so also in Luke internal poverty, hunger and sorrow are not excluded but implied. He had already (ch. iv. 18) quoted Isaiah's εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, *to preach the Gospel to the poor*, and now indicates the true meaning of that expression, the only one which it will bear in the prophetic Scripture; viz., that which includes both senses in the indeterminate language of the Spirit. Are mendicants, as such, inheritors of the kingdom of God? Only so far as their external poverty becomes true poverty of spirit; as on the other hand the externally rich may be truly poor before God. The τῷ πνεύματι, *in spirit*, is wanting to πτωχοί, *poor*, and τὴν δικαιοσύνην, *after righteousness*, to πεινῶντες, *that hunger*, but that they are to be understood in the Lord's word follows necessarily from its being his word.*

In the sequel we have as a mere change of expression, instead of *persecute*, its principle sharply defined in μισεῖν, *hate*, and with this, its manifestation in ἀφορίζειν, *separate*; the Lord may have uttered both; let his corresponding concluding discourse *to the disciples* be compared with this, and let the probable allusion in John xvi. 2 to Isa. lxvi. 5 be duly noted.† The ἐκβάλλειν τὸ ὄνομα ὡς πονηρόν, *casting out one's name as evil*, is probably the same as הוֹצִיא שֵׁם רָע (Deut. xxii. 19). Yet is ἐκφέρειν ονομα πονηρόν, as the Sept. translates there, somewhat different from the stronger ἐκβάλλειν of our text (which rather includes the idea of excommunicating or putting under ban), and from the just as much stronger τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρόν. This ὡς and this τὸ point rather to *the Name* which they preach and glory in; which they thus make *their own* and bear; see, again, the Epistle of James, which is pervaded with the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount (ch. ii. 7), where we the rather find a lusion to our text, as the *poor* and the rich, vers. 5, 6, had just been spoken of. In the intense σκιρτᾶν, *leap for joy*, Luke only remains true to his fundamental aim, to make prominent the contrast between the future and the *now*; but inasmuch as not a future but an imperative stands connected with "*in that day*," (comp. Matt. vii. 22, a prelude of which we may have here), it must be taken with ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, *rejoice*: Leap up joyfully in faith and hope, in anticipation of your future joy.

Verses 24—26. Just in these words the Lord assuredly spoke, though they may be reported with more or less literal exactness. It is not conceivable that any reporter could have falsely appended such contrasted *woes* to the distinctly marked benedictions; even leaving out of view the Spirit's guidance of Luke. Matthew, who makes prominent the *progress of development* as the main idea of the Sermon, has omitted these as well as much else that is similar; here, however, they take their place with the full force of perfect *contrast*. Here, still less than before, the externally rich, and full, and laughing, are intended as such; and we have new confirmation of the spiritual interpretation of the preceding. These sayings of our Lord find their type in the prophetic Scripture, Isa. lxv. 13, 14. James, in whom we discern so many elements of the Sermon on the Mount (as found whether in Matthew or Luke), to

* Who sees here only narrow-minded misunderstanding combined with rhetorical painting.

* Alford remarks very truly that a comparison of other passages in Luke without reference to Matthew, would render a spiritual sense necessary.

† Though there לְמַעַן שְׁמִי is to be construed differently from Luther, as my commentary on Isaiah shows.

which he immediately went back through the medium of living tradition, manifestly refers to it not only in ch. iv. 9, but also in ch. iv. 1; with which he also in vs. 2, 3 combines (as we saw before) an allusion to what is found in Matt. vi. 19, 20. Both in the former and in the latter passage he designates the externally rich, but as they are at the same time rich and self-satisfied in the sense of Luke xviii. 24, 25; Rev. iii. 17; Hos. xii. 9. Ye have received your consolation—once more an anticipatory note of Matt. vi. 2, comp. Luke xvi. 25. Very significant also is ἐμπεπλησμένοι, *full*, indeed, but not properly satisfied (Luke xv. 16; Psa. xvii. 14). They are the rich and the full, who, because they have the good things of the world and earthly consolation, think themselves also contented in soul: such are immediately spoken of, but they are taken only as a most striking type and example of those who are spiritually satisfied and at ease, of whom there are many, indeed, who have no external abundance of earthly goods and earthly joy. But he whom earthly good does *not* content, belongs to the hungry ones who were before blessed, even though he may abound in provision for his earthly life. The *four* woes correspond, as they are here arranged, to the four benedictions; hence the laughing has no bye-meaning of mad earthly exuberance of joy (as in Eccles. ii. 2, v. ii. 3, 6); it is only the exact converse of ver. 21. In reality it includes not only that wicked laughter, properly so called, which being a mere convulsive excitement of the animal nature is exhibited as unworthy of man, but also and more than that, the malevolent laughter of those who hate righteousness and triumph over the righteous, which is referred to again in John xvi. 20, but not in the same terms. Thus it forms a good transition to the mention of hatred and persecution, which follows presently in contrast. How apt is the proleptic allusion to the *false prophets* in the Lord's discourse, which in the first part already shadows out its whole course, we have noticed already upon Matthew. What James says in ch. iv. 4 may refer to this expression as directly as to Matt. vi. 24, probably to both together; his main idea, at least, is certainly an echo of the Sermon on the Mount.

The whole of our Lord's discourse, from Matt. v. 21 to ver. 48, this account compresses into that one pointed and prominent saying: *Love your enemies!* which here commences as it there closes all, with condensed and emphatic brevity. Here we find it again in ver. 35, and thus at the beginning and at the end it is the boundary of the whole discourse upon this subject. Hence the transposition of vers. 29, 30, which according to Matthew were spoken before, and formed the appropriate transition to this topic. Similarly ver. 31 was probably placed here instead of later, as in Matt. vii. 12, since to an inexact remembrance this seemed its point of connection. According to their sense and meaning the two sayings are strictly connected, for the one explains the other. Instead of the many contrasts in which the Lord so emphatically spake his *But I say unto you!* we have only now the ὑμῖν λέγω, *I say unto you*, remaining; which does not so much indicate a contrast of his words with other sayings and teachings of the scribes (the false prophets of ver. 26, with which the ἀλλά, *but*, in ver. 27 may be a slight link), as the absolute *authority*, which, even thus abridged, they emphatically announce, of him who now speaks. We observe here also how thoroughly Luke's account brings the earlier portion of the discourse into connection with the fundamental idea of its conclusion, the ὑμῖν λέγω with vers. 46, 47 afterwards. It is partly to express *this* that τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, *to you that hear*, is added; and partly as equivalent to πᾶσι τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, *to all that hear*—in contrast with the αὐτοῖς, *them*, of ver. 39, which specially points to the μαθητάς, *disciples*, of ver. 20. This is precisely in conformity with the Lord's meaning, who, beginning with his disciples in particular, then included all people universally in his address; finally, again, returning especially to those who were his own disciples and stood in his presence.

In vers. 27, 28 there is a transposition which disregards (as in the benedictions) the inner sequence of blessing, doing good, praying for, as Matthew preserves it, the *contrasts* merely being aimed at. In ver. 29, the concrete going to law for coat or cloak is generalized as a mere αἴρειν, *taking away*; hence, naturally, as we saw before, the cloak comes first. The essential power and truth of our Lord's words do not lie in these specialities; and this the Holy Spirit designs to teach us by the more exact or inexact expressions found in parallel places of the Evangelists. The αἴρειν is even not necessarily now robbery by force, but, generally speaking, a *taking away* without asking, which should, however, be regarded as equivalent to asking it; and so we find ver. 30 carrying on the idea, in conformity to its peculiar fundamental design as we discovered it in Matthew. Ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστί, *what thanks have ye?*—another form of Matthew's τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε, *what reward have ye?* We might almost say that it embraces in its generality the τί περισσὸν ποιεῖτε, *what do ye more?* which is there found hard by. For *sinners* also do—a general idea instead of the concrete Publicans and Gentiles. Matthew says nothing of the *lending*, but the Lord probably, as we there saw, added this, since it most strikingly represents the ὑπόνοια, or *hidden sense*, of all Scriptural teaching; unselfish love, without regard to its return, or to previous love in its object, a readiness to lend without interest, even at the peril of not receiving again even the principal, at least from *men*. Let Moses' prohibition (Lev. xxv. 35–37) of usury and increase be reflected on, and the commandment to lend to a poor brother, without hope of the principal, even though the year of release was nigh (Deut. xv. 7–10). Τὰ ἴσα, *the same*, in effect, refers rather to principal than to interest, as the antithesis μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες,

hoping for nothing again, afterwards more directly declares.* Ver. 35 corresponds in its threefold expression clearly enough to the three sentences vers. 32–34. The form *vioi ὑψίστου, children of the Highest*, here used, is after the Old Testament (see Ecclus. iv. 11, *καὶ ἔσῃ ὡς* υἱὸς *ὑψίστου*) and might have been used by the Lord, as well as the other, in a more detailed and copious discourse. The *χρηστός ἐστι, is good*, once more *generalizes* the sense, if we compare Matthew, and *ἀχαρίστους, unthankful*, is a human illustration at the close, corresponding with the context. "Ingratitude is the world's recompense"—this also experiences the most high God, the merciful One to all; let it not overmuch grieve you to bear the like. In this we have, and must not overlook, a keen *exposition* of the word which Matthew uses. God maketh his sun to shine and sends his rain upon the *evil*, that is, not merely upon those who were before evil and therefore deserve it not, but who remain so afterwards also, and thank him not.

Although so much that is intermediate is omitted, how spiritually correct and true to the whole harmony of the discourse is the condensation which attaches ver. 37 immediately to ver. 36. Matthew commenced a new subject with these words, but the thought was closely connected with what had just been said concerning a God-resembling, forgiving, blessing love of our enemies: and the fundamental idea of the whole section (Matt. vii. 1–6, 12) is pure, *unselfish* love. Matthew sets down the simple and impressive *μὴ κρίνετε, judge not*, but here we have a more detailed commentary upon his word, one which cannot be thought to have been added by any one *ex propriis*, for it is too definite, and striking, and appropriate. The Lord assuredly uttered these words, nor could *that* conception of the discourse, which has found "Love ye!" to be the centre and heart of the whole second part of it, willingly dispense with them. We have, further, in Luke a gradation, a threefold progression in the thought: Judge not, even *forgive*, and finally (as practical evidence of the same) *give*, impart, do good, that is, as the preceding verses require, to all alike without distinction, enemies as well as friends. The *having it measured again*, is, as in Matthew, an undefined promise, which in part finds its fulfillment from man, assuredly in full from God. This latter we hear in the *μέτρον καλόν, good measure*. The threefold detail of the figure (Bengel: *In aridis, mollibus, liquidis*, "in dry, soft, liquid things") is so familiar and acceptable to all, and clings so fast to our hearts, that we strongly suspect, though we cannot positively affirm it, that the Lord actually added these very words,* and all the more as *εἰς τὸν κόλπον, into your bosom*, with a changed application, however, from threatening to promise, comes from the same chapter of the prophet (Isa. lxv. 6, 7), to which vers. 21, 25 referred us, as ver. 22, to Isa. lxvi. 5.

Verses 39, 40 are peculiar to Luke, but suit very aptly the connection of Matthew. The significance of the subsequent *beam* is before indicated by the idea of *blindness*; the ground-thought of Matt. vii. 1–6, as we showed before, is then emphatically made prominent: Be *perfect* as disciples! Even if it were an expository addition, we would think that it penetrated the depth of the Lord's meaning.† But the Holy Ghost has expressly provided against this, by inspiring the Evangelist to insert *εἶπε δὲ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς, and he spake a parable to them*—which remark certainly cannot signify that here a parable spoken elsewhere is interpolated;‡ for the *αὐτοῖς, to them*, is only to be interpreted by ver. 20 and was used here to show (in contrast with ver. 27) that the disciples were particularly addressed. Luke also (ch. vii. 1) asserts beyond all doubt that it was a connected discourse which he had given. The Lord consequently uttered it at this place, and by a significant parable more decisively taught what in Matthew we find him teaching without it: that a censorious disciple is still, or has become no better than a Pharisee. For he has repeated the same words, afterwards, concerning the Pharisees, (Matt. xv. 14, xxiii. 16). Let it be noted that in this one word Luke also has given some intimation of the general tendency of the discourse to oppose the Pharisees.

When expositors and preachers refer ver. 40 to ver. 39 in such a manner as to interpret the words *only* that a blind teacher makes also blind disciples§—they entirely pervert the text. That would be too keenly-expressed irony,‖ and *κατηρτισμένος, he that is perfect*, then would be an altogether unsuitable word. No, the discourse passes into a severe contrast, and opposes to these false and yet-blinded teachers and censors, the one true *Master*, that perfect *διδάσκαλος, Teacher*, who now speaks

* This *ἀπελπίζειν*, which is only found here in the N. T., is explained by its context: hoping for nothing *of* it, *for* it, again. *Nullo modo desperantes* (a signification which is found in *Diodorus* and *Polybius* as also in a var. reading of Eph. iv. 19) would be altogether inappropriate; but the transitive sense which the Syriac gives it, is quite contrary to the language.

* If others think, rejecting Bengel's interpretation, that the same measure is designated only with the climax of full rising into overfull; we accept this as a subordinate sense, yet must cling to the threefold application of the figure.

† As G. K. Rieger's *Herzenspostille* on Luke vi. 36–42 (the Gospel for iv. Sund. after Trin.) takes from this verse the comprehensive theme, ein *ganzer* Christ—a *whole* Christ.

‡ In Luke v. 36 the Evangelist inserts the same before a strictly connected discourse; similarly also ch. xii. 16, xxi. 19, xiii. 6, xix. 11, xx. 9.

§ Hilgenfeld thus drivels: The Pauline "Lucas-Evangelium" could only have intended in this distorted saying thus patched in—according to the *connection* (in the expositor's brain!)—to have condemned the Jewish-Christian teachers.

‖ According to Von Gerlach: Even in the best case the disciple is only as his Master.

to his disciples. That meaning which has been incorrectly imported from Matt. x. 24–25; John xiii. 16 (where the Lord places the significant *Maschal*, or "parable," in an unusual, and altogether new application of his words), as if he meant that the disciples must suffer like their *Master*, is foreign to the discourse, where the παραβολή, *parable*, occurs in a general, and well understood sense. The *irony*, which indeed adheres to the *first* sentence (οὐκ ἔστι ὑπέρ) though not to the second, lies deep, and the Lord intends to say: Take care that ye do not in your rash and unmeasured condemnation of your brethren, exercise a *severer* judgment than I, in my love and forbearance, have exercised upon you! For does not the censorious judge place himself, as it were, above his forgiving, graciously-correcting, long-suffering Master? Πᾶς in its position here is not "every," but *totus quantus est*—when he is perfect, has learnt all as μαθητής, *a disciple*, will he be altogether whole and perfect, as his Master. The ἔσται, *shall be*, is a hortatory promise just like ἔσεσθε, *ye shall be* (ver. 35).

We have already seen that, in conformity with the spirit of the section, vers. 43, 44 omit the false prophets, and require from the disciples themselves the good fruits of the good trees; we now only observe, so that nothing may be unmentioned, the change of expression ἐκ βάτου τρυγῶσι, *of a bramble bush men gather*, and the transposition of σῦκα, *figs*, and σταφυλήν, *grapes*, as well as the *generalization* here suiting the thought: ἕκαστον δένδρον γινώσκεται, *every tree is known*, instead of Matthew's ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς, *ye shall know them*. The Lord *signified* that, though he may have only said this.

Of ver. 45, we have spoken again and again; we may point out that we are unjustly charged with maintaining a stiff mechanical theory of inspiration, since we here (though with the proper reservation, that it is only till we obtain a deeper insight) are willing to allow that this passage has been transposed from another place, and that it does *not* harmonize with the connection (not even with ver. 46). We may have frankly to concede the same in the case of Luke. We regard this, however, as possible only in his case and in Mark's; not in that of the apostles. But with equal confidence do we discern and assert the wisdom, correctness, harmony of the whole residue of Luke's report of the Sermon on the Mount, down to this one word: would that all criticism penetrated into the depths of the whole context, before making assertions of the same nature so abundantly and hastily as it does!

Ver. 46 gives in few words what we find in Matt. vii. 21–23, condensing the Lord's teaching after the manner of the shorter extract. As the original concrete presentation has been given up throughout, we have it here in *a general position*, which corresponds most perfectly with our Lord's meaning, as we find it later explained by himself in a parable (Matt. xxi. 28–31) which Luke has *not*. Finally, we have the same generalization in the πᾶς ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρός με, *every one that cometh to me*, which, though probably not thus spoken by our Lord, yet indicates at the close and fitly illustrates, the universal and all-comprehensive character of this first Sermon on the Mount, in which all other sayings were already bound up. Is there nothing but "dim and weakened exhibition" in an extract like this, so wisely selected, so skillfully knit together, according to its own independent point of *view* and aim?

THE LEPER.

(Matt. viii. 3, 4; Mark i. 41–44; Luke v. 14, 14.)

The first miracle of healing which Matthew records in detail, after the general statement of ch. iv. 23, 24, belongs assuredly, so far as regards its time and place, to the position which the "behold" of an eye-witness here assigns it. That the Lord's Sermon on the Mount had only resulted in a vague unimportant, and uninfluential impression—That was a mighty discourse! the Evangelist has just informed us. Nor is there more significance in the *following* of the multitudes, when the Lord had ended speaking. What inwardly passed in individual souls at the time, or afterwards recurred, to the conviction and salvation of the inner man, the sacred narrative does not reveal; this belongs to the "secrets of men" (κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Romans ii. 16). There was a poor leper, having ventured to approach or actually to mingle (probably, at least), with the ὄχλοις πολλοῖς, or *great multitudes*, as they listened at first and afterwards as they followed, whom the final close of the discourse, stern and severe as it was, had not discouraged from laying hold upon the loving-kindness of its first promises to all the poor and wretched; nay, rather by the very ἐξουσία or "authority" of its severity had given ground to his *confidence*. A wonderful type for us all in this respect, the truth and applicability of which are manifest in the narrative as given by the Spirit, even though the leper's prayer had no immediate connection with the influence of the sermon. This leper tells us parabolically what the true and entire result

of that sermon is to be in our minds: *Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make us clean!* This is the right "Lord, Lord," which will not be cried in vain. As God sends the leprosy, so God only can heal it—said the Jewish proverb; and Moses cried to the Lord concerning Miriam—Heal her now, O God! Above in ch. iv. 24 lepers are not as yet expressly mentioned; but in any case, even if such had been already healed by Jesus, and it had come to this man's ears, and still more so on the likelier supposition of the contrary, it is a strong faith which his words utter—Thou *canst* make me clean! (unlike Mark ix. 22). This faith it is that urges him further, even to the fearless approach and falling down before the Lord; even as to his *willingness* he does not really doubt, but his "*if*" is the becoming expression of an humble supplication,* which by this word seems to tarry afar off, as it was prescribed to the leper bending under the plague of God.

Verse 3. The Lord is now, as ever, ready to help. No sooner is the request uttered, than it is heard. The hand anticipates the word (Mark adds, *σπλαγχνισθείς, having compassion*), he stretches it forth down towards the leper, who scarcely knelt quite close to him; he *touches him*, as Elijah and Elisha touched the dead without defilement,† the word and deed are one, an immediate moment of most immediate *answer*. Alas! the majestic utterance may not be fully rendered into our own tongue, as the three Evangelists unanimously preserve it in those two only words so full of grace and authority: *Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι, I will, be thou clean!* The first is not merely an instant echo of his mercy to this present single request: I will *do it*. No, the Lord, who ever contemplates and perceives in his Spirit the whole in each, inclines himself to this man, as to that entire unclean humanity which he only can cleanse, with an avowal and testimony which comprehends everything—*I will!* The appealing "if" awakened the whole full tone of love in the depth of his heart—If I *will* heal and help? Yes, verily, it is for this that I am come! It is the same great *I will* with which he came into the world, and with which he leaves the world, which is consummated in that *I will* uttered to his Father on behalf of his sanctified ones, in John xvii. 24.

And now is added that word of authoritative command which was essentially contained in the former, but is now expressly uttered as a testimony to man—*Become clean! Be thou clean!* (comp. Luke xiii. 12; xviii. 42). Because *I will!* Therefore *I can!* I say not, I *can*; faith, awakened by my discourse will confide in me for *that*. My power is necessarily included in my willingness. In this manner never prophet before him healed, and he thus speaks only in the power of God who speaketh and it is done. An imperative this, which human language had never known before. The leprosy of the body must visibly and instantly obey him. The leprosy of the soul, indeed, not equally so; yet is there in the word of our Lord's authority, which *speaks clean*, at once both the power and the *will* on his part, to *make clean* also.

Verse 4. It was for the sake both of an internal and external propriety, that the wisdom and consummate prudence of the Lord added to his first utterance, which had sprung from the mighty impulse of his authority as well as of his love, something more, viz., a *prohibition* and a *command*, both wholesome and expedient. The prohibition, to tell no man of it, is not simply to be taken in connection with what follows—Delay not by so doing, but hasten to the priest! It is certainly to be understood in the same sense as many other similarly recurring prohibitions, in connection with one of which (when it was imposed upon all the healed together), Matthew (xii. 16) gives its most immediate signification and cause in the prophetic word—He shall not strive nor cry, neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. The Lord's design is—not indeed to suppress all that we may call rumor or noise in connection with his works, for he knew that his prohibitions were in most cases to no purpose; but to testify most expressly that it was not desired or demanded by himself. A deeper cause which is (in Mark viii. 26 for example and elsewhere) more distinctly intimated, was the wise aim of his love to direct the healed ones themselves into the seclusion of thankfulness before God, to a profounder penetration of the matter where the injurious talk about it might not dissipate their thoughts, in order that, if possible, what had taken place in their bodies, might lead to their inner healing. This, however, our Lord seldom attained, but he continues in every new case to impose it with unwearying patience. On the present occasion he spoke the prohibition all the more emphatically, because of the publicity which already had attended his healing word of authority. (Mark—*ἐμβριμησάμενος, strictly charging—εὐθέως ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν, sent him away*—thus as it were, strengthening the *μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἴπῃς, tell no man*).

With this is connected the recognition of the Levitical regulation, the reference to the priest's authority and prerogative, upon which the true High Priest meekly falls back, even at the moment when he has exhibited most impressively his own supreme authority, in order that we should not offend against it (ch. xvii. 27). Go thy way instantly, that if possible the fame of what has taken place may not outstrip thee, and give occasion to the evil-disposed to interpret my act of power into an invasion of their office. What lowliness of the mighty One! What condescension of the righteous One on account of unrighteousness! *This* healed one, forsooth, might have been justified in thinking himself released from the

* But not unbelieving, for, as Von Gerlach has well put it: "*Faith* always says, if thou wilt! not, if thou canst! The opposite of Mark ix. 22."

† The contagion of pestilence is overcome and kept off from the Lord, and can as little attach itself to him as sin (Braune).

offering: but just because he might so think, the Lord reminds him of it, and will not have that which he has done, otherwise regarded than as what God does when a leper is healed of his plague (Mark v. 19). The article in *τῷ ἱερεῖ, to the priest*, and *τὸ δῶρον, the gift*, points plainly to what was written in Moses; which Mark and Luke, having said indefinitely *ἃ προσέταξε, καθὼς προσέταξε Μωϋσῆς, what things, as Moses enjoined*, supplement and complete by the addition of *περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου, for thy cleansing*. We may not regard *τὸ δῶρον, the gift*, as being the offering especially prescribed by Moses for the first day in Lev. xiv. which was followed on the eighth by another, but it comprises the whole obligatory duty in one word.

In the conclusion *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς, for a testimony unto them*, which all the three Evangelists have in common, there lies a comprehensive meaning: that *they*, these priests so especially malevolent against me (this is signified in the transition from the singular to the plural, in the emphatic *αὐτοῖς, to them*), may learn *at once* both the miracles which I accomplish, and that I do not invade their office by them (comp. further on Luke xvii. 14). The former, however, is the special sense of that solemn expression, which recurs in ch. x. 18, xxiv. 14, where the general rejection of his testimony is pre-supposed. We must further guard against the error of many well-meaning persons (who are here unconsciously following Roman Catholic precedent), in interpreting this commandment to show themselves to the priests, as referring to our present spiritual guides, who must inspect and sit in judgment upon souls.

THE CENTURION.

(Matt. viii. 7, 10–13; Luke vii. 9.)

A second, equally prompt *I will!* A believing proselyte of the Jews from among the heathen placed in opposition to that unbelief of Israel, which the last word of the Lord had just indicated. Did the reader suppose that the stretched out *hand* and the *touching* were necessary in connection with the mighty *Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι*, "I will, be thou cleansed!" it takes place now through a simple *Γενηθήτω, So let it be*, spoken at a distance. But he who *can* do this, yet graciously and condescendingly complies in every case with man's request. That request, as Luke expresses it more definitely, was *ὅπως ἐλθὼν διασώσῃ τὸν δοῦλον, that he would come and save his servant*—and the Lord does not instantly utter his *Γενηθήτω*, "So let it be!" but *Ἐγὼ ἐλθὼν θεραπεύσω αὐτόν, I will come and heal him*. Whether the centurion came himself and spoke, or only by those whom he sent, can scarcely be determined with certainty, and affects the question but little. Without Luke's account we should unhesitatingly understand the former from the *letter* of Matthew, but the exceedingly definite account of Luke must have as much weight as the prerogative of Matthew as an eye-witness. Both have been united in the supposition that the man, in the unrest of his great desire, had sent once and again, and at last had come himself. This is possible, but appears to be contradicted by Luke (ver. 7). If, according to Luke, the first request was not urged in person, yet must vers. 5, 6 of Matthew be understood in connection with this, and Luke ver. 10 admits most assuredly of no other coming and going than that of those who were sent. Therefore we, for our part, would concur with Bengel, who holds Matthew's account to have been written *sublimiore divinæ quam historiae humanæ lege*, "after a more sublime law than human history." That is, not that it is indeed immaterial whether any man speaks by himself or by messengers (for there would be no justification of untruthfulness in this); but *it is no untruthfulness* to place one instead of the other, as the authoritative language of Scripture elsewhere teaches. How often in the Old Testament does speaking by the medium of others assume all the living reality of speaking in person! Compare in the New Testament Mark x. 35 with Matt. xx. 20. Thus Matthew's *προσῆλθεν, he came*, with its sequel may well be regarded as a living representation of Luke's *ἀπέστειλε, he sent;* the *λέγων, saying* (continued afterwards as *ἀποκριθείς, answering*), equivalent to the Old Testament לֵאמֹר in countless instances. So also in the *εἶπεν, he said*, of Matt. xi. 3, and in this very place Luke uses *ἐρωτῶν, asking*, in ver. 3, of the sending and saying by others, and in ver. 6 uses *λέγων, saying*, also. Let what we have elsewhere said be remembered, concerning the just distinction between the represented and the acted narrative, the historical writing which gives us the very life of the events, and the mere recital of the events themselves. In accordance with this let the higher grade of *freedom of spirit* in Matthew be here ob-

served as it is contrasted in this external circumstance with the more human exactitude of Luke.

This freedom, however, proceeds not so far as to place a word in the mouth of our Lord, which he might not in such a sense have spoken. Thus when Luke (ver. 6) only intimates that Jesus *went* with them, but Matthew announces a word of willingness and promise as spoken by him, they mutually supplement each other. So he who reads Luke, thinks almost necessarily of such an utterance in answer. Here also the word and the action are immediately united.

The humbly believing words of the centurion which follow, and which Luke records as having met the Lord when he had approached near to the house, appear in Matthew's living presentation of the whole circumstance as the answer of the man himself; so on the other hand even Luke in his external particularity has represented a similar approach of the man as if in person, who yet was not present. He writes in ver. 9 ἐθαύμαζον αὐτόν, *he marvelled at him*, and then gives the *commendation of his faith*, just as Matthew does (yet without Ἀμήν, *verily*; which, as it was so often spoken by the Lord, is not by all the Evangelists, and by Luke especially, mentioned with uniformity). He also more definitely states (with στραφείς, *turning*) what Matthew does not neglect to record, that the Lord spoke this praise τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν, τῷ ἀκολουθοῦντι αὐτῷ ὄχλῳ, *to those, the crowd that followed him*; that is, not so much to the centurion in commendation,* as to the Israelites for their shame, and as a testimony against them.

It has been said that this is the first time that *we* find the word "faith" in the New Testament; but the Lord had not only given utterance to it in the Sermon, ch. vi. 30, but on many occasions from Mark i. 15 downwards (comp. John i. 50, iii. 12, 15, &c., iv. 48; Mark vi. 6). He everywhere *seeks* and demands faith, not only as a susceptibility which his miracles and wonders must meet, but as that without which he cannot confer that blessing which he is so willing to bestow. Much else was to be praised in this eminent man, his amiable care of his servants, the humility so unwonted in a Roman, the profound recognition of God's revelations manifested in his retreating behind the despised people of God—but the Lord only makes prominent his *faith*. He even *marvelled* at his strong faith, as it is only once elsewhere (Mark vi. 6) said that he marvelled—but in that case it was at *unbelief*. He must have in some way given express utterance to this, else how could the Evangelists have ventured to record it? But let not this be hastily read and passed over; let us thoughtfully penetrate the depths which that *wonder* at faith or unbelief in the Spirit of the Son of Man discloses to us.* *So great* faith—he says; so strong, so great (Matt. xv. 28), by which this man, a *man* under authority, absolutely and nakedly trusts in me, confiding that I have power to command sickness† by a word without coming or laying on of hands in the name of *God*, just as he himself can command his servant in the name of Cæsar! I have not *found* it in Israel, I who come to seek it, and to seek it there first of all, where it should have been found. For is not *Israel*—the Lord while he puts them to shame in his language of reproof, yet uses the glorious and honorable title of their calling—beyond every other people the people of faith, called by God from the time of Abraham, and prepared, and through long ages trained unto *faith*? The Lord thus, as manifestly as expressively, indicates the great leading idea of the divine dealing with his people, the essential aim of all the institutions which had preceded his own coming.

Verses 11, 12. Luke, who elsewhere makes prominent the calling of the Gentiles, and for this reason records in detail the history of the centurion directly after the Sermon on the Mount, yet contents himself here with the Lord's first saying, which indeed involved all the rest. The extended development of it into that clear and ample prediction which now follows as taken from the prophets, he introduces in another place, (ch. xiii. 29,) where the Lord uttered it a second time (just as we found in the Sermon on the Mount). Ample occasion, however, was given by the retiring humility of the Gentile, and yet more by the self-complacent obtrusion of "our nation" (Luke ver. 5) in the saying of the elders, for such an utterance of our Lord—probably the first such testimony that fell from his lips, as probably this was the first heathen who ever came to be admitted into the kingdom of God. It was nothing new that he spoke, for it was only the blindness of Israel that failed to read it in the prophets, and to find in the promise of Abraham. Yea, it was only the remains of this blindness which rendered it of

* Bengel's remark that the Lord would not thus have praised the man if present—appears to us a refinement, almost in direct contradiction to Matthew, who felt nothnig of the kind. The word would assuredly be very soon reported to him, and thus was just the same as if spoken to him and in his presence.

* Julius Müller seems to us to pass over this deep meaning in a loose and unconsequential manner, thinking that goodness can only astonish *us*, because we have participation in sin. The ground of Christ's marvelling at the centurion's faith lies only, as his own words show, in its *contrast* with what the Lord was accustomed to find; not also generally in its contrast with the "evil unbelief" of mankind, since the Lord knows its *sin* without participation therein.

† Certainly his meaning was simply—Command the *sickness* that it depart (comp. Luke iv. 39); somewhat as the modern fashion of aiming to speak to, and drive away, bodily evil. What Lange says of "Genii of recovery and health, powers of life, a genius of healing sent as a servant," sounds very beautiful and delicate, but is an importation from another quarter altogether.

necessary to the Apostles of the Circumcision with Peter at their head, even after all that the Lord had said down to Matt. xxviii. 19, and after the uncomprehended testimony of the Holy Ghost in Acts ii. 39, to receive another and distinctive revelation of this mystery (Eph. iii. 5). The Lord expresses himself, as it were, euphemistically; avoiding the word "heathen," as also in Luke iv. 24–27. But he uses the prophetical expressions, *probably* alluding to the apocryphal passage (Bar. iv. 37; v. 5, 6)*— or directly to that fundamental promise (Gen. xxvii. 14) which the book of Baruch seems also to have in view, and the echoes of which are heard in such prophetic passages as Isa. xlix. 6, 12; lx. 4, &c. In contrast with Israel, and comprehending those gathered from all the nations of the earth, they are regarded as *many* who come into the kingdom of heaven. The *sitting down at table*, ἀνακλίνεσθαι, is not to be specially referred to the last futurity, although it points as far as that; it is obviously and first of all, the general Scriptural metaphor, firmly established in the phraseology of Israel (Luke xiv. 15), for the enjoyment of all the blessings and benefits of the kingdom of God. It has the same signification as in Isa. xxv. 6, and as it has in all the parables of our Lord concerning marriage feasts and suppers. The Israelites would not *eat* with heathens; the Lord puts them to shame by the express contradiction of this. We also see that the *coming* of these many signifies their first entrance into the fellowship of the kingdom of heaven set up on earth, by the contrasted simultaneous rejection of Israel in ver. 12. The *children of the kingdom:* this is not ironically spoken, as if meaning those who vainly thought themselves such (comp. ch. xiii. 38, where we find the expression in its most distinctive sense); but those who are already the authenticated heirs, the guests already called, those who were *born* in the typical kingdom of God in order to the inheritance of the Messianic, promised kingdom; they who as the children of Abraham stand already in some sense in its possession and enjoyment. With this sense only does the expression used in the later parallel accord: The kingdom of heaven *shall be taken from you* (ch. xxi. 43).

Let it be observed, further, how the Lord proclaims faith in his person, confidence in his divine power and authority, as the distinctive condition of entrance into the kingdom of heaven: throughout and entirely this and no other. For the whole discourse proceeds from this point, beholding in this *one* heathen the type and earnest of *many*, who in point of faith shall be like him. I have not found such faith in Israel, that is, at the same time—I have not been hailed and received with faith: a general and indefinite faith in God (John xiv. 1) is no more in question, since he makes his appearance; and when he proposes his claims, the evidence of such faith is to be sought and found as faith *in him*. But just as little as we are to seek the Lord's meaning in a more far-reaching, free development of faith as to its object; as if the insight into the person of Christ, as the Lord of spirits, from the *heathen* stand-point, is placed in advantageous contrast with the limited and straitened *Messianic* ideas of the Jews! (as Neander imposes his meaning, contrary to all Scripture). When Christ and the apostles speak of the measure, the greatness, the strength of πίστις, or *faith*, they never refer directly to its extent of perception and acknowledgment.

Let it be observed, further, that the Lord gives those who are to be cast out their full rights at first as "Israel," and "the children of the kingdom," as also that he describes even the entrance of the strangers from the east and the west as only an opening to them of fellowship *with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob* (quite in harmony with the prophets); but that yet the *casting out* of the unbelieving on account of their unbelief is, on the other hand, most definitely and decidedly pre-announced. For the *outer darkness* which is opposed to the feast of light and joy, although it seems in part to have its accomplishment in the blindness and obduracy of Israel upon earth, yet stretches its warning and threatening meaning to nothing less than what the Lord afterwards by similar expressions indicates (ch. xxii. 13; xxiv. 51; xxv. 30; xiii. 42). For as all the Lord's legislation does no more than fulfill and unfold what had before been written and spoken, so in all his prophecies he only illustrates, and perfects what the preceding prophets had included in their field of vision and range of utterance. *Darkness* in the Old Testament is equivalent to the prison (Psa. cvii. 10–14; Isa. xlii. 7; Eccles. xviii. 4). But finally to the *kingdom of heaven* stands only opposed the kingdom of him, who keeps bound in the everlasting bonds of death. The article before κλαυθμός, *weeping*, and βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων, *gnashing of teeth*, does not simply oppose emphatically the future torture to all pains of time,* but points obviously to the prophetic word, in order to connect the whole discourse with that in its conclusion. Isaiah lxv. 14 is indicated (as elsewhere ch. lxvi. 24 is brought forward), and placed in connection with such passages as Psa. cxii. 10, with which, again, Judith xvi. 21 may be compared. Whether in the significant contrast, weeping and gnashing of teeth (not chattering as with cold), a farther antithesis between the softer bewailing, and the mad fury of anguish is intimated,† we leave undecided; we prefer taking

* Where, indeed, the discourse is only of the children of Jerusalem returning, yet the Vulg. reading "Sicut *filios regni*" remarkably suits our passage. That the Lord elsewhere has apocryphal places in his mind, is undeniable.

* "The article is noteworthy: in this life is not yet anguish" (Bengel).

† According to Von Gerlach: "Probably the former represents the grief of the softer natures, the latter that of the more rugged." He also observes the more obvious contrast with the songs of the blessed.

the description as a simple Scriptural emblem of self-engendered, useless sorrow of every kind.

But let it be noted, finally, that the Lord, with wise discrimination, does not proceed as we might have expected— The children of *Abraham* shall be cast out. For in the background of this saying he designs to leave room for the *second* historical fulfillment of the great relative change between the far off and the near, those who are there within and those who are without—as it is prospectively announced by the prophets. Twice must the children recede, that those who were before strangers and afar off may enter into their place; the second great change is when the Gentile-Christians have become ripe for rejection, and the seed of Abraham dispersed through all lands shall return again from the east and the west, from the north and the south (Isa. xliii. 5, 6). The Lord does not say or signify this immediately, but he leaves room in the prophetic perspective, for this second and inverted fulfillment of his word.

Verse 13. Matthew's representation, which from ver. 5 has more and more clearly set the nobleman before us as if present, now passes from a spiritual intercourse between him and Christ, to what would seem to have all the vividness of a bodily intercourse. He who may think that the ὕπαγε, *go thy way*, spoken as if to a person present, departs too far from the reality of the occasion, may suppose, with many, that the centurion himself came afterwards; whereby, however, the greater inaccuracy of Luke, nay the only irreconcilable inconsistency, in the whole narrative is immediately involved. The *signification* of the word, whether we regard it as thus immediately spoken or not, lies in two critical points, which now recur in their relation, and which the Evangelist now points out and makes emphatic for the analogy of similar cases. *Faith*, with the praise of which the discourse began, is ever the ground of help, as the Lord now testifies, with joy that he has found faith and therefore may help, but keeping back in his lowliness the mention of his own power which is ever spontaneous and ready to help. Be it done *unto thee*, as thou hast believed, namely to thee in thy servant, for whom thy affectionate faith may avail. This expression is a universal word of mercy and of power, which the Lord had for every one who came, and may have spoken to many unmentioned ones, *with the same meaning in various expression*. It is the design of the Evangelist to record *this*, and in this lies the truth of his narrative *according to the mind* of the Spirit. As to the external historical letter of our Lord's words, we may safely resign that, while the Spirit continues from age to age to illustrate its living meaning in the world through the holy Gospels. Moreover we know not in any case, at least know not in the most important discourses, nor is it necessary for us to know, in what language they were uttered by the Lord.

THE TWO DIVERSE FOLLOWERS.

(Matt. viii. 20, 22; Luke ix. 58, 60.)

The chronological connection, which has been preserved hitherto, begins now to fail us. It *seems*, indeed, as if Matthew placed this transaction expressly between ver. 18 and ver. 23, yet Luke's account from ver. 51 has certainly the appearance of having adhered very strictly to the order of time. Who shall decide this? Thus much in general we may regard as certain, that, as Luke often collects into one homogeneous whole, events occurring on various days of our Lord's eventful history, so also Matthew by no means makes it his design to relate every where every thing *acoluthistically*, or in the strictest order (to quote the recent eminent critic Ebrard). It must remain undecided, also, whether the two incidents occurred in succession, as it appears in the narrative.* The sayings of our Lord are the marrow of the Gospels. Much stress is laid upon the connection of the more connected and longer discourses, but little or none upon the date and sequence of single incidents and shorter sayings, the beginning and end of our Lord's history being excepted. A comparative harmony may be very serviceable as it regards these. Here Matthew, who gives us in his eighth and ninth chapters a selection of the earliest and most remarkable miracles arranged on the whole in strict order, but while doing so is preparing the way for the mission of the Twelve in ch. x. (hence ch. ix. 9), gives us in connection two solemn sayings of our Lord concerning the following of himself, which contain a most highly significant *contrast*.* This is exhibited in the different treatment of the different cases, as the Lord's wisdom, in the most impressive manner, speaks to each what his all-seeing eye discerned to be necessary.

* It is our unbiassed judgment that according to the express words of both Evangelists the former of these examples occurred twice.

* See, generally, the contrasts in Matthew as they are shown in Lange's *Biblischen Dichtungen*, second part. We cannot, however, discover with him any dispositions or preparations for the apostolic office; or find Judas Iscariot, Thomas, and Matthew, in the three candidates for following, though Rothe too was not thus in the selection of the apostles; and (Ethik, iii. 419) appears to take such a view. If the Lord had, moreover, other close *followers* besides the Twelve.

For to this we may refer John ii. 24, 25. The enthusiastic one, who offers himself at once and with so much alacrity, is repelled almost abruptly; the considerate, reflecting, lingering one is quickened to his duty by a word of power which in his case dispenses with every other permitted and bounden duty.

Scribes do not offer themselves in great numbers, and this Matthew seems to intimate in the usual εἷς, *a certain*. But nothing was less aimed at by our Lord than to have *followers*, unless they were genuine and sound; he is far from desiring this, as it would have been easy to attain it. He tests the scribe severely, whether this was a matter of solemn earnestness to him. That he did not offer himself as *tempting* Christ is manifest; for in such instances it is generally either stated in the account, or detected immediately and exposed by the Lord. The man's speech sounds honest and decided, like Ittai's word to King David (2 Sam. xv. 21),* yea, as if he was prepared to reap the reward promised in Rev. xiv. 4. But it springs, probably, from a momentary paroxysm of feeling not uncommon at that time, and is not without a certain affectation of promising much; he by no means understood (like Thomas afterwards, John xi. 16), whither matters would tend with the Lord and his followers. Therefore the Lord tells him the rugged and naked truth which he little expected, that with him it would be otherwise than might have been usual in the case of a teacher so honored. This presses upon him the unexpressed question—Wilt thou still go with me? Hast thou understood and pondered all this? Probably the consequence was as in ch. xix. 22.†

The Lord's accompanying word has all the terseness and strength of a proverbial saying, and is in the highest degree vivid. Every thing living upon earth, even among its wild beasts, has its home, its secret place of rest and protection; not thus provided for am I! Places of abode are generally *upon* the earth; but the Lord designedly makes the variation: Even *under* the earth and *above* it the animals are cared for. The foxes are set against the more familiarly and proverbially used birds of the air, with this distinction, that while the former are among those beasts of the earth which are most secret and native under it; the latter are, on the contrary, free, unrestricted, and apparently homeless and unsettled. Nevertheless, just as the foxes have their cunningly prepared and secure holes, so *have* (and on this word the emphasis lies) even the birds their κατασκηνώσεις, *nests*, at least, and this contains the general idea which was appropriate to the occasion: nests are not meant, as such, but some little branch on which they may sit, or some tree or shrub under the shade of which they may find refuge. See ch. xiii. 32; Mark iv. 32; and Psa. civ. 12; Dan. iv. 18 in the Sept. But the *Son of Man*—and here first occurs in Matthew that name of deep meaning by which the Lord is wont to designate himself, and which has already been found in John i. 51. That it is a name which indicates and avows the Messiah, is certain from Daniel's prophecy; but it is equally manifest that it is most immediately a name of humiliation, of humble self-renunciation (a lowly *Son of Man*): which meaning holds also in Daniel, where it is used (as in John i. 51) in contradistinction to the angelic nature (ch. vii. 10); as the invocation, "O Son of Man," Dan. viii. 17, shows, and the repeated use of it in Ezekiel. Other significations are not excluded, as further, the Universal Man, the Second Man, the Son of God who yet has become man, and for man's sake will ever be such. Now the one meaning and now the other is prominent, according to the ever-varying connection. Here we have the identity of the Messiah-name with the name of a lowly, neglected son of man, and the second meaning holds good—*Men* usually are better and more commodiously sheltered than beasts, but I am one of them of whom even this cannot be said! Again, in strong and proverbial expression—Not a place where he may lay his head, no pillow for his weary sleep. Is there here allusion to Jacob's stone for a pillow, as in John i. Bethel had been referred to? Certainly the Lord does not merely say—I know not even for the coming night where I shall lay myself down (Herder). He speaks of his entire homeless and needy life, and lodgment, and wanderings since he entered upon his ministry; and if in his abode at Capernaum, or any where else for a short time, this expression might appear too strong, it was a great truth on the whole, and was even more and more literally working out its full accomplishment, till he bowed his head on the cross. This has the Lord most distinctly in view when he gives the answer to the avowal, I will follow thee *whithersoever* thou goest—*Thither go I*, that is my way and my goal! Wilt thou still go with me? If we take Luke's chronology, this would have a yet deeper significance, see vers. 51–53. But the Lord could well have said the same at an earlier period, conscious beforehand of the whole course of his career; and would do so, doubtless, when necessary, in order fundamentally to repel all Jewish expectation.

* With which we may compare Ruth to Naomi (Ruth i. 16, 17). Thus the expression, "Whithersoever thou goest," assuredly does not refer to the various roads the Lord may journey in! (according to the great Schleiermacher's very small interpretation).

† "The book-learned are generally fastidious and love warm housing: Thus on this account as well as on account of their burrowing in dialectical subtilties and the dust of books, they are least useful for the practical work of life, and for laboring in the Lord's vineyard—hence is the first immediately rejected as unfit!" So Sepp after his manner, rather too express in his anachronism about book-dust, yet with some ground of truth. As to the general sentiment Braune says excellently, "Many would be pious, but would keep their nests—houses, riches, honor, and respectability."

Not improbably the scribe or others who heard these words would say: Is this language for one who assumes to be Messiah! Is this Daniel's "Son of Man?"

The second belonged already to the *disciples*, as Matthew expressly remarks; that is, in the more comprehensive sense to those who, coming and going, attached themselves to the Lord: with this Luke's account that the Lord uttered to him a special ἀκολούθει μοι, "follow me," perfectly agrees; for this summons might, in its higher and additional meaning, be repeated a second time, as we find in the case of the apostles. The hitherto disciple is required to attach himself yet more entirely and inseparably to his Lord, and probably it was his intention to include him among the Seventy (Luke x. 1). Even in Matthew's account a second summons of our Lord is evidently pre-supposed, since the words of ver. 21 can only be understood as an answer to such a summons: *Suffer me first—!* The Lord, however, qualifies not his ἀκολούθει μοι, and speaks to this wavering lingerer who was in a danger that he knew not of failing to return, with such keenness and urgency as he would not have been likely to use in the case of an entirely new disciple. For the rest, it is entirely inconceivable that the meaning of the request was simply—Let me first go and await my aged father's death and burial. This is contradicted less by the letter of the petition,* than by the spirit of our Lord's refusing answer, which lays the stress of the emphasis upon the *burying*. The entire meaning of the expression, as we shall unfold it, would then be entirely displaced, and an incomprehensible severity unnecessarily infused into it, by refusing the attentions of an affectionate son to a yet living father. The man could not thus have come to Jesus from a house of death; the affliction and legal uncleanness would have forbidden this;† but having recently come to him, he received the intelligence of the death which summoned him home, while the Lord required him to remain. By *this* obvious supposition alone the whole is disengaged of difficulty, especially the command of Jesus—Therefore *go not*, but follow me! The man thought indeed that he might with propriety ask to perform the duties which nature and religion exacted, especially as in Jewish law the obligation of burying released from most other engagements. Hence it is with modest submission that he says—*Suffer* me first! Or should we rather say, with a *wavering* tendency? Certainly the position of this man's conscience, vibrating at that critical moment between return to his old relations and a persevering, yet closer adhesion to the Lord, manifestly betrays itself here: if he did not suspect danger in returning, would he have put the question—*May* I go? 1 Kings xix. 10 is generally compared, but this still more closely applies to Luke ix. 61. And in connection with that, the difference between the Old and New Testament is referred to, between the relaxation of requirement and its strong enforcement; but this does not apply here, since our Saviour also can in fit cases relax his demand, even as Elias did to Elisha. His expression has primary reference to the individual instance before him, and only applies in all its rigor to those who shall be found in the same precise position of mind. That is, he makes available in its literal significance a truth and a principle which, though in themselves perfectly general, are not always applied in a manner so directly interfering with human life.*

There is at first sight a tone of rigor and of harshness in this word of the Son of Man, who ordinarily is very far from breaking in upon any human ordinance, and certainly is at the utmost distance from a condemnation or violation of the most natural exhibitions of human love. The dead must be *buried*, according to the very ordinance of God (Gen. iii. 19). If it be said that burial is a matter which affects not the dead, and therefore that it is immaterial who performs it, whether a son or any one else; such a cold thought, which our Lord has not in his view, is contradicted by the recognized and universal right feeling of man. Is it not a *duty of love* which a son might be supposed to have permission to discharge without asking for it at all? And yet he who directed the cleansed lepers to the priests, refuses to concede to a son the duty and the right of burying his own father! Assuredly it is because he had said, Follow me! and to the same extent goes that other word—Whosoever loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me. We may be tempted to regard this requirement as being too high and strained for humanity, we may find it difficult to reconcile this saying of our Lord with his ordinary manner of speaking; but this should lead us all the more diligently to seek that hidden meaning which is concealed under the intentional paradox: and if we seek it we shall find it.

We set out with the literal burial of the literally dead; for the request referred to

* Yet as Alford well remarks (against Theophylact): πρῶτον απελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι, "first go and bury," must refer to a specific *act* to be previously performed.

† Such left not the house of mourning before the entombment.

* Very true and discriminating is Göschel's observation, that Luke ix. 61, 62, explains the foregoing, and that the Lord in both cases condemns the looking back (*Zur Lehre von den letzten Dingen*, p. 70. On the other hand, what follows in pp. 71, 72, concerning reference here to the mutual care of the dead in the church beyond—to the performance of obsequies in the name of Jesus—may be set down as ingenious wanderings beyond the letter of the text).

this, and the refusal must, first of all, have referred to it likewise. But that the *dead* who are to be buried must be figuratively understood, admits of no doubt, and needs no proof; for it can occur to no man to impute so meaningless a saying to the Lord as that the burying must be deferred, till one dead man shall bury another—Let the already dead care for the companions who join them! Who then are the *dead?* Not those who, being only mortals and soon to die, are reckoned as being dead; for then the contrast here would be lost. The disciple to whom it is forbidden, is himself one of such. No, the Lord speaks here as in John v. 24, 25, of spiritual death, according to the Spirit's usage throughout the whole New Testament. Thus the "burying," as an external work belonging to the things of this world, should, in regard to persons and circumstances where the doing of something more important is involved, be left to the children of the world, who can perform such matters, are good enough for them, and are in their generation better adapted for their performance. Thus far we have light arising in this dark word, and observe by this increasing light that the Lord goes still further, and *taking the present circumstance as a similitude*, designs that we should also understand the *burying* itself, and even the *dead* to be buried in their figurative meaning. Here we discern himself and his manner of teaching once more. How often do we find in studying his words, that his penetrating glance beholds the most internal and general significance of individual occasions and circumstances; and then, elevating the particular circumstance into an example and emblem, connects with it sayings of sublimest, and most far-reaching application. It is not otherwise here. When one called to be his follower has mentioned a "burial" which he must first take charge of, which, however, may very probably lead to the withdrawal from him of this called disciple, the profoundly wise Master gives him as an answer, not premeditated, but issuing at once from the depths of his spirit—an answer which at the same time opens up a wide field of thought.

But to perceive this, we must think of the still more harsh and mysterious saying: *Let* those who are dead in sin, perform their burial work one for another! This may appear to sound like what many loveless ones in their pride say in their thoughts or with their lips—Let the evil world perish, let it remain in its ruin! For a moment it may so sound, till we reflect *who* thus speaks. Did he then leave the dead in their death and burial? Did he not come for the very purpose, that whosoever believeth on him, should not remain in death? and is it not for this very object, that the great *work of revivification* should proceed upon earth, that he called his disciples, and sent them forth among the dead as his witnesses, with the word and spirit of life? And here we remark that his words to the disciples whom he called, contain a very impressive contrast between the work to be *left* to others, and the work which he himself must with his utmost diligence engage in. We should find this antithesis in the occasion and in the person, even if it was not expressed in word, but it is so. In Matthew we have the *Follow thou me*, that is, Hear the words of eternal life which will give life to thy soul; and again in Luke—But go thou and *preach the kingdom of God*, that is, Arouse those who are dead, being called to this, leave burying to others, who alas! do it naturally enough, so long as they themselves are as dead as *their* dead. (*Διαγγελλε*, cry aloud everywhere, far and wide, as in Rom. ix. 17.) The dead, indeed, are *not* to be thus left, but to them the true word of life is to be preached. The very reverse holds here. The Lord's stern saying is one which springs from the consuming zeal of his love for the world's salvation. He will have the one thing pursued without distraction and intermission. He holds fast his messenger of life, that the life-giving work may take no harm through his attention to the "burying." As in a great hospital, where many are hourly dying, the physicians' sole concern is healing and saving; others may charge themselves with burial, *they* have no time for that. So is it with the followers of the Lord in this world. When separation to this great calling is concerned, every thing else must give way. The proper burial of a father, even, is not excepted; although generally it is fit and right that a mourner should bury *his own* dead out of his sight (Gen. xxiii. 4, as here—*their* dead), and the Lord himself, Matt. xxvi. 12 gives us proof, in what estimation he held such a service rendered by love to its object. Much more must all that give place, which the Lord likens to such *burying*. Luther says very appropriately on this place: "Some there be who allege good works, for their not following and believing, but Christ regards them as only dead and lost works." O how much of such lost and valueless work is there under all kinds of forms and names, and with very specious pretension, but which bring no service to the kingdom of God, bring no dead to life, and from which the Lord not simply by permission but by express commandment gives his people dispensation—*Leave* these things to others! Much of this mere burial-work passes under the title of political or generally human obligations, yea, is to be found in the holy ceremonies of an ecclesiastical death. These things not only make no dead soul live, but bury the dead yet more deeply in their death (Rom. vi. 4). Thus do the dead bury each other! For all things in men's mutual commerce have the effect and influence either of *burying* or of *raising from death*. But this difference does not so much lie in any external act as such, as in the manner and spirit of its performance. The burying may be so ordered, as to conduce to awakening from death; men may so "preach the kingdom of God," as that the people who hear be preached into death.

This is the far-reaching, universally applica-

ble meaning of the word, in which it has its truth and force for all his disciples every where: *Ye* are called, as the living, to diffuse life; *leave* everything else as burying-work to the dead!* "Take with you who is fit to go; but miss not a step of your own way" (Zinzendorf). But *when* does this general principle lay hold of the soul in its full severity, and cut off from us by an unconditional prohibition, things otherwise permitted, and even demanded by the very instinct of life, such as the burying of a father in the present case? In *cases of collision* and *critical times of decision*, known to be such by the Lord's inward monition in the conscience. This man was in actual danger of burying himself again, while burying his father; and the third example in Luke ix. 61, 62, is an explanatory parallel of the second. He who felt in himself, while he put the question, the waverings of his spirit, perceived in his spirit more clearly than many expositors have done, the true meaning of the Lord's stern answer. Suppose it thine own case, should any the holiest obligations of life, even that of showing thy filial affection at the dying bed or the grave of thy father, call thee away at the critical moment when thy Lord's service most imperatively claims thee; tell it to him in the sincerity of thine heart: Lord, suffer me *first* to go and discharge this obligation! and if this *first* should *not* be approved of by him, as involving danger to thyself; then art thou released from all, hold thyself bound *to follow him!* What thou thoughtest thyself bound to do will be done by others, and no more will harm result from thine omission, than that the dead will fail to bury their dead.

* As typically the consecrated Nazarite might not defile himself even at the death of his father, mother, &c., though the high-priest was not forbidden to do so (Num. vi. 7; Lev. xxi. 1–4).

THE STILLING OF THE SEA.

(Matt. viii. 26; Mark iv. 35–40; Luke viii. 22–25.)

The significance of this history belongs not simply to the place where we find and expound the words. The whole human life of the Son of God is in all its circumstances and details altogether symbolical, because he who is the image of the invisible God in the flesh, appears in commerce with the world, with nature, and with men; and this symbolical, typical, prophetical character meets us with special significance on some most striking occasions. The passage over the sea is human life generally, disciple-life in particular; the ship in which he protectingly and savingly voyages with them, as it is the heart of his disciple, so it is also his Church, the antitype of the Ark. The three Evangelists note *three* sayings of our Lord in connection with this event: Matthew only records the central and most important word, to the right understanding of which belongs the right understanding of the whole narrative, inasmuch as in that word the Lord regards the occurrence prophetically and symbolically. He stills the storm, in order to teach by signs, how he could and will still all storms; he rebuked the little faith of his disciples, in order to speak in doing so a permanent word for all similar conjunctures and circumstances in all time to come. The Spirit secretly teaches this in the concise and measured words of vers. 23, 24, in Matthew. The disciples *followed* him, when he, evening being come (according to Mark), summoned them to the voyage by entering the ship, and announcing his will. *And behold*, where he voyages with his disciples, there arises the storm!

The *first* word (in Mark and Luke) is the Lord's purely human—Let us pass over unto the other side! On which we have only to remark that the Lord who so often is under the necessity of opposing his majestic *I* to all other men, all the more condescendingly on that account speaks of the *we* and the *us* in the external things of ordinary life:* yet as the whole tenor of the Gospels evinces, the *Lord* in his own pre-eminent dignity *only* thus speaks in such relations. All the more impressively does the *third* word follow, with which he, the only one, and concerning whom the question is forever rising anew—*Ποταπός ἐστιν οὗτος;* "What manner of man is this?" —rebukes the winds and the sea!

The word of main importance, however, is that central word to the terrified disciples, which the Evangelists remarkably enough give us in variety of literal expression, but

* Compare 2 Kings iv. 13 (especially in the original) with ver. 9. Just so do the apostles speak, in the same spirit mingling themselves and their attendants, ministers and servants together, even in spiritual things—though not with so much condescension as Elisha showed when he spoke of *respect* shown towards him and *Gehazi*.

with the same meaning. The power and force of *such* words must ever leave the mere letter behind, and fasten upon the heart as the immediate speech of spirit to spirit. "He rebuked us that our faith was little, that we were not ready with our faith, that we had no faith"—this was the never-erased impression of words which in the perturbation of the moment were not distinctly heard, but profoundly understood. One thing was beyond all else plain; that he pointed to *faith* as the principle through which fear is overcome. There was, indeed, great peril according to human appearance, in a ship already filling with water: Luke καὶ ἐκινδύνευον, *and they were in jeopardy*. Four fishermen familiar with the sea were there. But the Lord, whose office and work was not to row the ship, knowing no care as to the passage (critical from the beginning), *slept*, laying his weary head upon the wooden railing of the ship;* slept so sound and tranquil, that the storm and uproar around did not awake him, but only the hands and cry of the disciples. (All three Evangelists mention distinctively the *awaking* him, before they spoke to him.) And how does the awakened wake up? In the same majestic tranquility with which he had sunk to sleep, in the most perfect self-possession and power of his spirit. Let any man reflect how one suddenly roused with outcries of distress and danger of death around him, would in the weakness of humanity comport himself; and it will help him to perceive and estimate the unapproachable dignity of this Being, even while, as one with us, he is paying his tribute to the infirmity of our flesh. Yes, verily, *this* Son of Man sinks into sleep, and wakes again even like ourselves, and yet not like ourselves. This gives his word, spoken at this critical moment, its foundation of majesty, and must be considered in its exposition. That the Lord thus speaks and thus can speak, is at least as wonderful as that he in Adam's primeval authority and dominion controls the element; rather this latter is to be understood by the former. The Son of Man slept, the Son of God in man awakes and speaks; for himself exhausted, for others almighty.

Matthew gives the words of the disciples in their simplest expression, Luke indicates more strongly the urgency of their feeling by the twice uttered "Master! Master!"—Mark adds their reproachful appeal, "Carest thou not that we perish?" Canst thou sleep tranquilly, while we are in anguish and straits? He utters no reproach for the violent awakening, but perceiving instantly the whole significance of the occasion, he penetrates to the very heart of the matter, by speaking, as the great Master, a great word of instruction for all who are so terrified: *Why are ye so fearful?* So fearful? This Mark also places first. He never entertains fear of any creature; there is no trace of any such feeling in him throughout the Gospels. When anxiety, fear, or grief falls upon him, it springs from quite another principle. To fear is human, belongs to fallen human nature in its sin and fear of death; but *faith* in God should again expel this fear. This is the great thought in the mind of our Lord; it is only he who can speak to the terrified, in perfect fearless composure, concerning *fearing* and *believing*, as opposite one to the other. The Holy Ghost revives in the apostle the remembrance of the word, as if it had been: *O ye of little faith!* as in ch. vi. 30. The disciples were also in unbelief, which cried out—We perish! Yet were they at the same time sufficiently *believing* to awake and call upon him—*Lord help us!* Even weak faith is faith still, the trembling hand yet holds fast the Deliverer. If others among the people had called upon the Lord in such a storm to help them, in them it would have been a stronger faith. Thus the idea of little faith is relative; the disciples, more intimately familiar with the power of their Master, should not have allowed themselves so lightly to be whelmed in distress and deadly fear by the mere appearance of danger; to Peter, already walking on the sea, the rebuke is yet stronger—O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt! Mark and Luke give us another form of expression: *How is it that ye have no faith*, just now, when ye should have been able to trust? Hence equivalent to *Where is your faith?* for there is in truth no difference of meaning. More depends upon another difference; viz., that the Evangelists, not apostles, relate first the rebuking of the storm, and then the word of the disciples; while Matthew, on the other hand, tells us, and with a literal and express τότε, *then*, that the Lord spoke *first* the word of admonition to the disciples and stilled their disquieted souls, *before* he turned to the winds and the waves. In this lies the sublimest trait of the whole: he looks not round on the uproar of the elements, before he has discharged to his disciples in severity and love his accustomed function of Master.* Further it is τότε ἐγερθείς, *then he arose*—still sitting, the awakened one in the midst of all the tempest remaining unperturbed.

But then follows the act which sets its seal to the word. And just as this, so also does that carry its own meaning with it. And yet this *empire over nature* is a new thing which Matthew has to record concerning Jesus. His narrative of selected miracles in chs. viii. and ix., rises through a gradation of importance: cleansing of the leper (a great thing even to begin with)—healing at a distance by his

* For even though προσκεφάλαιον may signify ordinarily a second pillow or cushion, yet the *article* in Mark iv. 38, seems to indicate something belonging to the ship, which might serve *as* a cushion or *support*.

* "If they had awaked him, to restore their disorder and presence of mind scared away by danger, he would have entered on his function without rebuking them" (Braune).

word, Be it done!—commanding the wind and the sea—saying to the devils, Go!—*forgiving the sins* of the paralytic (more indeed than saying, Arise! or, Go hence! more than ruling the sea)—and finally giving life to the dead! Matthew and Luke both give us to understand that the Lord *addressed* the excited elements, as we speak to living and conscious beings; Mark gives us the *two words* of his invocation: Σιώπα! πεφίμωσο! *Peace; be still!* If we are to seek in the repetition any thing more than mere emphasis, that additional meaning is not to be found by referring (as Bengel does) the former to the *sonus*, and the latter to the *impetus*, but by regarding the previous words of Mark: He rebuked the *wind*, and spoke to the *sea*. This is so significantly echoed in the subsequent exclamation of the astonished men, as recorded by all the three Evangelists, that we may even on that account readily believe that the Lord literally spoke, as Mark records it—that he uttered one word of authority to the storm raging above, and another to the waves below. It surprises us to read in Lange that, as the wind and the billows were no "spiritual power" opposed to him, the invocation was not "properly such," but a "*prophetic* announcement with a mysteriously *symbolical* design," and to find that with a diluted rationalism he traces the "*immediate* causes of the stilling of the air and of the sea to the *atmosphere*." O no, there is an authoritative word of God's Spirit's power, which can speak into the atmosphere more than was before latent in it according to the *harmonia præstabilita*. This word of authority was not a manner of speaking which meant only a knowledge that it would become still! It is, moreover, generally true, as Von Gerlach understands the passage, that "the destructive powers of creation are for the sin of man in the service of evil spirits." That profound thinker Daub, for example (*Jud. Ischar.* ii. 353), has referred to this history in connection with his views of the demon-element in the terrors of nature and the war of the elements, and of the authority of God which can alone command them to be still. Whether the Gergesene devils, whose history presently follows, were the spirits who raised this tempest against Jesus (according to an old opinion), and thus their ordinance is spoken to instead of the beings who directed it, is very much to be questioned; and the invocation will certainly admit of no application to the intermediate agency in nature of *angels*, according to the opinion of many. We, for our own part, are not at all disposed to rest the simple truth of this history upon any such inappropriate and needless conceits; it is quite in harmony with the whole exhibition of the character of God's power, thus to exert authority over nature, Job xxxviii. 11 (Psa. lxv. 8, lxxxix. 10). What that mysterious question in Prov. xxx. 4 attributed to the "Son" of whom the Old Testament prophesied, now receives its manifest realization. Here is something much beyond Elijah's dividing the waters of the Jordan. We have no need too elaborately to work out the picture, and refer (with Pfenninger) to the imperative form of the Lord seen reflected in the instantly still water (it was, indeed, evening or night); we have ample foundation already for the amazed exclamation of the *men* (of the disciples themselves according to Mark and Luke) concerning this Son of Man: *What manner of man is this!* But he remains himself in his high dignity amid such an outcry of astonishment, the same as when he heard it later from the lips of Pilate—*Behold the man!*

THE DEVILS IN THE SWINE.

(Matt. viii. 32; Mark v. 8, 9, 19; Luke viii. 30, 39.)

One single word of the Lord does Matthew set within the margin of a wonderful narrative,* which, amid all the wonders to which we have been accustomed, stands alone and distinct in its kind. Thus much is by it clearly designed to be taught, that this Jesus who commanded the wind and the sea to be still, rules also in his unapproachable dignity over the devils, to whom his ὑπάγετε, "depart!" mighty in its tranquility, points the way of departure, and permits them to go; just as in ver. 16 it had been already said in general that he cast out spirits with his word. There is a simple grandeur in the account of Matthew, who brings forward no part of the circumstance which is not absolutely necessary for its right understanding. To the other three Evangelists there remain the individual and more exact details, and three other words of our Lord in connection with them.* The records agree perfectly in all essential points, and particularly concur in placing the in-

* The geographical investigations about Gadara, Gerasa, Gergesa, we gladly hand over to the learned.

* But it is no part of this greater exactitude, that they speak only of one possessed. We cannot agree, either with Olshausen who says, generally, that Matthew has confounded the accounts; or with Ebrard, who regards the second as taken from Mark i. 23–27, and connected with the first. We adhere to the simple conclusion, that according to Matthew there were two, while Mark and Luke, without denying that, speak more especially of one. We have only to add that the one might very naturally be prominent throughout the whole proceeding. He who would investigate further, forgets in subordinate and useless questions, the main point. Schleiermacher repudiates the second as false, because madmen never affect such close friendship and fellowship, but there are answers enough to that observation.

cident immediately after the stilling of the sea.

That truth, which had only been testified in Matthew's Gospel by the Father from heaven (ch. iii. 17), and which Satan had in vain endeavored to assail, viz., that this *Jesus*, the Virgin's son Immanuel, is truly *the Son of God*, —the devils have since understood, earlier and better than men. But while they know it they tremble before him! Mark, ch. i., has already announced similar testimonies of the spirits in the possessed. We understand, with all our science, so little of the natural history of hell, and of that interference of its spiritual powers with the affairs of human life which is ever being exerted, but was specially intense in our Saviour's time, that it might well be accounted the most infatuated of all imaginable folly to hazard the rash assertions of our ignorance against the plain declarations of Holy Writ, which have their thousandfold confirmation in our consciences, in history, and in religious science. These Gadarenes or Gergesenes disclose to us a dark and awful province of humanity, as lying under the ravages of the devil, the counterpart of which, at least in moral life, if not in such horrible manifestations of bodily possession, may be found in Christendom to the present day—to say nothing of its full analogies in heathenism. But over this region also *Jesus* rules, *the Son of God!* To believe and to understand this, is the main concern, and we would not bury or obscure this fundamental truth by any irrelevant discussions.

Matthew's expression, ver. 29, gives us at first to understand that the possessed called out upon Jesus, but it is afterwards made plain that the devils, ver. 31, spoke through their mouth, especially that of the one. The incident is made more vivid by the additional information of the two other Evangelists, that the men, in their frenzy, rushed towards the Lord, as they did towards all who were in the way, but that in his near presence there came a change upon them suddenly. The one devil who unites together many in them, perceives the great Ruler and Judge; hence the falling down before him, and the cry of horror against him who is come to torment them, who has power to bid them go away into their abyss. And how came this? *For* (thus both Evangelists add in explanation) he had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man, had uttered a word which arrested the mad attack upon him: *Come out of the man, thou unclean spirit!* I am he who can utter this command, who am come first of all to deliver *men* from the power of Satan. *Unclean* spirit—this was the ordinary phrase, used by the Lord because it has in his use a profoundly true significance. Did he address in these words the ruler of the host "Legion?" He was in his humiliation by no means omniscient, but, unless in cases when the Father gave him special and instant revelation, subjected to the successive perceptions of observation, like humanity in general. He appears here to have seen in effect at the beginning only an ordinary instance of demoniacal possession. But his first—*Come out of the man!** not indeed impotent, rather efficient to bring down the spirits to entreaty, was not instantly obeyed, as we often read, *e.g.* in Mark i. 26, ix. 26. Then does the Lord discern a possession of an aggravated kind (Matt. xvii. 21), and maintaining the sublimest composure in the midst of the raging fury of the demons, condescends as his king and judge to the being thus brought, as it were, before his tribunal; and enters into a most marvellous and mysterious colloquy with the unclean spirit.

What is thy name? (Mark τί σοι ὄνομα; Luke τί σοί ἐστι ὄνομα.) It is marvellous and quite peculiar (the only instance recorded), that the Lord should ask the unclean spirit concerning his distinctive *name*. For that this spirit is intended, and not the man of whom he had taken possession, is most decidedly shown in the context, according to the other two Evangelists. It has been well urged, that a question which would have been otherwise quite inappropriate and unmeaning, might in this case be regarded as quite useful, inasmuch as it would help to bring the confused madman to sober recollection. But the frenzy of possession is not to be treated thus, and we perceive at once that the conversation is not opened up between the man and Jesus, but between the devil who usurps the man's mouth,† and his Lord and Judge who commands him to stand and render account. That the devils as *spirits* are individual persons, and that gradations and kinds obtain among them, we already know; and can understand the object of our Lord's real question: What devil art thou? The *name* which he may have uttered, was indeed only intelligible to Jesus; for what we find in the Talmud or in any other books of ancient or modern times concerning

* By no means, as Neander thinks, a mere remark of a subsequent compiler, in order to find a motive for the words of the demons. Worse still, we find Schleiermacher deeming it incomprehensible "that the spirits are so considerate and thoughtful for themselves, and like children who have no inclination to obey, make their proposals and subterfuges"—and therefore holding that the παρήγγειλε γάρ, *for he had commanded*, is an incorrect addition. That the devils, indeed, have no wish instantly to obey, is their very nature—and in that they are actually worse than mere headstrong and obstinate children, who are full of cunning reasonings.

† Not however as if the notions and manner of speech of the possessed man were mingled with those of the possessing subject. This has been discovered in Mark's "adjuring *by God*," but incorrectly. For Dr. Bauer's question: "When was the devil so devout as to take the name of God into his mouth?" is answered most pointedly and well by Ebrard, when he writes "die Posaune des jungsten Gerichts gegen Hegel!" Von Gerlach observes generally that the "manifold abuse of the name of God among wicked men, shows how false the ideas of former times were, which conceived that the devil could not utter it."

the names of fiends, may be regarded as containing a little truth mingled with much fable. But expositors should be content to stand apart while the Son of God speaks to a being out of hell; well assured, however, that they perfectly understood each other. The malicious spirit, we further mark, made bold by the unlooked for condescension, evades the proper meaning of the question, and gives an answer which is in the genuine devilish manner, by a name which is only a disguise, and says proudly, impudently, and half-mockingly, as though a prisoner on defence—My name is Legion, for we are many. All this Matthew passes over, and hastens on to the request of the devils founded upon it, for permission to *enter into the swine.* This is the turning point of the whole narrative. The Lord who has *not* hitherto exhibited to us *merely* "a kind disposition to enter into the disordered fantasies of a maniac" (Weiss), *nor* his wisdom in the gentle, gradual, accommodating treatment of a sick man (as, alas! most of even orthodox expositors, down to Lange and Braune, would have us believe), but who has shown us, in this *the first direct and violent incursion of hell upon him*, the sublime tranquility of the Son of God in the Son of Man—knows at this critical moment, by the full revelation of the Father shining through his spirit, what the whole occasion is, and what it becomes him in this conjuncture to do. The trial and hearing are broken off abruptly, the request even of the devil is granted, and soundness is imparted to the men through the majestic and decisive decree—Go! Here the whole narrative finds its consummation, and just at the point where Jesus is revealed as their absolute Ruler and Lord, our curiosity concerning the mysteries of the devil's kingdom and subjects is left ungratified, and forever silenced. Whether there lay in the request merely the appetency for the unclean,* with a superadded disposition to destroy, or whether it was a malicious scheme to bring the Lord into evil repute through the death of the swine—sublime over all rises his calm, sovereign word of permission—*Go!* What calm supremacy, what mysterious depth is there in this one word! Latent within it is an answer to the question before put, ver. 29—*It is not yet time* for your final judgment. How much is there intimated yet not spoken, and which we dare not trust ourselves to penetrate, concerning the influence of unclean spirits even upon animal life, the only example† of which in Biblical history here meets us.* We do not read that the man or the men rushed upon the two thousand swine, to drive them into the sea; it is only said that the devils went out, and entered into the swine. Even Neander here recognizes the improbability and inappropriateness of the demoniac's being let loose upon the swine—although he then ventures to suppose, in explanation of this "obscure point" of the narrative, that the entering of the spirits into the swine has been inferred from their rushing down into the sea, and that the permission of Christ, as it is recorded here, has been fabricated in consequence. We altogether protest against such dealing with the Scripture. Braune ventures his doubtful remark, that the swine were seized with this madness from some "altogether undefined, and unknown cause," but we must read it as we find it—it was the simple result of the devils entering into them. Not indeed, only to possess them, but to *destroy* them, that going out of the men they may yet accomplish some work of destruction. The whole record shows that *this* was the sole object of their request. Nor were they in any special sense "stupid devils"—as Dr. Paulus ironically solves the mystery of their so soon forfeiting the transitional bodily homes which they had just obtained: they were more cunning than *this* Paulus!

But now come forward the silly expositors, orthodox and hetrodox of every shade, and think they have a right to ask, whether the Lord Jesus could have spoken this—Go! Many fly from this narrative, as if the spirits had entered into *them*, and driven them into the sea of unbelief; they enter upon all kinds of uncalled for apologies for the swine and their owners, forgetting, or seeming to forget, what the apologies of ages have testified on behalf of Jesus. Others, with better views, adduce many ingenious reasons for the act: as that the Lord would hereby give the most convincing evidence of the entire dependence of all spirits upon his word; and with this to give palpable assurance to all Sadducees of the existence of such spirits; so also to punish the probably Jewish owners of these swine (which we cannot think of);† further, to test the Gadarenes, how they would receive the des-

* "The ancient affinity between the serpent and swine, the union of which is exhibited in the dragon, the affinity of the demon nature for swine," as Lange labors to express his idea. The *mere* "inclination to the external, towards flesh, or towards a bodily dwelling" (Von Gerlach), does not seem precisely to explain the desire to enter the swine in particular.

† The inhabitants of the destroyed Babylon in the prophetic description might have been made to illustrate this, where animals and devils are in mysterious fellowship: Isa. xiii. 21, 22, xxxiv. 11–15; Bar. iv. 35; Rev. xviii. 2.

* Even the English Trench (*Notes on the Miracles*) refers us to the *Tellurismus* of our Kieser, and Passavant's *Unters. über das Hellsehen*, for the susceptibility of animals, to demoniac influence. Alford's subtle observation goes to shew that the same animal soul, which man has in common with animals, and through which the demon exerts influence upon him, may undergo the same influence in them.

† Sepp (ii. 393 seq.) gives us some interesting and learned notices of the Jewish greediness of gain which was shown in the breeding of swine, and the employment of Gentile laborers therein, for traffic among the Gentiles.

truction of their property; finally, to teach the value of the spirit of man, his healing being well worth some two thousand swine; or what else has ever been suggested. We have no need whatever of any of these remarks, true or otherwise, concerning this sublime transaction, the σκάνδαλον, *or stumbling-block* of which all three Evangelists have ruthlessly placed right in the centre of their several accounts; for we fix our eyes upon the plain fact, that *the deed itself is its own justification.* They did not then sue our Lord for any loss they suffered in the destruction of the swine; no more will we—we will not indeed dare to speak boldly concerning it. The question, why our Lord permitted the devils to enter the swine, is already answered by another question—Why had the Lord *permitted* them to enter the men?

But far more fearful than the hearing of this request of the devils, is the Lord's granting to the Gergesenes *their* supplication. (They dare not, however, cast any reproach on him concerning the swine.) He who does not desire him, as he is and as he acts, the Ruler of hell, the Lord of nature, the Physician and Healer of men, may beseech him to depart, whether courteously, or ungraciously, and have his request granted. Yet is his departure softened by the word which, according to both Mark and Luke, he uttered to the men who were healed. It is not now, as sometimes, when it was forbidden to make it known; here upon the very outskirts of the Jewish land there was no danger to be obviated. The poor people of the Decapolis shall have, though against their will, a testimony and living monument of his power—one who had lived among themselves. Not indeed to publish abroad every where (as he actually did) is the healed man sent back, with his brother not mentioned; but the command is—Go home to thine house, (ὑπόστρεφε,) *to thy people*, from whom thou hast been so long estranged! Not indeed with a prudent care against relapse, and in order to his full recovery, which would be prevented by his being alone: for he wished to go with Jesus, and the devils were clean gone from him.* But this springs from the gentle graciousness of our Lord, which desires the return home of this man, thus restored to his family. It is in accordance with this universal ordinance that the ἀναγγέλλειν and the διηγεῖσθαι, the "*telling*," should take its beginning from the social circle, and sound out from the home. It evinces also his constant humility, for he here speaks of his great miracle as what the *Lord*† hath done for thee. Mark adds, "and *hath had compassion on thee.*" The miracles of Jesus are ever God's acts of compassion towards men. This is one such instance, standing alone in its kind, and takes its place among the rest, with a word at its close which contains an exhortation that applies to this day to all who have received God's compassion in Christ.

THE PARALYTIC AND THE SCRIBES.

(Matt. ix. 2, 4–6; Mark ii. 5, 8–11; Luke v. 20, 22–24.)

The chronological order of this occurrence is not to be obtained with full certainty from the separate accounts: Mark's δι' ἡμερῶν, *after some days*, and Luke's ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν, *on a certain day*, however, allow latitude enough to permit our following Matthew—as is always the most obvious and natural—and to view his καὶ ἰδού, *and behold*, as immediately hanging upon his preceding narrative. The three Evangelists entirely agree in the matter itself, although the accounts of the two others are more detailed and vivid. The words of the Lord Jesus are repeated by them all in nearly the same terms. We read, first of all, in all three, that Jesus saw *their* faith (ἰδὼν). It is generally, but very improperly, supposed to be that of the bearers, and of *him who is borne*—as it were "the *united* believing efforts of the sick man and his friends." For not only is the latter *distinguished from* the former in the passage itself, but it was obviously the faith of those who brought him to the healing power of the the Lord that made itself so *manifest* in the painstaking and zealous means which they adopted;* and finally, the Lord's word to the sick man, unlooked for and striking as it was, finds its explanation in this, that he saw in *him* a state of mind and feeling *different* from theirs, aiming at an object distinct from that of the bearers, who only sought for his bodily healing. It may be understood, therefore, as a paradox and by way of *opposition*—although he perceived their believing desire, he did not immediately gratify it, but spoke first a word quite different from what they had desired:

* Schleiermacher would explain "the uncommon and almost tumultuous excitement about a home-born (?) sick man, whose case would have been no worse for delay," by a festival near at hand. But how much else is to be thought and said about that!

* As it regards the "inner and moral healing," the remaining with Jesus would have been the most effectual guarantee, as Von Gerlach remarks, in defence of the immediate *bodily* healing.

† This, and ch. xiii. 20, both in Mark, are the only places in which Jesus speaks of God, his Father, as κύριος, or Lord—supposing that he is literally exact, (for Matt. xi. 25 has not κύριε, absolutely.) The demoniac was not "probably a heathen" (as Braune thinks), in which case κύριος would have been to him just *Jehovah*, the God of Israel. The sayings are altogether Jewish in their structure.

or, it may be regarded as giving a profoundly significant reason—when he perceived that their strong faith would well bear the test of delay. In any case the key-note of the narrative is this, that he acted in a manner *unexpected;* but the secret reason of our Lord's dealing is left unconcealed in the narrative, even as it first revealed itself in the transaction in the concluding reference. The Lord perceived in the soul of the paralytic a sentiment more akin to despair than to faith, rather a doubt whether his healing would correspond with his friends' confidence; for he was greatly troubled on account of his sins, which probably had a particular connection with his sickness. This penitent state of mind, on the one hand, was more than the confidence of the others, which had reference to bodily healing; and the Lord, rejoicing more over his *penitence* than their *faith*, does not fail first of all and immediately to invigorate the troubled spirit with the best consolation. On the other hand, although *their* faith might have availed for the healing of the man, the Lord prefers to excite within his own heart the spirit of faith, that so he might come to experience a greater healing than would have been imparted through the faith of others. When preachers on the eighteenth Sunday after Trinity lay down faith as a pre-supposed condition for the forgiveness of sins, they forget, in their dogmatizing, that the encouraging word must be uttered first, which then faith lays hold of and appropriates.

A gracious and most affectionate word of consolation to the dejected man precedes the utterance of the great and express word of absolution. Luke has only retained the ἄνθρωπε, *Man!* which marks an address to the person himself; and that only in general terms, while the other two Evangelists mention more exactly and literally τέκνον, *Son!* which is more affectionate even than θύγατερ, *Daughter!* (Matt., ver. 22), and the same word which our Lord afterwards used in addressing his disciples. Matthew only adds θάρσει, *Be of good courage!* and we feel it to be quite natural that the Lord should utter just such a word; while the other two Evangelists, presupposing that, give only in full prominence the assurance of the *forgiveness of sins.*

We might now go on to exhibit and expound the testimony given in this narrative, so as to bring out its reference to that which is of the highest moment, of infinitely greater importance than bodily help. We might make some remarks upon the interval, however short, which the Lord permits in this case between the taking away of the guilt of sin, and the removal of its punishment; and show that in the counsels and plans of the Most High, many must be contented with hearing the first essential word of grace, Thy sins be forgiven thee! while they must still continue to lie on the beds on which those sins have laid them. This, however, must be guarded, by bearing in mind, that when forgiveness is received, the punishment is in reality taken away; what remains of suffering is no more punishment. All this instruction, however, lies in the matter of the narrative itself; it was scarcely the Lord's conscious design to express all this himself, or to give any testimony directly on these subjects. It was so natural to him to greet a penitent sinner with his immediate θάρσει, *Be of good courage!* it was so great and so rare a joy to his own heart, that in the sublime simplicity of his full authority, he uttered the words which we find, without any oblique or subordinate reference in them whatever.

But since no prophet, no son of man had ever, with power and confidence like this, spoken to men this word of absolute consolation, astonishment and prejudice are excited against the divine voice of his authority, and this its authoritative utterance; not among those who brought the sick man, but among the Scribes and Pharisees, who, though they were not now gathered together as a "first inquisitorial assembly" (according to Sepp's fancy), yet occupy there their seats of pre-eminence, and now take occasion to vent upon the Lord the enmity of which their hearts were already full. They might have used opposite language, and said: Such a word of spiritual consolation is very *easily uttered;* he only feeds thus the sick man's confidence, but he can do no more! But they give it a far more malicious turn, and say that he blasphemeth. Christ has not said: I forgive thee thy sins; but his simple word contained this latent within it, and their spirit of opposition did not engender in them an incorrect suspicion; they rightly understood his meaning. They do not *say* it, but they think it, every one regarding his neighbor with looks which said, as Matthew tells us—οὗτος βλασφημεῖ, *This man blasphemeth!* The others filled up what they intended, by adding the obvious position—Who can forgive sins but God only? a perfectly true proposition in itself; and the inference from it, that "he who assumes this power, being no more than man, *blasphemes,*" was more correctly deduced by these Scribes in the *reasoning of their hearts*, than by the rationalists of our time, who leave the Son of Man all his full honors as Son of Man, but are not so scrupulous about his claims of divine power and authority. The Lord *saw* the reasonings of the Scribes,* just as he had seen the faith of the bearers, and the penitence of him whom they bore; for in relation to his spirit, the penetration through the conduct or countenance to the internal heart of man was one and the same with his knowledge of that which was in man, as man's great Archetype and Head. It was not with the omniscience of God that he pierced the thoughts of all men's hearts, though nothing could remain concealed from him, and nothing could deceive

* Whether we read this second time εἰδὼς or ἰδὼν in Matthew, does not affect the case, for compare ch. xii. 25. Luke has ἐπιγνούς, and Mark in the most express and pregnant words has ἐπιγνοὺς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ.

him, when his spirit in the Spirit of God entered into relation with man. And thus he here exhibits himself, first as the Possessor of all grace for the penitent sinner, and then immediately as the Searcher of hearts and Judge, for the proud and reprobate and self-blinded.

He most impressively lays bare the secret language and murmuring of their hearts, by a piercing question which referred the origin of their *thinking* to their evil *heart*.* Mark has only *ταῦτα, these things*, expressed, Luke still briefer, only *τί, what*, but Matthew is here as before more precise; as is seen in the conscience-stirring *ἱνατί, wherefore*, as well as in the addition of *πονηρά, evil*. This latter would probably refer the Scribes to Zech. viii. 17 (although the Sept. does not accord). Their application of these remarks to the person of our Lord was as *wicked* as their conclusion *in thesi* was sound; so that we may regard *them* rather as having blasphemed in charging him with blasphemy. For first of all, they exhibit no sense and feeling for his gracious consolation of a dejected sinner, which every right-minded person would in its first impression have sympathized with and understood. Then there is the malicious, unprincipled, wilful pre-supposition that Jesus is no more than any other man, which stands in direct contradiction to the emphatic and distinctive words of *his* consolation, and which those very words, addressed in supreme dignity to the paralytic, were quite sufficient to have confuted. Yet the Lord does not leave them to their folly, as they had deserved. He would, in any case, have effected the healing, but it is *for their sakes* also that he utters the other word of authority which all are waiting for and desiring. To put their perverted reasonings, however, to shame, and profit them, he puts an enigmatical question concerning the relation of the *two words* which he has *spoken*. It is a light thing to him to cast down all the folly and wickedness which exalts itself against his acts; but he condescends to their weakness, in that divine wisdom which knows how to accommodate its teaching to the folly of men. He enters more deeply into those thoughts *of theirs*, which he has just condemned in their wickedness. Are ye not now thinking that it is easier *to say* (with baseless assumption, without authority and without effect), Thy sins be forgiven thee! than to say (what would immediately convict itself of impotence), Rise up and walk! This is manifestly the immediate conecting meaning, with which the Lord condescends to their imaginings. He does not directly express himself thus, but leaving the question indefinite and in suspense, intimates that the answer should be very different from what he pre-supposes in them. In effect, the converse is to be understood in his question—Many have performed miracles of healing, prophets and apostles, as well as false wonder-workers, but to forgive sins with the authority of God is greater, nay the greatest of all. Or to apprehend it in another way—To God in heaven, and his representative on earth who is now speaking and acting, both are one and the same: the forgiveness of sins is not consummated without the certain, though subsequent, removal of all their punishment; and the bestowment of health is not truly making whole without its accompanying and essentially blended communication of forgiving grace. However we take it, there is much to be pondered in the question of our Lord, and a very different answer to be found than that which was pre-supposed in the general thoughts of men. He intimates this himself in this enigmatical and sacredly ironical manner, before he proceeds, in accommodation to their foolish thoughts, to give the evidence they need.

We have here, consequently, in a particular example, a general explanation of the significance of the external miracles of Jesus. The immediate self-evidencing clearnesss and truth of his word, spoken in the power of his spirit, should, in strict propriety, have required no further evidence. When a soul like Nathanael's heard from his own holy lips, I came forth from the Father! or a sinner truly poor in spirit heard his great invitation, Come unto me all who are heavy laden! such souls needed no further evidence, before they would believe and follow him. The paralytic, who embraced with a ready heart the first word of comfort, did not put the doubtful question—By what authority dost thou thus assure me? heal my frame, that I may believe in thee! And so all Israel would have needed no more than to hear—I am come to bring you grace! if all Israel had been found in true repentance. But the less must become evidence for the greater, to their hardness and folly of heart, although by an inferential reasoning which has not always and to all, absolute validity; for the word of the Holy One, which testifies the forgiveness of sins, is just as much a proof of the divinity of his miracles, as these again are the authentication of the truth of his word. By this we may understand the only sense in which the Lord might say—*But that ye may know*, or perceive, that not without power and authority to do so, I forgive sins! To the sick man, on the present occasion, such evidence was not necessary; he was already comforted, and thought less than before of the he healing of his body. Let preachers upon this text beware, also, of a perilous *hysteron proteron* into which a false spirit of allegorizing has led many; as if the words, *rise up and walk!* were spoken first to the soul (renewing unto holiness), and were an *evidence* to it of justification. That would be to reverse the evangelical order of grace, since in a spiritual sense the rising up and walking can only result from an appropriated forgiveness. It is not so much for the paralytic

* "A proof, how far unenlightened reason may lead us, when childlike simplicity of heart is wanting!" (Von Gerlach.) In this sense, the emphasis in Luke has been laid with ironical meaning: 'and they began to *reason*."

as for the others that the act for healing follows ; this is as evidently declared in the whole narrative, as it is that forgiveness of sins is essentially the greater thing, and sufficient for itself. Let it be further observed, how meekly the Lord veils his divine majesty, even while he must testify and assert it. The fully developed answer to their evil thoughts might have been—That ye may know that I do not as man invade the prerogative of God, but as the Son, one with the Father, forgive sins in my own divine right and dignity. He says not this, that he may not cast a stumbling block in their way ; just as throughout his whole testimony he ever kept back the simple declaration—I am God ! in order to avoid the provocation of unbelief. (Let John v. 17, etc., x. 33–36 be noted, for example.) He calls himself, also, here the *Son of Man*, while he appropriates a prerogative of God, and the Son of Man *upon earth*, which was equivalent to saying, the fully authorized representative of God *in heaven*.* Quite correctly Bengel remarks : This language argues his celestial origin. It is not admissible to construe *here* ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, *upon earth*, with the following ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας, *to forgive sins* (as at Matt. xviii 18 in a lower degree) ; although certainly (as Richter says) the earth is essensially the proper place where he does forgive sins. And now he turns in the concluding sentence from the *Scribes* to the paralytic, lets the immediate word of his power speak in act, and utters, without further preface, the command which he had prepared them for—Stand up and walk ! In this *change of his word without drawing the conclusion*, there is a sublime breviloquence ; the Lord does not first say : I will then speak what ye require—but he *speaks it !* This is proved by the σοὶ λέγω, *I say unto thee*, of Mark and Luke, in which (as Alford fails not to observe) the emphasis lies on the σοί, *to thee*. To connect with this the λέγει, in Mark, as being part of the Lord's own words, is *he saith*, an unskillful forcing of his language and meaning (" That ye may know that the *Son of Man* hath power, he saith now in your presence to this paralytic, *I say unto thee !*"). Besides which, this construction is not admitted by εἶπε, *he said*, in Luke, nor by τότε λέγει, *then saith he*, in Matthew, which is an insertion of the Evangelist, as we infer by the use of the same narrative λέγει, *he saith*, afterwards in ver. 9.

It is immediately obvious in this as in all similar instances, that the taking up of the bed, and going to the house, was designed as convincing evidence of perfect soundness instantaneously imparted. What the Lord bestows, he bestows with full hand and in unrestricted measure : when he condescends to attest his power in the sight of man, he will have it worthily esteemed and magnified ; and more worthily by us who believingly read than by the astonished people of that time, who in all probability when they glorified ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην, *such power*, in his hands, rested upon the lesser instead of the greater manifestation of power. But the Lord restored soundness to the paralytic man, in order that we might apprehend him as one who could also say to us—Thy sins be forgiven ! *This word* may neither be criticized nor wondered at, but *experienced*.

THE PHYSICIAN FOR THE SICK.

(Matt. ix. 9, 12, 13 ; Mark ii. 14–17 ; Luke v. 37, 31, 32.)

This is another example how various is the meaning which we should attribute to our Lord's *Follow thou me !* according to the development of circumstances. In Luke vi. we find that Matthew had been, suddenly to himself, chosen into the number of the Twelve before the Sermon on the Mount. It does not follow because he himself relates his final call from his secular office two chapters after the Sermon, that therefore that final call must have occurred later ; but a comparison of the Evangelists indisputably proves it, since otherwise the parables of ch. xiii. must also have occurred before the Sermon on the Mount, which is not to be supposed.† Matthew appears to have returned more or less to the business of his office, just as Peter had returned to his nets ; and the Lord, who in his wisdom regulated all things according to their respective conditions, allowed this to be so ; until the critical moment came when he saw fit to repeat that first call, strengthening it into an unqualified command to follow him permanently. The very artless manner in which Matthew records *this* final summons, omitting the former choice of him altogether (in which the two other Evangelists follow him, according to the established tradition), proceeded on the one hand from a most amiable modesty, on the other from a deep consciousness in his own memory that it was the last " Follow me !" which came *to him* at the critical moment of release from all. We, however, deny that his conversion had been, as Sepp says, the work of a moment. We hold against Ebrard with the profound Bengel, whose harmony is not to be lightly and superficially rejected. (See his § 55. " Peter and Andrew,

* Neander : " God forgives the sins in heaven, but Christ as man, announces to the sinners the divine forgiveness. *Son of Man* and *on earth* are correlative ideas." This is at the same time directed against the Pharisaic-catholic doctrine, that there must ever remain uncertainty among men concerning God's forgiveness in heaven.

† [This supposition by no means follows; nor, if it did, would it be so improbable as the author's— that Matthew was chosen an apostle before he was called as a disciple.—Am. Ed.]

James and John, had been *followers* before they became *apostles;* Matthew is called to be an apostle, before he has become a daily follower of Christ.")

But, without any argument, such an apparently sudden summons from office and function pre-supposes some previous acquaintance and connection. It is no where written that no one of the Twelve left the person of our Lord after having been first called; but the remarkable, and, in its kind, singular procedure in the case of Matthew, affords us much subject of thought, which however here we may not speak of more particularly. His "rising and following him" is not to be understood as if he left every thing as it then was, according to the mere letter of the narrative. It is to be understood that he set everything in order pertaining to his house and office; and the text itself allows us to think that he even made a parting feast for his former companions, at which he might introduce to them his new master and his other fellow-disciples. He only intimates that this occurred in *his own* house, because that must be mentioned in order to explain the following sayings of the Lord, so memorable to himself. We may doubt whether, as Menken has it, "before long, some Pharisees added themselves to the company," for the Pharisees were not wont thus to mingle, at least unbidden, with the Publicans. We only understand by the ἰδοντες, *when they saw*, of Matthew (even in connection with Mark's ἐσθιοντα, *eating*), that they saw it, or became acquainted with it, perhaps, as they departed again, or sometime afterwards. (Luke designates by οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν, *their scribes*, the Scribes belonging to the place, where Jesus, always watched closely by this kind of people, participated in such a meal.) They do not venture to address themselves directly to the Lord, just as we saw in the foregoing history. In ch. xii. 2, xv. 2, they do indeed address the Master, but only allege, as against the disciples, what their Master did or approved; here they mockingly attack the disciples on their Master's account. At furthest they only proceed to utter once their murmurings in the third person, as in Luke xv. 2.

The Lord is immediately ready with his answer, to deliver his disciples from their embarrassment, and to inflict salutary shame upon the questioners. His answer and vindication consists, according to Matthew, in *three* propositions, which indeed are one in their fundamental meaning, but advance in a threefold progression of conviction in their expression. He begins in a popular and gracious style with a well-known proverb, figuratively to set forth a principle, applicable in this case, which they, in their perversion, utterly forgot. He then attaches to this a word of Scripture for the scripturally learned scribes, which neither the wisdom of the market-place, nor the wisdom of the sanctuary, had yet understood and learned. His conclusion gives a most penetrating and direct *answer, in an utterance of the Lord himself*, concerning himself and the design of his coming, which at once explains the proverb and expounds the Scripture that he had quoted, as *fulfilled* in himself. Matthew alone gives us the passage of the prophet which mediates between the figurative and direct expression, partly because of its immediate interest as occurring at his repast, and partly because he especially has preserved the reference to the Old Testament Scriptures.

The proverb concerning the physician for the sick, and not for the sound, which occurs as well in the Talmud* as in profane authors, and is of universal use, is given by Luke in the most simple form, with the anthesis of ὑγιαίνοντες, *whole*, and κακῶς ἔχοντες, *sick:* the other two Evangelists have the more exact ἰσχύοντες, literally *strong*, which probably made the contrast still more emphatic, as we should say, the robust, who are of radically and permanently sound constitution; (although, indeed, to be strong and grow strong, is a Scriptural expression for recovery and healing after sickness, as in Isa. xxxix. 1; Ezek. xxxiv. 16.) Apart from the confirmation of the common practice to send the sick to the physician, which lies already in the use of the proverb, its application here has a further two-fold reference. First of all, being spoken to the teachers and spiritual guides of Israel, it puts *them* to shame as bad physicians, who, although called to strengthen the diseased, and heal the sick (Ezek. xxxiv. 4), yet in their loveless selfishness acted perversely as the physician would act, who should avoid the sick man *who needs his help*, in order to escape the danger of infection! But then *the Lord* announces himself as the true Physician for the sickness of the soul, using thus an expression wide and deep in its meaning, which contains at the same time an *interpretation* of the miracles that he performed on the bodily sick. The Lord speaks here in the sense in which the Evangelist had already given that interpretation by a prophetic passage (ch. viii. 17), and it is for the sake of this that Matthew appends these sayings of our Lord, with their occasion (and its continuation in vers. 14–17), to the record which he had given, in the eighth and ninth chapters, of bodily healing of all kinds. It may indeed be said, with some propriety so far as regards the first of his expressions, that the Lord uses the language of humility, and appears to place himself only in the ranks of physicians in general; yet we cannot but perceive immediately afterwards a more intense and peculiar meaning in the sing. ἰατρου, *physician*, as spoken by our Lord in the person of *him who has come* (ver. 13). It is no other than if he had said: I am *the* Physician, the one and only Physician for the souls of men; just as he had said, I am *the* good Shepherd, and as he presently afterwards

* Talm. Babyl. tit. *Bava Kama*, fol. 46, col. 2, as Antisthenes in Laertius, Diogenes in Stobæus, Pausanias in Plutarch, Ovid *de Ponto.*

in ver. 15 distinguishes himself as *the* Bridegroom. These are nothing but names of God and his Christ through the whole prophetic Scripture. Even in Exod. xv. 26 more than merely bodily sickness is intended.

How wonderful is the union of gracious tenderness and supreme dignity in this as in every other word of the Great Physician who is come into the world; assuring every one, who will receive it, of forgiveness of sins in God's authority, and of the healing of all his iniquities by the Divine power! In uncharitable perversion they criticise and condemn the peculiar exercise of his function; he only and simply answers that this is, nevertheless, his office and work. It is the voice of that compassionate love which brought him from the bosom of the Father, that is heard in the χρείαν ἔχουσιν, *have need.* It is the gracious view which divine compassion takes, to pass by the idea of *guilt* and to regard our sin as *sickness*, which, though it does not deserve yet *needs*, to be healed—it is thus often represented in the Old Testament; *e. g.* Jer. iii. 22, and more particular Isa. liii. How deep and grievous our injury is, we learn indeed from this, that God only can repair it, and that only by the wounds of his dear Son. But who are the *whole* who *need no* physician? We shall hear in this, with Calvin, an *ironica concessio*, if we rightly consider the subsequent explanation of our Lord, which goes beyond the mere literal meaning of the proverb, and tells us plainly that the Lord never recognizes upon earth any "righteous" and "sound" but such as think themselves to be so.* This is opened up to us by the quotation from Scripture, to which the Lord refers the scribes with a keenly penetrating hint—*Go ye and learn*, what that often read, but never yet understood Scripture meaneth. (In the Talmud the Rabbins frequently say to their disciples: צא ולמד, *go and learn.*)

Let us also go and read the words in their connection in Hosea, in order that we may read and expound them aright—not reading and expounding them, however, as the modern scribes of our day do, who allow the prophets to say no more than what dim-sighted investigation of the present age thinks reconcilable with the history, and the views, and the range of thought in the times of the prophets themselves; and who thus remain at the utmost distance from that one, only exegesis, according to which the spirit of Christ himself who spake by the prophets, expounds and opens to us by the mouth of Jesus and his apostles, his own anticipative word, and bears witness to it as now first fulfilled, and now first accessible *in its full and consummate meaning*, to our understanding. We cannot penetrate too deeply into the words of the Holy Ghost, specially cannot we hold too firmly by the principle that the quotations and expositions of the Old Testament in the New, give to us the right key for their interpretation.

Misapprehending this, even orthodox expositors have missed the inmost and fundamental meaning of the impressive ἔλεον θέλω, *I will have mercy*, which the Lord has appropriated out of Jehovah's word to Hosea, at the same time carrying it on to its development, in the person of him who was to come. It is almost universally understood, as Von Meyer's note upon Matthew expresses it: "as a gracious condescension to teach sinners, and not a rigid, external separation of himself from them," thus referring to that mercy and love which man should exercise towards man, according to God's good pleasure. Though this seems at the first glance to suit the connection, yet might we, penetrating deeper, already mark that the Lord, who has proclaimed himself the physician of sick humanity in the power of the grace of God, in the following words refers rather to God in heaven, and must mean the *mercy which God exercises towards sinners for their healing and salvation*; and in effect, this is the first and only true meaning of the word in the prophecy quoted.

The great theme of the fourteen chapters of Hosea from the beginning to the end, is generally, as in all the prophets, an annunciation of punishment in order to subsequent mercy, a prediction of the dispersion and return of Israel. His whole discourse passes from threatening to promise, and is arranged in four sections, ever strengthening its hold, and widening its view, as it goes on. The second of these sections embraces ch. iv. to ch. vi. After long rebuke and threatening there is a sudden transition in ch. v. 15 to that *healing mercy*, which will survive the judgments, be prepared for by them, and even effectually work in and through them. That God only, as his people's Physician, can heal them and will, is a fundamental idea which runs through the whole of Hosea's prophecy; and our Lord's citation therefore seizes the central idea of the prophet. The Assyrian could not *heal* them, nor *cure* them of their wound, ch. v. 13. When I would have *healed* Israel, then the iniquity of Ephraim was discovered (ch. vii. 1) —finally I will *heal* all their backslidings, ch. xiv. 5. But how is this to be effected? They must acknowledge their offence, and seek my face: this they will do, they will in their penitent affliction say—Come, and let us return unto the Lord; for he hath torn and he will *heal* us; he hath smitten and he will bind us up (ch. v. 15, vi. 1). The spirit of Christ in the prophet here glances forward into the *new covenant*, the covenant of *grace*; and in the reference ver. 2, to *the third day*, after two days, as in its most obvious meaning, the critical time of God's speedy turning from judgment to mercy, we discover a latent typical under-meaning, such as, despite all modern exegesis, the Old Testament abounds in, by which the resurrection of the Redeemer

* [So the German original. But it does not appear to represent the author's real meaning.—Am. Ed.]

on the third day is foreshadowed.* Then is the future, New-Testament grace further commended and set forth in vers. 3, 4; where, assuredly, חַסְדְּכֶם, *your goodness*, (comp. Jon. ii. 9 חַסְדָּם, *their own mercy*,) can mean no other than, the *mercy*, *which I will manifest to you*, entirely as מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ, *thy judgments*, in ver. 3, signify my judgments against and upon thee. That other interpretation which is generally preferred, and which Von Meyer's note also approves as "the most immediate and obvious," is altogether to our thinking inapplicable here; for the passage from the first to the sixth verse has no tone of rebuke, but is full of promise and encouragement. The coming of the Merciful One to heal and make alive is foretold in ver. 3, as the full preparation of the morning dawn, and as a fructifying rain; and presently afterwards it is testified in ver. 5, that through judgments and after them *light* should *break forth*. How then could we suitably interpose a rebuke that "*your goodness* is as a morning cloud, and as the early dew that goeth away, that is, *fleeting* and *transitory*." We must not, therefore, be misled by the passage in ch. xiii. 3, which designedly applies the expression in another meaning, but take the decisive conclusion of ch. xiv. 6 as a strict parallel: I will be as *the dew* unto Israel! Comp. Mic. v. 6. The only true exposition of ch. vi. 4 is that of Burk, *Gnomon in xii. prophetas minores*, who says: "Iram comminantem, in quam nonnulli (omnes fere hodie) interpretes hæc verba vertere conati sunt, totus tenor textus et connexio cum antecedentibus et consequentibus plane excludit. Sicut *nubes mane*, quæ *auroræ* correspondet, et in quâ radii auroræ eo magis conspicui sunt. מַשְׁכִּים הֹלֵךְ—cito, tempore matutino, summo mane *ros* venit. Mox ubi efficaciam et virtutem suam terræ communicavit reliquitque, iterum abit videturque evanuisse; revera vero prodesse non posset, nisi abiret, et dum evanuisse videtur, *quam maxime adest* et in effectibus lætissimis, in pratis virentibus, in herbis celeriter succrescentibus, novo habito indutus, splendide prodit."†

We have been constrained to discuss all this beforehand, in order to found upon it our protest against the ancient and modern misapprehension of our Lord's citation of the sixth verse. The fifth verse forms the transition from the gracious promises, vers. 1–4, to this all-comprising conclusion of the whole discourse; and indicates the aim and object of the prophetic threatenings, of the word which rebukes and kills, and of the chastising and purifying judgments, to be, that light should break forth upon the people thus humbled and prepared. *For*, saith the Lord, *I desire mercy*, to show mercy and not sacrifice. This does not *immediately* mean—I am well pleased, when *ye* shew mercy one toward another,* but there is a *twofold* contrast between God and men. Israel would *give to God* in sacrifice and *offering*; this is the leading mistake of the Old Testament, and it is here once more protested against: I will *take nothing* from you (see Hosea v. 6). I will rather *give to you*, it is for you before and above all things, first and last, to seek and to find my compassion and my love! This is the true knowledge of the Lord, דַּעַת אֱלֹהִים which ver. 3 had spoken of, and which ch. ii. 19, 20 confirms. Taking this sentence, which forms, as it were, the central point of our Lord's discourses out of Hosea, let us look backwards and forwards through the prophecy, and see how the *mercy* and *compassion* of the Lord is testified to be the only source of healing from the beginning to the end. Ch. i. 7, אֲרַחֵם, *I will have mercy*—ch. ii. 4, רָחָמָה, *mercy*—ch. ii. 21 (19) וּבְחֶסֶד וּבְרַחֲמִים, *and in loving-kindness and in mercies*—ch. xi. 9, נִחוּמַי, *my repentings*—especially the sublime conclusion, ch. xiv. 3–5, which shows that this is the true sacrifice, when sinners confessing their sin seek forgiveness, when the fatherless find *mercy* of God, and he *heals* their backsliding.

This then is the first and most essential meaning of the word which the Lord bids the Pharisees study, in order that they might discern the healing mercy of God as now having appeared unto sinners—Your God has ever in the Old Testament testified, as the end and aim of all his revelations to his people and dealings with them, that he alone is the true physician for the healing of his sick people. He will *impart mercy, not take sacrifice*.† We do not deny, for it is perfectly obvious, that on the foundation of this meaning, a further hortatory application is intended—He who has found mercy, should be merciful, affectionate,

* According to *th eScripture*—says Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 4. But where shall we find it, save here and in the typical history of Jonah? This latter does not seem to us enough of itself to sustain the emphatically asserted "on the third day."

† Reichel also, from whom I extracted in my commentary on Isaiah, was very vehement for Luther's translation and interpretation. In an unprinted manuscript upon the twelve minor prophets, which I have looked through, he complains much of the damaging and disfiguring perversion of this passage into a threatening sense.

* As the Chald. בְּעוֹבְדֵי חִסְדָּא, *by deeds of mercy*, —and the Rabbins who indeed think directly of their עֲשׂוֹת מִשְׁפָּט וּצְדָקָה, *works of judgment and righteousness*.

† Lange, whose opposition cannot lead us astray, says himself "that God only rejects sacrifice, when it is offered to him in contradistinction *to mercy*, and quite correctly, *scilicet* the mercy *of God*, that alone is the true and deep *contrast* here. [The author's labored interpretation of "mercy" or "goodness" in Hos. vi. 4, 6, as being *that shown by God*, is opposed to the obvious import of the passage, and especially to the parallelism with "the knowledge of God" in ver. 6. The sacred writer evidently means *piety*, and Stier's exegesis is only correct in recognizing God as the ultimate source of this.—Am. Ed.]

and full of kindness towards sinners. Hosea himself speaks, ch. iv. i. and xii. 7, of חֶסֶד, *mercy*, among men, just as Mic. vi. 8, and Zec. vii. 9. But in this fundamental passage he discloses the foundation of the divine compassion, which must and will itself prepare the sacrifice which is well pleasing to him, that is the living sacrifice. Unless we err, the apostle in Rom. xii. 1 makes allusion to this same passage of the prophet, as would appear from the conjunction of his three fundamental ideas: the *mercies* of God, the *sacrifice offered*, and *acceptable* to God.

And now observe, further, how profoundly and sublimely the Lord, continuing his words with γάρ, connects them with the words of God in Hosea! I have had pleasure in showing mercy, saith God—I am come to call sinners, saith the Son of God, in whom the God of Israel comes and manifests himself as the promised dawn of righteousness and grace. As Jesus had, in the previous healing of the paralytic, called himself the Son of Man, while assuming to himself a prerogative of God; so now he directly speaks in the person and name of God when his human action, which is also divine, is measured by a false standard and judged by man. He now gives full utterance, having prepared the way by the quotation from Scripture, to his interpretation of the previous proverb; but his interpretation and application of it must go beyond its ordinary meaning. The proverb pre-supposes some who are whole, who need no physician, but now the great physician who is come, the revealed God of Israel, who will heal all sin and backsliding, finds none but the sick or *sinners*, none who are whole or *righteous*. Therefore *the article is now omitted* which had been prefixed to ἰσχύοντες, *whole*, and κακῶς ἔχοντες, *sick*, and this has a critical significance. The Lord knows no class of men, whom he might term τοὺς δικαίους, "*the* righteous," whom he is not come to call. That great "I am come!" which he so often repeats, thereby indeed *testifying* himself to be the Messiah, has its application for all. His *calling*, which sounds forth to *all*, regards all as *sinners*, not as righteous. If they had not needed such a physician, he would not have come at all! This is the final and full answer to the question of ver. 11, in words which correspond to it—It is for *sinners* that I am here!

Yet does this simple expression, which knows nothing of the righteous, assume, when connected with the preceding proverb, a severe tone of irony against the proud, who think themselves sound, just as in Luke xv. 7, there are righteous referred to, who think they need no repentance, but there is no joy, but sorrow rather in heaven over them. That he speaks of a righteousness of the Pharisees, which availed before him, no rational person will admit. But because they perceive not and feel not themselves to be sinners, in this particular sense not needing the physician, not κακῶς ἔχοντες, or *sick*, the gracious Physician can only say to them, in his angry sorrow—For you, such as you are, it is as if I had not come at all, for ye receive me not, although *I* call you too as sinners—ye are not such, ye are the strong and the righteous! And in the very fact of uttering this in their presence, he does nevertheless call them, and they might have known it. It is as much as if he had said—ἦλθον καλέσαι πάντας (εἰς ἔλεον, εἰς μετάνοιαν), οὐχ ὡς δικαίους ἀλλ' ὡς ἁμαρτωλούς, *I came to call all* (*to mercy, to repentance*), *not as righteous, but as sinners.*

The question whether εἰς μετάνοιαν, *to repentance*, is the right reading in Matthew and Mark, as well as in Luke, does not affect the case; for on any supposition Luke has rightly completed what must be included in the full meaning of the καλέσαι, *call*. To what does the Lord *call* sinners but to *mercy*, and how can this be obtained but in the way of conversion from sin to God, that is of *repentance*? We should regard it as more probable that the Lord's words were uttered as we find them in Luke. He thus manifestly referred to the preaching of John the Baptist, continued as it was by himself, whose cry, Repent ye! went forth to *all* without exception.

Jesus does not merely eat with publicans and sinners, he sanctifies this eating and commerce, as he sanctifies his whole life and work, by the testimony and *call* which pervades it. And not only so; his graciously condescending, never-repelling fellowship with them, is itself a call, and an invitation and an attraction most powerful.

ANSWER CONCERNING FASTING.

(Matt. ix. 15–17; Mark ii. 19–22; Luke v. 35–39.)

Matthew's τοτε προσέρχονται, *then came*, which will not admit of a relation of anything past, indicates a close connection between this and the preceding discourse. The conversation with the disciples of John must certainly be conceived of as having first taken place after the answer given to the Pharisees; and, consequently, the chronology indicated in Mark v. 21, must not be so far pressed, as to leave no room for all that Matthew relates as having transpired before the request of Jairus. Mark, who has related these circumstances earlier, places the discourse concerning fasting immediately after that concerning eating and drinking, though with but slight bond of connection; Luke, however, connects the one

directly with the other, as if the subsequent objection had been urged by the same circle surrounding the Lord, from which the previous one had sprung (*οἱ δὲ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν*). It seems nearly certain from the whole, that the two conversations, closely related in their matter, should be placed, according to Matthew's *τότε, then*, not merely in relation as facts but in strict chronological conjunction; with which it will accord, if we perceive in the second discourse a reference to the former, which was still in our Saviour's thoughts.

The *disciples of John*, too, who now came, according to Matthew, to our Lord (that is, *certain* of them, whom the article in Mark indicates as representatives of their kind), present themselves to our Lord and his disciples, with their objections and scruples, just as the Pharisees had already done. For even they stand *in part*, if not for the most part, on that footing of the old, which will not comprehend the new as revealed in Christ. This is the general fundamental idea, which our Lord's discourse makes prominent. They themselves, with great simplicity, indicate this their position—*We and the Pharisees.** Whether they were incited to bring forward their objection by the Pharisees, may be left to conjecture; we may very well suppose the impulse to have sprung from within themselves, without any such external stimulant. We are very far from saying, with Schleiermacher, that "such a question from John's disciples themselves would have savored of simplicity"—many as wise as he, might in their case, have shown only the same wisdom. We *fast so oft* (Matt. *πολλά*, Luke *πυκνά*, *καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται*) does not mean that they thought it too much, and would rather have it lightened like the disciples of Jesus; it is rather the proud zeal of their righteousness which expresses itself thus, upon which they value themselves. Thy disciples *fast not*: a slightly ironical, euphemistic expression for *eating and drinking* as Luke has it, which is now made objectionable in itself, as before it had been objected to for being in company with *publicans and sinners*—almost in the spirit of sympathy with the invidious meaning of Matt. xi. 19.†

We have then to do here with the contrast of that distinctively and entirely new thing which the Lord brings in as exhibited in himself and his disciples, with the entirely old, to which Pharisaic Judaism adhered, as well as with that intermediate position of John's disciples, which, vibrating between the old and the new, had rather a preponderance of the old element. We have it clearly recorded, how the Lord openly and decidedly opposed himself to *both*.* If this collision is confined to the special point of *fasting*, all who were susceptible of faith might have perceived in his words a token that the *Messiah* was come; for it was the Jewish teaching, as we find in Maimonides, that "all fasting should cease in the days of the Messiah, and that there should be then only holidays and festivals, as it is written in Zech. viii. 19." Resting on this, our Lord utters in his first response the great contrast openly and decisively expressed; thus proclaiming himself as the giver of joy now come, and present among his disciples, and designating the period of his presence among them as the marriage time. He had already declared himself to be the *Physician*, and this gives additional emphasis to a second title: I am also *the Bridegroom!* But the weighty significance of this Messiah-name, pointing as it does by the definite article to the prophecy and its fulfillment, would be altogether weakened if we should limit that article to its mere use in the figure, instead of deriving the figure itself from the prophetic name; and interpret it as only meaning—So long as the bridegroom is with them—that is, he who is, as it were, a bridegroom to them, *as being the source of their joy*. It is incontrovertibly obvious that the Lord here refers the disciples of John to the testimony of their own master, as we find in John iii. 28, 29.† In that passage *ὁ Χριστός*, and *νυμφίος*, *Bridegroom*, are strictly parallel. There the Baptist named himself the friend of the Bridegroom, *paranymph*, *παράνυμφος* or *παρανυμφίος*, *νυμφαγωγός*, Talm. שׁוֹשְׁבִינָא, he who demands and leads the bride to the bridegroom. He does not indeed there say *ὁ νυμφίος*, "the bridegroom," but the Messianic reference in the preceding *τὴν νύμφην*, "*the* bride" is even yet stronger than that would have been, when we consider the whole meaning of John's demonstrative discourse. (All men come to him; *the* bride, the church the people of God turn towards him: and this is as it should be, for, as this proves, he is indeed *the* bridegroom

* In Mark, they speak of the practice of the two discipleships in the third person, just as (according to Ebrard) a Lutheran might say to a Roman Catholic: The Lutherans and the Reformed do not keep Corpus-Christi-day. We may very well conceive (with Von Gerlach) that after the imprisonment of the Baptist many of his disciples would rather attach themselves to the *better kind* of Pharisees than to Jesus. The opinion on the other hand, that the Pharisees proposed this question to Jesus, only referring to John's disciples; and that Matthew's Gospel derived the account from a misunderstanding and transposing tradition, is one more of the petty shifts of Scripture dishonoring modern theology.

† They speak, however, as Roos says, with simple hearts, and hold probably the *disciples* of Jesus only in suspicion, as being an undisciplined people, who would not so readily acquiesce in their Master's enforcement of prayer and fasting as they had acquiesced in John's.

* Which we find here "in a marvellous union which is perfectly natural, but on that account full of instruction and warning." It is thus Seyler preaches: see his *Mittheillungen über die zehnte Versammlung in Gnadau*.

† Subordinately a not unimportant example, how the contents of the fourth Gospel are pre-supposed by the Synoptical Gospels, and are confirmed by them.

of *this bride*. I have no other function than to lead her to him.) But the Lord's words here have a more extended reference; all his disciples generally appear as *υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος*, "children of the bride-chamber," friends of the Bridegroom: and with this we may compare ch. xi. 11. This expression, indeed, indicates something much more intimate than *marriage company* or wedding guests generally, since *νυμφὼν* signifies the bridal-chamber, and not merely the hall of the wedding-feast. It refers already to the calling of the apostles to be the bringers of the bride, in the same sense as the Baptist had intimated; for in such indefinite parables as these, which hint more than they say, the narrower and the wider meaning pass one into the other.

It remains, however, clear and important that the Lord here, by a general citation of the Old Testament, terms himself *the Bridegroom*. This was according to a general orientalism, which thus exhibited the relation between ruler and people, and with a much deeper meaning it was applied to the sacred relation of Jehovah, the God of Israel. But the prophets testified clearly that the true betrothal, the true marriage (which Psa. xlv. and the Canticles predict) would take place when God, the King, the husband of Israel, should come as his Messiah. Thus are given first of all the great promises in Isa. lii. 6, 7, 12—I myself, who now speak, will be He! Thy God reigneth! The Lord will go before you; and the God of Israel will be your re-reward! Then is interposed the marvellous prophecy concerning the servant of the Lord; but immediately after follows again in ch. liv. the prediction of the fruitful marriage, ver. 5: For thy maker is thine husband, the Lord of hosts is his name; and thy redeemer the Holy One of Israel; the God of the whole earth shall he be called. Hence are to be understood the subsequent marriage parables of our Lord, which are already prepared for in this discourse to the disciples of John. It is, finally, a very striking circumstance that the same Hosea to whom the Lord had referred the Pharisees, as he testifies of *the Physician*, so also testifies of *the Bridegroom*. For in Hos. ii. 19, 20 (which is to be regarded as an interpretation of the typical conduct of the *Prophet*, with an allusion, at the same time, to a meaning of the idol-name בַּעַל, *Baal*, i. e. lord or husband,) we find it said: I will betroth thee unto me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in loving kindness, and in mercies. I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulness; and *thou shalt know the Lord*. Now this is the true explanation of חֶסֶד, *mercy*, and דַּעַת אֱלֹהִים, *knowledge of the Lord* (Hos. vi. 6), which the Lord himself supplementarily brings, while he blends in his answer a reference to that testimony of the Baptist with the thoughts of his own mind, which still linger in Hosea's prophecy. Thus by means of both the prophet's predictions, that of the Physician and that of the Bridegroom, uniting in strict harmony and concert, the Lord declares with ample clearness for all who have ears to hear, who he himself is. Where I thus am present, the Bridegroom, there can be nothing but joy for my chosen disciples especially, who are elected to be paranymphs, friends of the Bridegroom. To fast now would be a plain self-contradiction, for fasting pertains to *sorrow* and not to joy. But these are glad, and rightly so, because the long-expected is come at last, and they are conscious of nothing but this. The Bridegroom is come, the marriage must and will now go on! The presence of the Bridegroom is already to them the beginning of the marriage. Interrupt them not, they will soon enough discover that an interval must take place: yea, these and my future disciples shall during many a dreary season, find cause to fast—for the actual marriage is yet far in the distance. Such generally is the meaning of this prophetic discourse, though, alas, most Bible readers accept it with difficulty, for Luther's word, without explanation derived from oriental biblical customs, misleads them to think of the actual marriage at once.

The Bridegroom is taken from them, just as the king first takes his journey, in order to receive his kingdom (Luke xix. 12; Matt. xxv. 14). The very generally announced prediction which the Lord gives* concerning this, refers immediately and first of all to the days of his sufferings and death; for the disciples of John, whose Master, according to every correct harmony, was now in prison, the words would contain a latent analogy, which the Lord more fully utters in Matt. xvii. 12, "*Your* Master, for whose imprisonment ye would mourn and fast, is not, however, the true Bridegroom, who will similarly, yet quite otherwise, be taken away!" The first presence of Jesus among his disciples, however full of joy it might make them, was nevertheless quite transitory; there stood the cross before him, by which the Bridegroom would become the Physician, and lead the truly healed through deep affliction to perfect joy (John xvi. 20–22). All this the Lord knew from the beginning, and in the midst of his gracious acknowledgment and approval of the joy which surrounded him in his own disciples' hearts, he alone looks beyond into the days which were coming. (Wizenmann may well cry: "What man ever looked down so tranquilly, so cheerfully, from so great a height into so profound a depth?") Indeed the *ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι, but the days will come*, and the *τότε, then* (which Luke still strengthens by *ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, in those days*, a more exact expression than Mark's singular) stretches the prospect far into the times of the Church, in which, as well for the whole as for individuals, there will be a manifold and perpetual recurrence of the departure of the

* Where the grammatically unusual *ἀπαρθῇ, taken away*, the same in all three Evangelists, stands alone in the New Testament.

Bridegroom, and the pressing through the sorrow of the cross to the joy of the resurrection.

Nevertheless, the Lord will not permit any to disturb the present joy of his own, however transitory it may be, in himself and his personal presence (ἐφ' ὅσον, Mark and Luke ἐν ᾧ μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστιν—Mark again ὅσον χρόνον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἔχουσι τὸν νυμφίον)! Although the most fearful suffering was at hand, although the greatest of the prophets awaited in the prison his death, yet even these things may not suppress the joy of the disciples, and make them fast, so gladdening is the presence of the Bridegroom. It is *in this* that we are to seek the peculiar contrast between the Old and the New, which is now intimated, and afterwards expanded more fully; not, indeed, merely through the presence of the Bridegroom (for this is limited by an ἐφ' ὅσον, and fasting even in the new time is plainly contemplated), but rather in the distinction between fasting as genuine and corresponding to the occasion, and fasting as enforced and legally imposed as an external obligation. The specific point of the Lord's saying becomes obvious to us in Matthew (who has here the exact word in preference to the other two), for he speaks, first of all, of *mourning* instead of fasting, and with a frank μὴ δύνανται, *cannot*, asks if it be befitting and right to enforce fasting in a time of joy? Mark strengthens it with a repeated οὐ δύνανται; Luke expresses this fundamental idea through a less direct tradition, but in a vigorous manner and quite consistent with circumstances: μὴ δύνασθε ποιῆσαι νηστεύειν; "can ye *make* them fast?" What gives truth and reality to external fasting, is the internal mourning; all such exercises as outwardly imposed and enforced it, belong to the old and legal position, which in the circle of our Lord's discipleship is utterly removed. And further, what was all the עַנּוֹת נֶפֶשׁ, even as imposed in the Old Testament by God himself, but a preparation for coming joy? It was never an end in itself, only the transitional means. And when now he that is come inspires the joy, where is the occasion for fasting?

It will return, but never again in the legal, Old-Testament, Pharisaic spirit and manner, but in the truth and reality of the fulfillment of its design. *Then shall they fast*, that is, now conversely, they shall mourn of themselves, naturally and truly and necessarily fast. This is no commandment, but a prophecy of those fast days which God himself will apoint to souls, and not they themselves impose voluntarily upon themselves. That which in the time of the first fulfillment happened symbolically to the disciples, who in their affliction forgot to eat and drink, though it never occurred to them to say, "We must appoint ourselves a fast," will have a perpetual realization in the Church. It might indeed in a certain sense be said that the whole time of the Church during her Lord's absence, the whole interval between the Ascension and the Second Coming, is a time of solemn earnestness, of sorrow, and of fasting. Yet there is a qualification of this, since for the Church, as well as for its individual members, times of the Lord's presence alternate with times of his absence, the one profoundly preparing the way for the other. There freedom and truth must be uninterfered with in all their conduct. If a soul has found its Saviour, let no one disturb it when rejoicing as the disciples rejoiced in the beginning: the hard ways of the cross will come afterwards, let them be prophesied that they may be provided for, but nothing more. The complete consummation, which already appears to our first apprehension, and with truth, to be so near, is the marriage of the Bridegroom with his own, a time of joy and delight, in which all fast-days are lost.

Verse 16. We shall now be better able to understand what the Lord goes on to say concerning the *old* and the *new*, yet in marriage similitudes still, for garments and wine may well occur to our thoughts when preparation for the marriage is spoken of. What is the altogether new? That freedom and sincerity of deportment which ever correspond with the reality of the inward state, and which should henceforward alone avail: not, assuredly, a mere vain joy, as before a mere vain sorrow, but the eating and drinking when man is glad, the fasting when he is sorrowful; that is, as we are wont to say, the government of the *evangelical* spirit, rule of life, and guidance. What, on the other hand, is the *old* which the Lord thus by the very word emphatically announces already as done away, even as his apostle afterwards (Heb. viii. 13) must do again? All that pertains to the legal, Old Testament, imperfect, preparatory, typical relation, as it is opposed, in the Pharisees and John's disciples, to the spirit of the New. What then is the mixing and mending which would put a new patch upon an old garment? It would have taken place, if the Lord in his instruction of the disciples whom he was now training for the entirely New, had still retained the Pharisaical, Old-Testament spirit as his foundation; for then nothing fundamentally and permanently new would have resulted, *they would not have agreed together*. No one acts thus, who will provide a durable garment, that is, no practiced workman, for of this unintelligent, wretched, and indeed (holding to the external figure) necessitated *patching*, there is abundance. It is very plain that here as elsewhere, our Lord's word, which in its dignity condescends to the meanest details of the earthly, and common realities of life, enters into the history of a mended garment, elevating in his wisdom the most trivial thing into a glorious similitude. If the garment itself is *old*, worn out, and holds not together (and the whole rests upon this supposition), no new patch inserted will do it any service. The ἐπίβλημα, *patch*, which was intended to be a πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ, ("put in to fill it up"), can accomplish that purpose only for a short time and very badly; it αἴρει ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱμα-

τίου, *takes away from the garment*, that is, although it rends not itself, it does not hold to the seam of the old, the new piece taketh away something from the old;* the consequence is, as Luke expresses it, καὶ τὸ καινὸν σχίζει, *both the new maketh a rent*, in the end the new is thrown away, inserted in vain, no better than rent, like the old itself. The new is not entire, the old is not firm. (Comp. the parallel, ver. 17.) Luke gives the fundamental idea quite correctly, whether the Lord now uttered it or not, οὐ συμφωνεῖ, *agreeth not*, the old and the new fit not, agree not together: but Matthew and Mark say most distinctively and decisively χεῖρον σχίσμα γίνεται, *the rent is made worse*, such improvement only makes the evil worse. See here in the history of an unskillfully and vainly patched old garment the prophecy of many injuries and schisms made worse, in souls, in congregations, and in whole Churches! Oh that wicked piecing of evangelical patches upon the old ground! O that it were in the thing signified as it is said to be in the figure —No man doeth this!† Poverty constrains us not to do this, now that he is come to provide us the new wedding garment: *that* we should put on *whole* and *new*, in the new nature of the spirit and of liberty, the old nature of the letter and of bondage being entirely cast off. Let it be once more observed, with what far-reaching wisdom our Lord, passing beyond the present occasion which gives birth to his words, makes them universal; and with what irresistible conviction the thought thus clothed in parable teaches us to hold fast his doctrine.

Verse 17. Are we to suppose that the Lord is saying *the same thing* in a second figure? Many are of this opinion, though it runs entirely opposite to our Lord's manner of teaching. It is not sufficient to say that he views the subject of his discourse under two distinct relations; as if he first condescends, as it were, to figure the new "only as a subordinate element, repairing the deficiencies of the old," and then in the second similitude speaks more definitely and strongly of the new spirit and nature, for which an altogether new external form is necessary. For if the former were true, the Lord could not have blamed the coming to the aid of the old garment with a new patch; whereas he already in the first figure requires a totally new garment. The difference between the two ideas is certainly not to be sought in this, for the full contrast is the same in both. What then is it? We must not take the old and new *bottles* as corresponding directly to the old and new *garment;* he who retains this notion, must misunderstand the whole discourse. Rather that which the Lord has compared to a *garment*, he now in the second instance compares to a *wine*. As in the first instance, starting from the *old* garment the opposite entirely new one is intimated only by the new patch, which is not, however, the new garment itself; so, in the second instance, the contemplation sets out from the new wine (for so should it be translated), with an understood contrast with the old wine, which as we shall see in Luke, is actually mentioned. Thus much is here plain: a garment is put on from without, but wine is received from skins or vessels inwardly; and what was first viewed rather as an external manner of life or even doctrine, appears now as a spiritual principle, as the spirit that moulds the habits, the life within which shapes the life without.* The new garment is the New Testament *freedom and truth of external life*, in which man lives and moves, the new wine is the *internal spirit* of such freedom and truth itself. And what are the *bottles* which contain and hold this spirit? They must necessarily correspond to the *men* who wear the garment; consequently that is true which might now be raised as an objection, that neither "the ancient Jewish nor the new *forms*" are alluded to, but the *persons* who may or may not be capable of being used. The figure is, moreover, scriptural (see Job. xxxii. 19); where the "new bottles" are either, as is probable, equivalent to bottles with new wine, or Elihu, in his inflated discourse represents the spirit which urges him as so mighty, that even new bottles would be burst by it.

The expression of our Lord, which is now shown in its completeness, has a twofold aim: that the new must not be mixed with or inserted into, the old; and that *rightly disposed people* must be chosen for the freedom of the new which he inculcates. But in the nature of things, the similitude will not absolutely suit in every respect, inasmuch as men and nations in themselves are no other than *old* men and nations: it suits, nevertheless, relatively at least for the relations of the time then present, and for all similar relations; inasmuch as while many are too firmly rooted and fixed in the old, and cannot, like old bottles, receive and retain the new wine and the new spirit, many, on the other hand, are found susceptible, unprejudiced, prepared, and, *as it were*, already corresponding to the new. Men put not new wine into old bottles—the Lord by this *justifies* at the same time the conduct of *John*, who treated quite rightly his disciples who were not yet ripe for the evangelical freedom and joy, and *his own* conduct in seeking for him-

* Mark, according to the correct reading, αἴρει τὸ πλήρωμα τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ, see Bengel, and on the construction of αἴρειν with a genitive, Winer's *Grammatik*, § 30. 6.

† "Christians should never call God's work upon them through Christ, a *mending*, but a *new creation*" (Von Gerlach). But there have been sad times, when men have talked about "moral mending and perfecting of our nature."

* When Seyler suggests that "garment and bottle are the external forms of life; the garment, to wit, the inner life exhibited in outward things, the *bottle*, as inclosing and containing that life on account of its self-preservation and refinement," is there not an inharmonious confusion between the bottle and its *contents?*

self new bottles; or rather he justifies the wisdom of God, which sent to the men of that generation in near connection and succession, both the severe Elias and the benignant Son of Man (ch. vi. 17–19). The Lord, indeed, received his disciples in part from John the Baptist, but not those of them who were Pharisaically narrow-minded and rigid, such as now put the question to him; his accepted new bottles were publicans and sinners, whom he immediately called to himself. John indeed predicts the new wine, but not many receive it, as is proved by the very fact that there are yet fasting disciples of John, even long after their master had pointed them to the Bridegroom. To such the Lord meekly replies—Remain ye in the old, and leave to my disciples the new! Thus it is meet, and thus will we for a while be separate.

Finally, wherefore and what means the *breaking* of the old bottles, so that the good old wine is spilled, and the bottles perish, and thus a twofold injury arises from the false conjunction of things that agree not together? The new wine *ferments*, in order that thus it may out of must become true *wine:* Thus the wine *bursts* the skins—*will*, as it may be foreseen, *burst them*, as we read in Mark and Luke. As Matthew and Mark condense and break off the Lord's expression, it seems just to hint at this explanatory fundamental idea; but Luke in ver. 39 gives it plain and significant utterance. Yet how have short-sighted expositors on all sides perverted this undoubtedly genuine and important addition, because they cannot deal rightly with its meaning; and yet how simple and clear, how entirely appropriate to what precedes, when that is rightly understood, is the thought which it expresses! The emphasis lies in the εὐθέως, *straightway*, for the *genuine new*, of which the passage speaks (not an externally new form or mode as such, which people readily enough seize, as they do new garments, but a new and free and living spirit), does not easily and immediately take possession of people who are accustomed to the old. Not, by any means, as if the old wine were actually better; but he who has hitherto drunk it (being accustomed, that is, not merely to "old habitudes," but to the life and principle stamped upon them, the *spirit* of legal exercise and righteousness), feels that to him it *tastes* better; he *says* the old is more agreeable and pleasant. The Lord in his gracious wisdom says this, partly in blame (for men cannot and should not always tarry in the old, the years as they roll on bring their new growth), partly, also, in gentle apology for them.* Thus it must be, it lies in the nature of the case. I know well that your much fasting is to you, with all its severity, preferable to the freedom of my disciples. Length of time makes the old habitual pleasant to us; the yoke, otherwise intolerable, bearable and even easy. Here at the conclusion our Lord is also answering the *first* part of the question—*Why do we* with the Pharisees fast? He teaches, finally, that a time will come, when the new, which so few now relish, will better commend itself. When the new wine is old, thou shalt drink it with pleasure, said Sirach anciently (Ecclus. ix. 10). *This* is the meaning. Not merely as Schleiermacher says, that "he would not find fault with them for not liking the new wine, but holding the old wine as usual for better; the *value* of the *new wine* would *come out* in the taste, but this would be the case with them only *by degrees.*" It is not our taste merely which is concerned here, but the actual fermentation and clarification of the new life and the new spirit, which, after the manner of new wine, is unready and imperfect within as at the first. The figures proceed with each new turn in the discourse more fully and deeply, into the reality, and its whole process. The *bottles* which *contain* the new wine, but should not, indeed, retain it for themselves, are the constantly chosen bearers and instruments of the new spirit; the *people*, who should drink it, are all others to whom then and thus are communicated the new power, doctrine, and discipline. This distinction must be well seized; typified in the relation of the apostles and the first disciples, it finds its ever recurring application to all time. Hast thou, for thy part, received the new wine of grace into a sincere and humble heart, into a mind which lays aside all that is past, as into a new bottle; then take good heed, that thou do not impetuously pour it out before all people to drink, and complain if they relish it not. Thus does the circumspection of our Lord's word fill up its meaning—Rejoice in thyself; no man shall constrain thee to fast; but cry not out too soon—Rejoice all with me as I rejoice! The divine Spirit in the spirit of man, when it at first approves itself a fermenting new wine, must itself become ripened and mild.* But when it is so, there is nothing more lovely, more heart-rejoicing, that goeth down more sweetly (Cant. vii. 9) to every unperverted taste and conscience than the thoughtful, powerful, affectionate testimony and exhortation of such disciples as have prepared themselves in wisdom and patience for the Bridegroom's will, from their first joy through all succeeding mourning, until his new thing in them is fully ready to be offered to the world. The more fully this testimony of the whole apostolical church since Pentecost has been published to Israel, with so much less sincerity of excuse can they allege of their old wine, that it is better.

*Seyler calls it emphatically a "word of excuse inexpressibly mild, and almost in '*scherzender*' form," but where the Lord seems to speak *almost* in this style, he is only giving utterance to the deepest earnestness of truth in the most *affectionate* manner. Compare Luke x. 42.

*A Jewish saying (quoted by Sepp) has it: He who seeks instruction from the young and inexperienced, is like one who eats unripe grapes, or drinks new wine out of the wine press: to learn from the old, is to taste ripe grapes, and old wine.

THE ISSUE OF BLOOD.

(Matt. ix. 22; Mark v. 30; Luke viii. 45–48.)

Matthew records in the most concise manner in three verses, the incident which was interposed on our Lord's way to Jairus. As his recollections rise to him in more and more rich profusion, the apostle and eye-witness employs in his Gospel a more pregnant brevity of style (that the book may not become too great, John xxi. 25); and suffers himself not to be diverted to the right or left from the prescribed design of his plan. In addition, we must regard as coming to the aid of this as foreseen and provided by God for the *first* Gospel, the Apostle's own individuality, which is less adapted for sharply defining the small, characteristic traits of an incident, and on that account more fitted to arrange and combine events and discourses under great leading aspects; though never, however, contrary to the strictest truth of facts. Mark and Luke then fill up many things left in outline by Matthew; in perfect consistency with their characteristic, that of more searching, reflective, accurate, and most exactly faithful reporters. Yet this filling up must also be regarded as strictly faithful to truth. If any man, for example, would regard the narrative of the Ruler's daughter and the woman with the bloody flux, so self-evidencing in their incomparably artless originality, and living freshness, as invented, or either with or without design elaborated and adorned, we must lament his critical failing and account him fundamently perverted.

But in these narratives the *words* of our Lord are so interwoven with the circumstances occurring, that without understanding these, those cannot be understood; yet we must be on our guard against entering into the history too much. In this view, we must rather reckon upon too much than too little in the reader himself; that so our book also may not grow too large.

Who touched me? or, more properly: Who is it, *who was it*, that touched me? This question the Lord asks in the midst of the press of the crowd: the disciples marvel, and instead of answering they use that liberty to which they had been encouraged by his lowly intercourse with them; and by Peter's ever ready mouth throw out a kind of demurral as to his putting such a question at all. According to Mark, who may here be the more exact, it was, Who touched *my clothes?* or more properly, *Me by my clothes?* A well-meaning but incorrect dogmatic prudently remarks here that the Lord had well known all from the beginning, but that for the sake of men, and because he would not have his wonderful power thus experienced in secret and kept hidden, he procured its disclosure by such a question as this; but this springs from a purely human mistake as to the essentially human in the Son of Man, and plainly opposes the most distinct words of the Evangelists. First of all, the indefinite masc. *ὁ ἁψάμενος, that touched*, does not favor this view; but Mark further reports that the Lord turned round to find him who had done, or, as he speaks in relation to the known fact, her* who had done this thing, yea, that the woman came and *told him all the truth.* Consequently he did not yet fully know her from the beginning, rather nothing more than that which his genuine question expresses, that *some one* had *touched* him with such longing of faith as had drawn from him his healing virtue. Mark selects the words very carefully and with exact propriety: the woman *ἔγνω τῷ σώματι*, marked or felt *in her body*, that the fountain of her blood was suddenly dried up; but Jesus puts his question *ἐπιγνοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαν, knowing that virtue had gone out of him;* as he not only felt in his body, but at the same time knew in himself (*τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ*), what had taken place.

According to Luke the Lord himself testifies this by a second word, which we should have been required to supply in Mark, even, independently of this, as the Lord's explanatory answer to his disciples' demurral, *Somebody hath touched me*, and, as I think, in a different way from the thronging crowd; hath touched *Me*, and not merely, like them, my clothes: thus does the Lord defend his unintelligently blamed question, and explains its reason by the same word which Mark has woven into his narration—*For I perceive that virtue hathg one out of me.* *Ἐγώ, I*, first and emphatically; if no one else, I at least must well know. *Ἔγνων, knew*, in the same proper sense as Mark has explained it: the bodily feeling with an inward consciousness of the internal and essential import and reality of what was taking place. The *ἐξελθοῦσα, gone out*, connected with the *δύναμις, virtue*, especially with the emphatic *τὴν, the*, in Mark, teaches us that it signifies more than an ordinary *miracle*, as many would sophisticate it. And consequently it remains undeniable after the distinct evidence of this narrative, that that *power to heal* (Luke v. 17, vi. 19), which was there inherent in him, and went forth from him, bears some analogy with that

* Which expression narrating *post eventum* (*τὴν τοῦτο ποιήσασαν*) should not be urged (as *e.g.* by Alford) as a proof that Jesus, when he put the question, already knew.

in human nature of which we know some little under the name of magnetism, as exerted through the medium of a certain bodily relation; and this is confirmed by further analogies, such as that of the Apostle's handkerchiefs in Ephesus.* But then the whole narrative, with the words that pertain to it, is especially recorded in such a manner as to show us the *difference* between the higher and the lower, between the healing and living power of the God-man, and the influence exerted by magnetizing physicist and physicians. The immediate discussion of this, however, belongs not to this place. But thus much, the Lord's word which we are expounding testifies, that to the *efficacious influence* going forth from him which heals the body, there must correspond a bodily *virtue* in himself, which might be imparted through the hem of his garment; but that this did not occur in a physical way without or against the intervention of his conscious will. And it is just to refute this very error of the woman which would otherwise have been confirmed and propagated, that he speaks and will not keep silence; and that he is constrained in all kindness to abash still more the ashamed woman, by bringing her into prominence. The physical virtue which passes over does not go from him without his *will:* that will is *always disposed*, stands, as it were, always open and prepared for approaching faith; and *this* is the reason why that which occurred could take place. Further, not without his *knowledge*, as is immediately shown: the touch which derived the virtue from him, was assuredly unexpected; but he *marks* it immediately, knowing it within himself, rejoicing over the *faith*, by which he is well pleased to allow himself even to be *thus touched*. We can only apprehend this spiritual-physical virtue through taking into account this *spiritual relation:* the people generally throng and press him, without *that relation*, but the timid touch which scarcely laid hold of his garment brings healing to the sick woman, because she has faith to be healed. A striking figure for the preacher, often used to distinguish the crowds from the little few around Jesus!†

It is this *faith* which touched his person, that the Lord makes prominent in his last word, discerning what was directly needful in this unexpected occurrence. We find it only in Matthew, who thus in his brief narrative retains the essential point of the whole, namely, the *contrast* of our Lord's word with the woman's thought as given in ver. 21. That there was a certain admixture of an improper, and in the gentlest sense, *superstitious* notion in this thought, is proved by the circumstance that she thought she might steal away unobserved and unknown with the healing she had secured. There was something in her, as Grotius on this occasion profoundly remarks, of that idea of the Philosophers, *Deum agere omnia φύσει οὐ βουλήσει* (that God performs all things by nature not by will), and this our Lord could not allow to pass current, lest wide-spreading error should arise from it. *Thy faith*, thy touch in faith hath saved thee (*σέσωκέ σε*—as she had said, *σωθήσομαι* and Matt. adds *ἐσώθη*), not merely thy touch or my garment!* It was indeed, with all its lack of perception or acknowledgment, which does not affect the matter,† a strong faith which trusted that the hem of his garment could do more to heal her than the instrumentality of all physicians of whom she had for twelve years suffered many things, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse. The Lord now as ever *praises* such faith, and compensates her for all the pain and shame which his testimony for truth had required that he should not spare her, by his gracious *θάρσει, θύγατερ, Daughter, be of good comfort!* (Matthew retains only the paternally affectionate *θύγατερ, daughter*), which was immediately uttered in anticipation of the word that praised instead of blamed her act. O, how his love rejoices over such faith, in whatever form he finds it; that love which delights to *give* all, rather than to *receive!* It is his continual manner to ascribe all that his virtue effects to faith, since notwithstanding his *δύναμις* or *virtue* always ready in himself, *πίστις* or *faith* is yet the *canditio sine quâ non* of its *ἐξελθεῖν* or *going out;* (comp. Matt. ix. 29, viii. 13; Luke vii. 50, xvii. 19, xviii. 42.) Thus does he speak in every new instance, to encourage others that they also may believe, as well as to confirm those who have already believed. Mark and Luke add here his usual *Go in peace;* Mark besides this gives the assurance, so welcome to this poor woman, that the instantaneous cure of this twelve years' disease should retain its permanence—Thou hast believed, go in the peace which this faith brings, which hath healed thee; and *be* for ever *healed of thy* sad and long-suffered *plague!*

* [Strange that so evangelical an expositor as Stier, should condescend to have recourse, in explaining Christ's divine power, to the pretended science of animal magnetism!—Am. Ed.]

† Augustine: Sic etiam nunc est corpus ejus, id est, Ecclesia ejus. Tangit eam fides paucorum, *premit* turba multorum.

* Matthew does not most assuredly design to report, in contradiction to Luke, *that now first at this word* the woman was made whole. This is that reading of a modern exegesis which beforehand expected *its* contradiction.

† Alford refers very beautifully to this as being a miracle full of the highest encouragement to all who might be "disposed to think despondingly of the ignorance or superstition of much of the Christian world—that he who accepted this woman for her faith even in error and weakness, may also accept them.

JAIRUS' DAUGHTER.

(Matt. ix. 24; Mark v. 36, 39, 41 [43]; Luke viii. 50, 52, 54 [55, 56]).

Be not afraid, only believe! once more the same gracious invitation and excitement to faith, and the same contrast between faith and fear, which we have already seen in Matt. viii. 26. All that is to be held as true in the doctrine of "faith *alone*," is represented to us by this μόνον, *only*, in the region of external things, which the Lord himself every where regards and exhibits as similitudes of things internal. In Luke we have the promise connected with the πίστευειν, *believing*, of Jairus for his daughter: καὶ σωθήσεται, *and she shall be saved*. This does not indicate that our Lord doubted the correctness of the subsequent intelligence that the daughter was now actually *dead*, as the ordinary language of man terms dead, for the mother especially would not send the sad intelligence prematurely to the father on the way. If Jesus had hoped or certainly knew, as his word afterwards, even before he saw the particulars, might seem to say, that the maid was not dead, he must, to preserve the truth, have contradicted the intelligence at once before the people, and could not have allowed it to pass current, as he nevertheless did. His promise does not fully and openly announce, for so it seemed good to his humility, that he would, because he could, make her live again; but under this veil of generality it contained such an intimation: Fear not—be not disconcerted by even this message of death; let what may take place or have taken place, thou hast summoned me to be thy helper, and I will assuredly help. *Only believe—tu contra audentior ito.*

That the man had from the beginning been aware of his daughter's death, and had attributed to Jesus the power even to awake the dead, is inconceivable in itself, would be unexampled in the whole evangelical history, and is opposed by the resignation to the event of even Martha and Mary when their brother had actually died. The rapid condensing brevity of Matthew at the commencement of his narrative might lead the unwary reader to think so, but to prevent such inconsiderate reading we find the contrary expressed both in this and the other Evangelists. Matthew passes over the intermediate message, which was certainly not unknown to him, and in his brief and comprehensive reference to it *throws back upon the former part of the transaction the impression and feeling of the latter.* This is his manner; his Gospel delivers its narrative in this unstudied style, because he can pre-suppose a living tradition of the more minute details of important occurrences, before the subsequent Evangelists had rendered them permanent. But with all this he ever writes the truth; for strictly considered, the ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν,* *she is now dead*, means no more in the father's mouth than in Mark's ἐσχάτως ἔχει, she lies now in the article of death, there is the most critical danger, all haste is needful, probably she may be, while I am calling thee, already dead. Nothing else is obviously meant—and this is decisive—by Luke's ἀπέθνησκεν, *lay a-dying* (as ἀποθνήσκειν is elsewhere the beginning of dying, the danger and anguish of death, *e. g.* 2 Cor. vi. 9), from which he himself in ver. 49 distinguishes the τέθνηκεν, *is dead*. Consequently ζήσεται, *she shall live*, is not directly—she shall again return to life, but, she shall continue to live, *survive* the immediate peril of death. Mark quite correctly: ὅπως σωθῇ, καὶ ζήσεται, *that she may be saved, and she shall live.*

And now between the hope and fear of struggling faith, the Ruler's mind is agitated by a new thought. He who at first pleaded for the healing of his only daughter suspended between life and death, has now to ask—If she should now be dead, can the Master's helping power help me then? The people, whose excitement had been increased by the incident on the way, were now intent upon something marvellous which would take place in the Ruler's house; for the circumstance which had at first vibrated in uncertainty between life and death, has now reached its highest interest in consequence of our Lord's word of encouraging promise in reply to the message of death. Common curiosity now rules all, even to the extent of irreverent pressing and thronging. Our lord submitted to this as to the customary pressure of his great work, yet no longer than to the door of the house. Entering, he beholds the scene which Jewish custom exhibited in bewailing the dead; even there where he has determined in the power of the Father to bestow life. What is more natural than the first cry with which he arrests their lamentation: *Give place!* Ye weepers are not wanted yet! Thus we have it in Matthew: Luke, on the other hand, expresses it, *Weep not;* and Mark, *Why make ye this ado and weep?* The sense in all is the same: it is the indication of absolute assurance that he was bringing help,† as well as the deprecation of all that tumult which too commonly mingled itself with lamentation for the dead, as unbefitting the dignity of his own person and of the present solemn occasion. And then he adds—let it be remembered, before he had entered in and seen the child—that word of wonder which all the three Evan-

* Which is no false supposition of the reporter, as Schleiermacher thinks.

† Bengel: Certus ad miraculum accedit.

gelists have retained alike—For *the maid is not dead, but sleepeth!*

This is so definite and precise that one might at first understand it in the letter, and yet with but few exceptions the whole church has understood it otherwise; rightly indeed, for the whole connection constrains us to do so. It is well known that it was the caprice of the late Olshausen to maintain the literal interpretation, from which many of his friends in vain endeavored to dissuade him.* To what Matthew and Mark briefly intimate—And they laughed him to scorn, Luke adds decisively, εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπέθανεν, *knowing that she was dead*, and in the clearest manner records afterwards, καὶ ἐπέστρεψε τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς, *and her spirit returned*, just as it is written in I Kings xvii. 22. She was thus certainly dead, though the Lord speaks concerning her as concerning Lazarus (John xi. 11–15). This is his *first* raising from the dead, the *only one* that Matthew records, which could not have been wanting in his Gospel because of his testimony to the Lord's saying in ch. xi. 5.† *Three* awakenings from death the Spirit has caused to be recorded for us, although others may well have taken place; and these indeed in a remarkable and significant progression, which is in itself a corroborative testimony for this first: the maiden is here dead upon her bed, the young man at Nain was carried forth upon his bier, Lazarus had lain four days in his grave.

But why did the Lord speak thus? His word has a sublime universal meaning as it regards all who are by us termed "the dead" generally, and specifically with a two-fold design as it regards his then present hearers. To the tumultuous people without, it is veiled and repulsive, the opposite of that lofty language which would not have suited his lowliness, such as—Even if she were dead, I nevertheless can, and will raise her up! But to the desponding, wrestling father it would be no other than a repetition of—*Be not afraid, only believe!* Therefore he rejects the word of fear and dismay—She is *dead!* and substitutes another which promises to faith a re-awakening—She *sleepeth!* One whom it is his will to awake immediately as in this instance, sleeps indeed only in a short sleep of death. Even we have no other way of speaking it than to call it a *re-awakening*, and consequently thereby confirm the right of him who re-awakens, to speak of it as a sleep. But the Lord does not speak now with reference only to the present occasion. At this first resurrection which the Father gave him, there rises to his soul, in one great comprehensive view, the death and resurrection of all the children of men, and he speaks in language of sublime and majestic superiority over the narrow thoughts and limited lamentations of mortal mind. He speaks with the deep meaning of his subsequent word, in which he says concerning the God of the living that all live to him (Luke xx. 38). *Bodily* death is not essentially *death:* we know how the Lord elsewhere speaks of *death* and destruction, and may appropriately call to mind his words concerning the dead to be buried, in Matt. viii. 22. This the poor people understand not now, and they show how unsympathizing their lamentation had in reality been, how untouched their hearts, by passing at a bound from weeping to *laughter*, only seizing the manifest contradiction between his assurance and what they knew to be true. But the father, prepared beforehand for faith, may well in a certain sense have felt the meaning of the disguised words, as if the Lord had openly said—I will raise her up, as one that sleeps, so that she, notwithstanding all, is *not* dead!

The curious and the laughers must all be put out. The three alone, whom the Lord now for the first time makes prominent among the twelve, with the father and mother who will receive from his grace their daughter again, may be witnesses of the deed which was not to be performed for idle wonder. Not as Elijah and Elisha in old time enforced his prey from death with effort of body and spirit, does the Lord awaken this dead one. He utters the same simple word, in his immediate personal authority, with which he heals the sick; and takes her by the hand (Matt. viii. 15) to wake her up, as one would take a sleeping child. He addresses the dead as already living, so that they must hear the voice of the Son of Man (John v. 25, 28); and utters, with perfect confidence in the Father who hath given him this power, that incomparably sublime cry, which veils the loftiest dignity in the most tender affection, *Talitha cumi!* Mark, probably from Peter's communication, preserves to us this most distinctive utterance of the resurrection-word from the all-holy lips, which recurs once more with the same simplicity—*Young man, I say unto thee arise!* (Luke vii. 14); and finally in the last, *Lazarus, come forth!* (John xi. 43). Mark thus also teaches us, as by the "Ephphatha," ch. vii. 34, that in the ordinary intercourse of life our Lord spoke the language of the country; although this does not decide the question as to the language of the many longer discourses which were uttered before companies composed of learned and

* Hase indeed in his *Leben Jesu* calls the maid "the sleeper!" Braune also, unhappily, will unconditionally contend that the Lord literally said and meant—She is *not* dead. Even Neander, although "all the circumstances make it probable to him that it was but the condition of a trance," yet concludes that the Lord (who does not know or observe that?) spoke with reference to the *result* of the awakening rather than to death. Lange, on the contrary, rightly maintains that the decisive account of Luke that she was dead, is the only supposition on which the conduct of Jesus can be understood—quite truly. If it must be taken literally, it would be *sleep* merely, and not trance. Even Von Gerlach acknowledges that Luke gives it as his view that she was dead—but such a view of the Evangelist *we* hold for undoubted testimony.

† Which we find in Luke had been just preceded by the resurrection of the young man at Nain.

unlearned, Jews mixed with Gentiles. But the Evangelist does not translate it in its bare literality, but adds, in order to indicate the emphasis of the invocation and its authority σοὶ λέγω, *I say unto thee;* whence we learn further how the translation of our Lord's words in the spirit of their letter, was intended by the Holy Ghost.

The other two Evangelists report two further expressions; yet only in *indirect* citation, as if with the exquisite feeling that no other and lesser word should follow upon the great ἔγειρε, *Rise!* The command *to give meat* to the awakened one, is not so much a confirming assurance that she now truly lived and was quite restored (although that might be necessary for the astonished people who were unable to realize it at all), as, if we mistake not, an indication of an affectionate care, which, even in the midst of the greatest things forgets not the least, and which would provide for the necessities of the exhausted child on her return to life. This word springs from the same amiable regard to this child which dictated the affectionate *Talitha.* He has given back life and health, and thus imparted help beyond the father's prayer or thought. But at this period he restrains that miracle-working power; it had restored a life physically healthy, of which the surest mark was the ordinary ability to eat and drink; and he now points them to the restored functions and ordinances of nature. He might, indeed, have awakened her as already nourished; but that would have gone, as we feel, beyond that fitness and propriety with which the miraculous energy of Jesus ever adjusted itself to the circle of earthly life. The second expression is that well-known prohibition with which he interdicts the publication of what had taken place, and thus would prevent, so far as in him lay, all mere vain-glorious rumor: yet the fame thereof went abroad through all that land—he has made even the dead to rise! Had this, indeed, not been the fact, he would not only have repeated his former οὐκ ἀπέθανεν, *she is not dead,* more distinctly to prevent error, but instead of the mere prohibition to tell τοῦτο τὸ γεγονός, *this that was done,* he would have given a full explanation of what *had* been done, and what had *not.*

She who touched in secret was constrained to avow it openly; he who publicly asked his request, is led into secret and exhorted to stillness. Let this be pondered well, that we may understand our Lord's meaning in all his wise and symbolical discourses and deeds.

THE TWO BLIND MEN.

(Matt. ix. 28–30.)

Through all the manifold variety of the *ten* miracles of healing which Matthew, placing among them the raising of the dead and the stilling of the sea, relates in these two chapters—as examples of what is generally stated in ver. 35, recurring to ch. iv. 23—there runs one idea, which our Lord three times distinctly announces, and the Evangelist (ch. ix. 2) once more testifies, viz: that *faith* is the great essential, and that the Lord, in the exhibition of his power, causes it to be done to his petitioners "according to their faith." The word to the two blind men is the same as that to the centurion; it was his chosen and loved expression—how often afterwards uttered by him! We observe, however, here even now in this extract of the history of the first period of our Lord's public life, the point of transition, by which he passes from instantaneous fulfillment of the desire, to the keeping of his petitioners waiting, in order to the trial and exercise of their faith. The foundation of this is, in general, that the Lord cared not so much for the acts themselves, as for the faith, which should afterwards seek and find spiritual help. In this particular case it must be added, that our Lord is fully aware of the increasing enmity of the embittered Pharisees (ver. 34), which keeps pace with the progress of his miracles, and therefore does not instantly respond to the cry of "Son of David" with which these two blind most movingly address him, as if he would at once hasten to acknowledge such a title. He kept them waiting, till they came to the house. And now the question does not run, *Believe ye.* then, that I am the Son of David? but, *that I am able to do this,* that is, what you signify by your ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, "have mercy upon us!" *open your eyes?* Believe ye this firmly and faithfully, is it in this faith that you have persevered in following and in crying? O how his heart is rejoiced by the firm *Yea, Lord,* which they reply! *According to your faith* be it unto you! It is not co-operation that the Lord requires, so much as an acknowledgment and acceptance in accordance with his power. Every where beholding in the external its internal significance, our Lord can never too often, nor too decisively bear witness for posterity that *this* is what is distinctively necessary.

The prohibition finally—*See that no man know it* (as in ch. viii. 4, at the beginning)—has on this occasion, for the reason above mentioned, a yet deeper emphasis than before. Matthew designedly says here first ἐνεβριμήσατο αὐτοῖς, *he straightly charged them* (as

before in Mark i. 43 in the case of the leper—with another meaning, Mark xiv. 5; John xi. 33), which certainly indicates human emotion. Suidas explains, ἐμβριμᾶσθαι, *to straitly charge*, by μετὰ ἀπειλῆς ἐντέλλεσθαι, μετ' αὐστηρότητος ἐπιτιμᾶν, *to enjoin with threatening, to rebuke with austerity.* Here there is mixed with the affectionate kindness which can never deny itself to faith, the vibration of that feeling still, which had made the crying in the street (Matt. xii. 19) so displeasing to him; but this again had its prudent reason in that wise penetration of all relations, which constrained him thus to throw a guard around his actions. If the Lord had never again thus forbidden and threatened, how would the perpetual concourse of all the sick have overburdened him, so that neither time nor strength would have been left to him for preaching the Gospel (Luke iv. 43), and the contradiction of the crucifiers to the people's hosannas would have broken out before the time.

THE MISERABLE SHEEP AND THE GREAT HARVEST.

(Matt. ix. 36,38; [Mark vi. 34].)

A new scene is now in preparation—the first mission of the chosen heralds of the kingdom; now in the first place to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, but foreshadowing in this beginning the future ambassage to the whole world. Matthew introduces it by our Lord's discourse concerning the laborers for the great harvest, spoken actually at this time and afterwards repeated by Luke on the sending forth of the seventy. But he previously mentions (ver. 36) the Lord's compassion for the people, and gives us in connection with it what we can scarcely consider his own reflection, but (as in ch. vii. 29) an indirect citation of the words in which that compassion may have been uttered. The ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους, *but seeing the multitudes*, is immediately dependent on ver. 35, so that Hess seizes it rightly, "wherever he saw a crowd of Israelites" he manifested his pity over and over again, in these or similar words. (Hence in Mark vi. 34, we have the same on another occasion.) See Matt. x. 6 presently after, and again somewhat later xv. 24. Yet may it well be, that just at this time and to be inserted immediately before ver. 37, the Lord uttered these very words.

For the rest, the expression is evidently taken from the prophetic Scripture; for from the prayer of Moses before the Lord in Numb. xxvii. 17 downwards, we find this very natural image (by which in heathen antiquity also, the people are called flocks, and kings their shepherds) occurring in proverbial use through the entire Old Testament. As, for instance, in this its more obvious sense the prophet Michaiah uses it, when prophesying the death of the king (1 Kings xxii. 17). Then do the prophets use it with a deeper meaning in reference to the spiritual shepherds; and, condemning and mourning over these shepherds, describe in the same terms the poor neglected people: as in Jer. l. 6; Ezek. xxxiv. 5, 6; Zech. x. 2, 3. But its inmost significance is seen most clearly in that leading text Isa. liii. 6, where wandering sheep are used as a type of the state of sinners generally; not without intimation of their own fault (compare ch. lvi. 11), but with the compassionating reference to their misery predominant, as it is here. The two expressions in Matthew view the pitiable condition of this shepherdless flock under two aspects: in themselves and as individuals the sheep *faint;* but regarded as a flock that should be united in one, they are *scattered abroad.* The true reading is ἐσκυλμένοι from σκύλλω originally to *rend*, lacerate, thence to harass, exhaust, and (especially in long journeying) to tire out, as it recurs in a milder sense Mark v. 35; Luke viii. 49, vii. 6. Here it is stronger—sunk on the road, driven about without pasture; compare Zech. x. 2 יָעֻנּוּ, "they were troubled;" xi. 9, 16 נִכְחֶדֶת and נִבְחֶדֶת, "to be cut off" and "that is broken;" Joel i. 18, אֵין מְרְעֶה, "there is no pasture." On the other hand ἐρριμμένοι is not merely *cast away* (as if a mere gradation upon the former), but scattered one from the other here and there, wandering sheep, a flock no more; compare נָסָעוּ, "they went away," Zech. x 2; תָּעִינוּ, "have turned," Isa. liii. 6; וַתִּפָּזֵינָה, "and they were scattered," Ezek. xxxiv. 5; נְפוּצִים, "scattered," I Kings xxii. 17; without unity and connection, like the then Israel split into sects, their fellowship in the way of God dissolved; one by one overdriven, as a whole scattered abroad!

For they have *no shepherds!* With such compassion does he behold them who himself is come, their true and rightful shepherd, to revive them again, and bring them back to the fold: thus deeply is he afflicted for the "poor, misled people" whose guilt he merges in their misery, imputing that guilt all the more severely to those who had been instead of their shepherds their deceivers. O how his heart yearns to heal and to help! But how? It were a light thing for him who gave back health to the sick and even life to the dead, to bestow upon his people all needful earthly good, and defend them from all external evil; but all this would have been unavailing, and

have rather aggravated than lessened their wretchedness. Quite different is the view which his word discloses to the disciples. The healing of their hurt must be a long process of labor upon their souls, and to be effected again by the instrumentality of man. But the discourse glides into another figure—the invigoration and gathering together of the poor sheep into the one fold of God, reappears under the notion of a seed-time and harvest. The Lord indeed mentions, definitively, only the *harvest;* hence many, comparing John iv. 35–38, apprehend here an antithesis of the Old and New Testament economies, according to which they are related as seed-time and harvest. In that passage, however, when narrowly investigated, there is no such meaning to be found, for in vers. 37, 38 the Lord places himself, the only and pre-eminent sower, in opposition to his apostles who should only labor upon the produce of his previous sowing. Such a notion is especially unsuitable to our context, inasmuch as the allusion of these words is not to any preparation already found, but, on the contrary, to a condition of absolute neglect. We have only, then, to understand the expression according to the analogy of the subsequent parables. Assuredly must the seed of the word of the kingdom be first scattered by the Son of Man and his succeeding sowers; but this entire divine husbandry upon and among the men whom he will prepare and gather to himself, is here embraced under this one name of harvest, as regarded from its final consummation. This is at once a consolatory and a mournful view, inasmuch as it is thus emphatically suggested, how much *labor* will be needed before so wide and desert a field can be transformed into the *harvest* of God: and yet that waste as it is, it is the Lord's and decreed to be his harvest-field, even as the wandering sheep are still his flock! The laborers are thus regarded not as at once reapers, who would only have to bind up the sheaves (which misunderstanding can only derange the general sense of the allusion); but their office and work embrace generally the preparation of the future harvest from the very beginning.

The harvest is *great* or *plentiful!* The Lord's *immediate* reference is only to the people and land of Israel, whose numerous and crowded towns the apostles, as is intimated ch. x. 23, would not very soon have gone over. He thought of many among the mass of the people who, susceptible of faith, should be called and made meet, even as he afterwards saw beforehand his much people in Corinth (Acts xviii. 10). *The* laborers—genuine, and worthily so called, are few, however many bear the name! But although the Lord had Israel especially in view, it is nevertheless impossible to admit that the thoughts of his heart in such a discourse did not stretch further, and that there did not mingle with them anticipations of that great harvest of God which should extend over all the earth; and this is our warrant for taking this word of his mouth which brings before the contemplation of every age the times then extant, as the text, also, of our own world-embracing missions. Is then the labor needed in order to the harvest, in one people, the neglected people of God, so great; how *great* will it be when extended over all the nations of the earth! Who is *the Lord of this harvest?* Jesus, in his meekness, speaks of the Father as such; but we also understood it of himself, the Son, to whom already the Forerunner had assigned the threshing-floor and the wheat as *his*, even as he himself then forthwith *sends forth* the laborers, those who were called to be fishers of mne.

A special emphasis has been traced in *ἐκβάλῃ, send forth:* that he would send them forth with vehement impulse of his Spirit, as zealous laborers; just as according to Mark i. 12, the Spirit *ἐκβάλλει, draws*, the Lord into the wilderness. But this word, which we find presently in Matt. x. 1, and often afterwards down to John xii. 32, applied to the casting out of devils, and then in other places of other forcible sending out (as Matt. ix. 25; Luke iv. 29), has yet in all other passages quite lost this accessory meaning.* Consult Matt. xii. 35, and more especially John x. 4, concerning the leading out of the sheep. We must regard it here as nearly equivalent to *ἀποστέλλειν, send forth*, ch. x. 5, only that *here* there may be a superadded meaning in the *ἐκ*, "forth," in harmony with the connection of the whole train of thought, such as—send *out*, from rest and comfort into the heat and toil of labor, for the performance of which none but the *Lord* of the harvest can give commission and power.† They labor not, in effect, whom he sends not.

But the weightiest element in our Lord's saying, the solemn key-note, the clear tone of which we would hear ringing at the close, is the challenge to the disciples—*Pray ye* the Lord! all the more emphatic, as this very Lord himself it is who announces that he will be prayed unto, and that he waits for their prayer in order that he may send. By such words of the Scripture is our weak thought ever anew confounded, while it is constrained to submit to the thousand-fold attested, but inscrutably marvellous mystery of the power of human prayer as a condition. That the saving of the lost sheep, the preparation of the great harvest, should be effected by the instrumentality of mortal men, we have before understood: but that the sending of such laborers, again, should be suspended on man's prayer; consequently, that the all-merciful God should permit the salvation of the world, and the gradu-

* Its use in the Sept. for שָׁלַח in the Old Test. is at least doubtful: *e. g.* it may have, as in Exod. xii. 33, the sense of "release and let go," or that of actual driving out as in Psa. xliv. 3.

† Not, however, on that account to emphasize *βάλλειν;* to urge, to *drive* out—as recently Father Zeller (*Beugg. Monatsbl.* 1851, No. 3) has explained it.

al furtherance of his kingdom, to be dependent upon that compassion in men which having been by him first excited, urges them to pray and long for his own compassion—must ever remain a wonderful and impenetrable mystery. It is so—Scripture and experience attests it. What remains for us, then, but to comply with his command, and *pray* for ourselves and the whole world around us?

Certainly the disciples would not, nor could they, at that time, understand the Lord as saying—Ask of *me*, that I may raise up for the wretched people true pastors and preachers, who may gather out of them a people for God! He directed their thoughts by δεήθητε, *pray*, which is obviously an expression of the highest prayer, to the Fountain of love on high, to the God of Israel whose will it is not that his poor people should be left in their lost estate, who regards the scattered sheep as still his flock, and the field now waste as yet hereafter to be his harvest-field. Do *ye* not also take compassion upon the people? Pray then the Father, with me, that he send forth laborers! Whence it is necessarily inferred, that whoever thus prays offers himself, if it is possible, to labor too. So that is—Will *ye*, my disciples, not lend your aid, when so much is to be done? Thus he reminds them of their calling to the Apostleship, which had been certified to them already before the Sermon on the Mount. And thus he prepares them for the mission which immediately after followed, when he suddenly, and in a way which even this preparation had not led them to expect, declared himself to be the hearer by anticipation of the prayer which he had just prescribed, and in the Father's name the Lord also of the harvest, whose prerogative and whose will it is to send. He now first begins their mission, certainly, according to the common acceptation, as a discipline, preparation, and trial for themselves and their future Apostleship: but that there was blended with this an earnest zeal for the miserable people, yea, that regard for them was the main impulse of this mission, the Lord's own preface to it clearly assures us.

THE MISSION OF THE TWELVE.

(Matt. x. 5–42; Mark vi. 8–11; Luke ix. 3–5.)

This longer discourse is again indicated to us by Matthew in the most literal and decisive manner as spoken in its integrity on one distinctive occasion (let ch. x. 1, 5, be read in connection with ch. xi. 1). All, therefore, that has already been said in connection with the Sermon on the Mount, may also be used here in refutation of that strange and wilful opinion which imputes to the Evangelist an elaboration into one discourse of many sayings uttered at various times. This opinion is grounded strangely enough upon quite different reasons; sometimes upon the lack of connection in the whole, and sometimes, on the contrary, on its far-reaching comprehensiveness, which too completely embraces all futurity to be consistent with the occasion of its utterance. This latter acknowledgment and supposition is, assuredly, the only true one; but the conclusion drawn from it is only the more false. He who can see in this chapter a collection of loosely-bound and inharmonious fragments, has not yet understood it aright, as our exposition, it is hoped, will show. But he who is capable of feeling and marking the deep-founded unity of the discourse, which proceeds in its organic structure from the immediate present to the most distant futurity, from the concrete contemplation of relations near at hand to the widest view of all relations, must also and necessarily be driven to the conclusion that only the Lord himself could have constructed and given us such a whole. Would it not have been far more unnatural and wonderful, that an humble and reverent minister of Christ's word, in his record of that word should have formed such a profoundly systematic discourse out of scattered utterances, than that the Lord himself in the wisdom of his spirit should have spoken it? Yea, we boldly affirm, resting upon the continually recurring analogies of our Lord's discourses, whether lesser or longer, that on this mission of the twelve he *could* not have spoken otherwise than we read in Matthew. It was impossible, at the critical and significant beginning, that he should not look forward to the futurity which was to grow out of them; he could not fail to mark and to seize, in all that transpired within the sphere of his earthly life, the germs and prophetical types which were therein wrapped up. This we have distinctly seen in what we especially and distinctively called his "First Words." Now such a first word we have here. He is sending his apostles for the first time, and how could he but see in them his future ambassadors to the world? The most cautious view of this restricted, preliminary test-mission through the cities of Israel (as the Lord himself declares it to be), cannot but attribute to him the contemplation of the future and distinctive career of these same apostles, involving far more solemn and grander interests, the form and procedure of his kingdom even to the end, the position of all his ambassadors and followers. Nothing could, in fact, be more natural than this. Let it not be said, that though these might have been the secret thoughts of our Lord in connection with this

mission, it would have answered no end to utter them beyond the necessity of the occasion, and the ability of his hearers to understand. This would be to misunderstand utterly the essential nature of all our Lord's discourse, which always and throughout, even where it does not so plainly declare itself as here, must have a *prophetic* character. Whatever he spoke from time to time, he spoke for futurity even to its utmost end, yea, even for eternity itself. This will become manifest when all the unwritten sayings of the Word made flesh (not one of which can fall to the ground, be utterly forgotten or lost) shall be disclosed and recovered, in their influence for mercy or for judgment; and to the believing apprehension it is already manifest in those words which show that they were spoken by the Spirit which forms the Scripture, in order that they might there be recalled and vivified.

Thus the Lord is here speaking to his apostles great words, far-reaching in their meaning; and he speaks them *prophetically*, just as his Spirit had formerly spoken in the Prophets. The progress of his internal contemplation assumes here as every where the form of a *perspective* view. The present and the immediate are to him the type of the more remote. In sending forth these, he contemplates all later missions of these apostles and their successors. The words which he now speaks to the Twelve in such a manner that their literal meaning can only apply to the present object, contain, in their spiritual sense, truths applicable to their whole future apostolical course. But from this typical starting-point the thoughts and their expression rise more loftily and freely into words, which the disciples scarcely understand at the time, much less use and follow out, but which must at least have awakened within them the consciousness of extended developments to spring from them, and which are given to them now in order that the Spirit in his time may recall and interpret them to their minds.

The discourse evidently falls into *three* main masses, the limits of each of which are marked out by a concluding sentence, and a fresh commencement taken. The Lord first speaks literally and especially concerning this first mission and preaching, which may be almost regarded as similar to the commission and stand-point of *John the Baptist* (ver. 7)—save that John performed no miracles, did not travel up and down, could not as yet preach the peace of the opened kingdom of heaven to the poor. This section, which pursues its way through simple directions having no reference beyond the present occasion, finds its most solemn conclusion in ver. 15, where finished unbelief rejecting their words, is referred to the final *judgment*. In ver. 16, a new section begins, with an almost abrupt declaration, which however unexpectedly replies to the question that the apostles might rightly ask—Does this then end all? *Behold, I send you!* that is, reduced to plainer words—I shall send you yet again, and amid conditions of much greater severity, even into the midst of contradiction and persecution. The expression, "send," corresponding to their name of *apostles*, now for the first time occurs in his discourse, and it indicates that then their full office is to be entered on, that great mission for which the present is but typical and preparatory. This section consequently embraces the *apostolical* period; the view extends to *men* generally, and the transition in their preaching from the rejecting Israelite to the Gentiles is plainly indicated (vers. 17, 18). Now first is announced the promise of the Spirit, and with intimation of persecutions (as in John xv. 26; xvi. 4); in ver. 22, the meaning is the same as afterwards, in Matt. xxiv. 9–13; and ver. 23 *concludes* with a catastrophe to precede the judgment, which, according to this connection, can refer only primarily to the destruction of Jerusalem. Yet not exclusively this: for the "coming of the Son of Man," as it is a type of a future and proper advent, so was it also typified in his present coming or immediately following whither his disciples were sent before. The prophetically-perspective vision beholds the progress of events as they actually are, in all their internal significance and entireness: in the periods which are formed by great epochs of development, the earlier covers and foreshadows the later; not, however, that the Spirit arbitrarily makes it a type, but because it already includes the latter as a germ. Consequently as the instructions (vers. 5–15), in the *prophetical* sense of their literal meaning, have an application to the more distinctive apostolical career; so does the apostolical instruction (vers. 16–23) find its application to all the followers of the apostles, to all to whom the Lord may ever say—I send you; being thus the immediately authentic *missionary-instruction* for all ages, disclosing its deeper meaning as centuries, and their varied experience, roll on.

This now comes into significant prominence in the third part of the discourse, the part which is developed with most completeness. The Lord's glance passes from the apostles to the *disciples* generally, who were to be the salt and the light of the world, ambassadors and witnesses to men of the kingdom of God, as in the Sermon on the Mount. This section began, generally, in the third person ("the disciple," ver. 24), and it only returns once to the direct style of address to the apostles (vers. 26–31), thence proceeding to the end with declarations quite general (with the exception of vers. 34 and 40, where, however, the apostles as such are not referred to alone—*Whosoever* shall confess me—*He that* loveth father or mother—*He that* findeth, etc. Here the condition of persecution which had been predicated of the apostolic period, is predicated as the permanent condition of his Church until the distribution of final rewards is seen in the farthest perspective. The continuous process and final issue of Christ's great cause are predicted as *through warfare to victory;* his kingdom is pre-announced as to all his subjects a

Kingdom of the Cross, before the immeasurable rewards of glory are revealed. Such is the true method of this discourse, exhibiting its compact harmony, and progressive meaning; and it so entirely asserts its own unity, that even Olshausen in his exposition of what he calls this conglomeration of fragments in Matthew, involuntarily forgets his own opinion, and writes, for example on vers. 38–41, as if the Lord himself were speaking, and as if the "Redeemer himself were closing" a discourse with his own impressive conclusion.

If we look at the arrangement more in detail, we find that the first part (vers. 5–15) falls into a threefold subdivision: the *commission*, or sending, in the first, most distinctive sense; then, the *equipment* for it; then *directions for their conduct* in the execution of their commission. The sending—first of all, naturally, *whither?* vers. 5. 6 (with which, to indicate what is preliminary, we have at first, whither *not*). Then *for what purpose?* ver. 7, 8. (To preach the Gospel, in the power of miracles, and both perfectly free.) The equipment (vers. 9, 10), is likewise negative; partly in contrast with future times, partly as typical of them. Finally, the directions for their conduct (vers. 11–15), rise in their confirmatory conclusion to a far-reaching *anticipation* of the *issue* of the judgment, which thus forms a transition to the next starting-point.

Verses 5, 6. This limitation to Israel is not announced by Luke (ch. x.) as prescribed to the Seventy; but it is to be understood in their case, and ver. 1 intimates it plainly enough.* Only whither he himself would come, could the Lord send messengers; apart from every other consideration, this only would have been befitting. For could the Messiah and the Saviour satisfy any man with his mere representatives? Could the true Shepherd hand over a lost sheep to mere servants? Thus it is only his coming after them (and in spirit going with them), that gives to these missionaries the authority and ground of their commission. What the Lord now says is in its due time solemnly revoked (Matt. xxviii. 19; Luke xxiv. 47; Acts i. 8); while, for the apostle to the Gentiles, the commission is simply reversed—*Not* to Jerusalem, but to the Gentiles! (Acts ix. 15; xxii. 18; xxvi. 17). Not beyond Israel's borders εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν, into the way that leads to the Gentiles; yet in the way of the Samaritans they may go, which passes through the midst of Israel, but not εἰς πόλιν, into no town or city of Samaria. Speaking to the Samaritans in the way or abroad, as in the Lord's own example (John iv.), was not interdicted to them.†

Christ himself as the promised Messiah was first of all a minister of the circumcision (Rom. xv. 8), and in his own mission was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, as he declares in ch. xv. 24, repeating his own words from ch. ix. 36, x. 6, with similar emphasis. In merciful fulfillment of the promised grace, to them *must* the Gospel first be preached, and, in the same mercy, to prevent their stumbling and rejection, to them alone. Hence the Lord remains within their borders, only he does not repel those heathen who made advances, and who were not repulsed by the Jews themselves.*

If we now ask, what is the internal spirit and meaning of this decision, revoked indeed in the letter, for all future apostolic missions; the answer is near at hand. The first consideration to one who is sent of the Lord must ever be, that the immediate sphere of his activity should be accurately prescribed to him, and that he should know with precision whither he must not go, whither also he must. The wisdom of God in sending forth his servants (Matt. xi. 19; Luke xi. 49), deals ever in various methods and degrees as was the case with Christ, who chose for himself at first the narrowly limited, already prepared sphere of his influence; who formed within this, from among the susceptible and worthy, the germ of his great work, and afterwards provided for its furthest and utmost development. This is the character of the commission of his messengers also. There are for them those that may be called Samaritans and Gentiles, spiritually understood; in order that they may not transgress, presumptuously and rashly, the limits of their specific mission for the present time. Even the apostle to the Gentiles, whose instructions embraced all men, was yet aware of the *measure* of a rule, of a district assigned to him by God, beyond which he would not allow himself to wander in his zeal εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα, *without his measure* (2 Cor. x. 13). And when we closely examine these words in relation to those who were sent to Israel, we find even among the people of Israel a selection made, and a still narrower restriction imposed. It was enjoined upon them, not only for the future, but for the first πορευέσθαι, or *journey*, that they should seek out the susceptible and already prepared among the people (comp. ver. 11). For such are, properly speaking, *the lost sheep* of the house of Israel (שֶׂה אֹבֵד, Psalm cxix. 176; צֹאן אֲבֵדוֹת, Jer. l. 6), which involves more than merely *wandering* from *home*, comp. Matt. xviii. 12 with 14; scattered abroad, indeed, with-

* So that Olshausen's observation, that Luke, as writing for the Gentiles, would suppress this circumstance, seems to be incorrect.

† Although, indeed (as Braune remarks), the apostles would have been equally at a loss, at that time, in dealing rightly with the *Samaritans* as in dealing with heathen—and would have, we may suppose, disputed with them to no purpose.

* It is in perfect ignorance of the fundamental ideas of Scriptural truth, that men like Gfrörer would save the liberality of Jesus by the assumption that only the Ebionitish spirit has imposed this limitation on the Lord's words. We cannot but observe how readily these people detect the roots of Christianity in a Judaism and primitive Christianity of their own imagining; how slow they are to seek them in the Old Testament.

out shepherds; abandoned each one to his own erring way in which, unless sought after, he must perish, and thus to all intents *lost;* but *sheep* still, who let themselves be found by the shepherd. In a certain sense all Israel is, by calling, the Lord's flock; yet in the midst of Israel there are true sheep to be sought out, who need only the shepherd. The wolves of ver. 16, at least, have not the peace of the kingdom at once offered to them: even the good Shepherd distributed to them their "woe," instead of "blessed;" if perchance they might hear his voice even in that. We think then, that the Lord here in Matthew does in reality speak of the sheep in the same sense as in John's Gospel (chap. x. 26, 27). It must be remembered, however, that the servant is not justified in saying of any that they are not the lost sheep, until it is most decisively proved that they hear not the seeking voice. Where we are constrained to suppose that we have to do with such lost sheep, our commission is bound upon us by the great Shepherd, and is to be executed, as is necessarily implied, in the compassionate spirit of that Shepherd; not in the spirit of rebuke and condemnation, not proffering the word of faith in the spirit of a keen and impatient alternative, but in the spirit of patient invitation and allurement, going after them without weariness, until the lost are found.

Verses 7, 8. *Πορευόμενοι δὲ κηρύσσετε, And as ye go, preach,* is not a tautological repetition of ver. 6, but has its distinctive meaning—Proclaim on the way, travelling round, going further and further, from one city of Israel to another, and announce that the kingdom of heaven is at hand! Afterwards in ver. 11 it is pre-supposed that after some tarrying, they are always to continue their journey. This was the case, in the most literal sense, on their first mission; but it was also, in a more extended degree, characteristic of their full apostolical office, which was thus distinguished from a pastoral connection with some particular place or district. Apostles must ever be *itinerant preachers;* to found and constitute churches is their province, but not to govern them individually afterwards. When Paul remained beyond a year in any one place, it is announced as something special; and we may assume the same with regard to the others, and their continuance in Jerusalem at the first was specially ordered. The substance of their first preaching in the towns of Israel, coincides, on the whole, with that of the Baptist's (ch. iii. 2), and with the simple, preliminary announcement of Jesus himself (ch. iv. 17); yet it is not without significance that the *μετανοεῖτε, repent,* is not found in it. For though they might not yet proclaim Jesus directly as the Messiah (ch. xvi. 20), yet the ground-tone of their announcement *was not to be* the severe summons to repentance, but rather the evangelical, "Peace be unto you: the kingdom of heaven is at hand, and will come even to you!" (Luke ix. 2, 6; x. 9, 11). The degree of knowledge which they had then reached, had ample scope for exercise; with the single restriction that they were not openly and publicly to preach the name of Jesus. We may suppose that they with difficulty restrained themselves to that message. The confident joy of their faith was not yet strong and free enough to correspond with their Gospel commission, and, contrary to its design, they rather declined to the Baptist's ground, as is intimated in Mark vi. 12. Yet more: John in the wilderness had already announced that the forgiveness of sins was to follow his baptism of repentance (Mark i. 4; Luke iii. 3, i. 77); but they made the preaching of repentance predominant in the Gospel which was committed to their charge, and thought they gave it only its due, until they better seized the design of their commission—repentance and forgiveness of sins (Luke xxiv. 47). These are now both embraced, for all time to come, in the "preaching of the kingdom of God" (Acts xxviii. 23, 31, xx. 25); and that it is called the kingdom of heaven from the very beginning, forbids for ever all intermixture with the affairs of the kingdoms of this world.

The additional authority to work miracles, was needful to them as an authentication now at the beginning; for who would have believed these fishermen and publicans without some such credentials? The Lord afterwards confirmed their word by signs following, until this in the course of time became unnecessary for their successors, and the demonstration of spiritual power in the cure of the soul's sickness took its place. The article is not in the original, but being inserted in our translation, "heal *the* sick," etc., excites a false idea, as if they were to heal all the sick whom they found, whereas they were only directed, following their Master's example, to heal such as desired it. In respect to the "*raising of the dead,*" we find this sentence wanting in [many of] the most ancient manuscripts; it is transposed by the Vulgate and Syriac; and is inserted, neither in verse 1 nor in the parallel places of Matt. and Luke (comp. Luke x. 9, 17). It ought certainly, according to the true gradation, to have followed as the climax upon casting out devils (comp. ch. xi. 5); and we hold it as a spurious importation from a later time, since nothing is found in the first part of the discourse which does not literally hold good of the first mission, and their weak faith could not then be entrusted with this greatest of powers.* The direction, in a cer-

* Lange, indeed, defends the sentence by arranging the ideas thus: Help ye the poor in life (the sick) even unto raising them from the dead; the impure even unto driving devils out of them! But our main point is that here, at the *outset* of his instructions, as is proved by the subsequent part, the Lord does *not* only "speak symbolically," or with symbolical reference, but rather with a directly literal application of his words. As we could not conceive it said at ver. 1 that he gave them power over the dead, no more can we conceive it at ver. 8.

tain sense admonitory, freely to give what was freely received, does not refer to the working of miracles alone, indeed only in a *lesser* degree to this, for none but a Judas Iscariot would ever harbor the idea of being paid. It embraces all that they have to impart, at once the exercise of their power to heal and their preaching of the kingdom, indicating *both* as grace to be freely offered. No gift of God's grace is to be bought and sold with money (Acts viii. 20), or as Tertullian says: "Nulla res Dei pretio constat"—a comprehensive and most pregnant position, which cannot be too much laid to heart by God's ambassadors even to the present day: condemning all improper methods and commercial stipulations in preaching God's grace, all payment that surpasses the limits of their need (ver. 10), and all those unbecoming perquisites which are ungracefully attached to the direct ministration of the word and sacraments.

Verses 9, 10. The disciples might have supposed, after the command which they had received, that they must amply provide and equip themselves for such an enterprise; but the Lord forbids this: Make no express provision for yourselves at all; go forth without any further care, even as ye now are! This is the general meaning of these expressions, which in their literal sense were adapted to this wandering mission; and Mark and Luke, even in their very brief statement, make very prominent this specific prohibition of all equipment for their journey. What each man then had, he might take; but purvey nothing to be taken on the way: *μὴ κτήσῃσθε*—Mark *μηδὲν αἴρωσιν εἰς ὁδόν*, so also Luke. Equipment for a journey consists especially of three things—money, food, raiment. In Matthew the first is made very emphatic, since all the three kinds of metallic currency are mentioned (in Mark only *χαλκός*, *brass*, in Luke *ἀργύριον*, *silver*, for money generally), and the girdles also which served as *βαλάντια*, or *purses*, (Luke x. 4). This *πήρα*, or *wallet* ("scrip"), is according to Suidas, *θήκη τῶν ἄρτων*, *a receptacle for loaves*, hence the two other Evangelists mention also bread. The *ὑποδήματα*, *sandals*, of Matt. (not as opposed, according to Lange, to "hard travelling-boots") are manifestly a second pair provided for change, in the same manner as the two coats. (Compare Mark, which explains Luke xxii. 35.) Finally, the anticlimax descends to the minutest particular: He who does not possess a staff, is not to *provide* himself one by purchase (for all in Matt. hangs on the *κτήσεσθε*). Thus Mark and Matthew are simply at one in this, as also in respect to the shoes.* Many incorrectly think here (*e.g.* Sepp and Roos, relying on extensively circulated information) of a difference between the staff for defence and the staff for leaning on; and even (as Grotius) of a second staff not to be provided, as in the case of the coats and shoes; but who ever takes with him a supernumerary staff? The reading *ῥάβδους*, *staves*, in Matt. and Luke is a gloss that has taken its rise from this misunderstanding, which, not entering into the simple sense, would thus do away with the apparent contradiction to Mark. Their harmony lies in this, as has recently been rightly said, that the *staff* touches the extreme limit of what was really necessary to be taken with them and to be procured; but not even this was to be bought, if it were not possessed already; which is the same thing as Mark's taking it, if it were.

But this prohibition of all provision is, if narrowly examined, itself a glorious equipment; for he who thus forbids, thereby permits and commands them to expect in faith what they need; and to be fully assured beforehand of what they afterwards (Luke xxii. 35) were constrained to confess—that they should lack nothing. The Lord expressly makes prominent the foundation of promise in this prohibition—For the workman is worthy of his meat! The word *laborer* looks back to ch. ix. 37; the Lord of the harvest, will not permit the laborers whom he sends, to hunger. It is, first of all, a common *proverb*, which the Lord, as his wont is, dignifies and raises to its highest meaning; but then it is also a *word of Scripture*, as Paul cites it, I Tim. v. 18, scarcely meaning by his *ἡ γραφή*, *the Scripture*, the Lord's own words, but referring generally, as he is speaking of *reward*, to Deut. xxiv. 14, 15; comp. James v. 4. On another occasion our Lord also uses the expression hire or reward (Luke x. 7); in substituting meat here for hire, he has Num. xviii. 31 in his view, where the reward of the Levite's service is that they obtain what to eat; and Paul (1 Cor. ix 13, 14) appeals to the agreement and the Old-Testament right and the words spoken by Christ to his apostles. The workman shall receive *his* meat—that which is needful and convenient to him, in order to his *working*, but nothing more; that is, hire and yet no hire. He who does not work, may not eat; but he who does not eat, cannot work. The Lord will charge himself with the care of this when extraordinary missions are concerned; and it is his engagement to provide this hire for those whom he sends, and through human means where these may suffice. Consequently it is a narrow perversion, and mere fanaticism of the letter, with which the Spirit has nothing to do, to impose upon preachers to Christian congregations or missionaries among the heathen, literal obedience to these prescriptions of our Lord.* Our Lord never afterwards imposed it upon his apostles in its literal sense, as he himself explains it in Luke xxii. 36. See

* We leave it altogether undecided whether (according to Lange) Mark aimed beforehand to remove a misunderstanding which was likely to arise from the literal apprehension of the original expression.

* As in a book, which made much stir in its time: Irving's *Missionary School after Apostolical Institution.*

2 Cor. xi. 8; 3 John 5–8. Even the *Gossner* missionaries have humbled themselves from their proud humility, and been constrained in their regulations to admit the needful contributions of Christian brotherly-kindness: indeed they did not refuse even formerly the guineas offered them in London, because they might carry no money in their scrip; and probably many a one set out from Berlin with his πήρα, or knapsack packed with more than a single χιτῶν, or garment. "For needful use Christ himself had money, bag, and bread-basket too" says Luther. The spirit and meaning of this first typical mission and its accompanying instructions, as it was intended to be ever developed in the Church, is no other than what the great and disinterested apostle teaches us in 1 Cor. ix. It tells us ever that flesh must not be our arm, that we must not put our confidence in any mere external equipment and outfit; that we must lean upon no other staff than that with which the Lord furnishes us and sends us forth; that we must restrict our necessities as much as possible, and go on our pilgrim and witness way as disentangled and free as may be. Thus, indeed, it does teach us that there should be no rich livings in the Church for any man, no high salaries, no gentleman-outfit for heathen lands, but—the workman is worthy of his meat, and there it ends. What in these first missionary instructions is to be retained for all times and for all altered circumstances, the Spirit, who giveth ears to hear the true meaning of Christ, will teach; and from him may it be learned by all preachers, and bishops, and messengers to the heathen, and missionary committees!

In verses 11–15, the further *directions for their conduct* in their preaching office, especially for apostles or travelling evangelists with a special call, contain prescriptions as well for the *commencement* as for the *issue* of the testimony which they are to bear for the kingdom of God. For the *commencement:* Go ye—to *whom?* As far as ye know and can perceive; first of all even to the ἄξιοι, *worthy*, among whom the Lord has already been preparing your way! Secondly, *how?* With disinterested perseverance, avoiding all abrupt change, and restless wandering about from place to place! Finally, and this it the main point, *with what?* what have you to carry and to offer? Peace, in all the benevolence of the sinner-greeting mercy and love of God. The *issue* of this offer will be, even among those whom ye thought to be susceptible, that some will accept your peace and some will not. In this *issue* let it be your *consolation*, that the unbelief of the hearer shall do no harm to the true preacher; but let your *action* be, when the decision is final against you, to shake off the dust of your feet, and leave the scorners to the full and certain severity of judgment.

Verses 11, 12. What is here termed ἄξιος, *worthy*, the Lord afterwards in Luke x. expresses as υἱὸς εἰρήνης, son of peace, after the well-known Hebrew usage of בֵּן, *son*. They who in seeking peace already have its beginning, though concealed in a sense from themselves—the τεταγμένοι for πιστεύειν, or *prepared for belief* (Acts xiii. 48)—these are the sheep, who hear the voice; and to find out and gather together these, can be the only object of the apostle's office and testimony. These may be found sometimes afterwards even among the scorners; and he who has not yet despised, may be presumed to be capable of faith and willing to believe: but the regulation of the divine wisdom absolutely requires that those who are perceived to be ἄξιοι or strictly worthy, should be first addressed, in order that their faith may become a good foundation for further influence upon them. The question here is not of *worthiness* as such; they who are thus designated are such as are fitted, adapted, disposed, prepared, pre-arranged to hear and receive these words. *Inquire* who in it are worthy! What a difficult problem; one which, as the Lord presently anticipates, we never can resolve with perfect certainty: yet we should essay it, and sometimes it may fortunately happen that we can discover even from the world itself, who are the children of peace concealed among them. The prudent selection here commanded is the other side of the same precept which in chap. vii. 6 recommends the withholding holy things from dogs and swine. The *abiding* there till they go thence, that is, the seeking no other lodging,* was then literally prescribed to the disciples in opposition to the running about from place to place of the Jewish proselyte-makers; and that for many reasons: not to awaken the suspicion that they thought their entertainment not good enough—to teach them the necessity of acting so disinterestedly as never to leave their work half done, and think it accomplished when it is only begun—and to guard against their too quickly giving up those whom they have once addressed, as if they had not spoken to the right purpose. In its spiritual meaning this direction is opposed to all πολυπραγμοσύνη or *officiousness*, which begins in many places at once, holding out no where; it exhorts at the same time to quietness and as much collectedness as may be in the midst of their moving onwards with the Gospel, and condemns and forbids all suspicious changes of office and station among the servants of the Lord. It says: Abide till ye *go thence*, as ye were *sent!*

Salute the house, into which ye come: and what does that mean here? In Luke x. 4, it is forbidden to salute any man by the way, that is, with such kind of empty greeting as would cause delay and do no good: but the case now is quite different. So presently afterwards Luke (ver. 5) teaches what kind of greeting the Lord intends, just as Matthew in the next verse indicates by the coming of ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν, *your peace* upon it: שְׁלוֹם לָךְ,

* The prohibition to accept invitations (as we read in Sepp), is not to be thought of.

or לָכֶם, *Peace to thee* or *to you*, was the Israelite's greeting; and this comprehensive and beautiful expression must be a reality on the lips of the messengers of the kingdom. They are messengers of peace, they bring with them and they publish peace; they would fain be to all, who receive their greeting, helpers of their eternal peace and perfect joy. For where, as among the Greeks, the salutation was χαίρειν, *greeting*, this word also becomes a reality in their mouth (James i. 1; Acts xv. 23): they adopt every good custom which might be a fit medium to express the benevolent, condescending love of God addressing itself to man. They wish good day, or good morrow with full sincerity whithersoever they come; and with heartfelt humiliation uncover their head, according to custom, yea, bend it more profoundly than others do, when their lowliness is understood. A servant of the Lord is truly *courteous*, for he has learned to be so in the high court of his King. When he has to beg, as the disciples then had, reception and entertainment, for his Lord's sake, he gives beforehand superabundant compensation out of the riches of the heavenly treasure which he has to offer. This word of our Lord condemns all such impropriety as obtrudes itself upon any man's house, without an amiable attention to laudable customs; all that official severity which, contradicting humility and love, so often repels; all that premature rigor of condemnation which has not paved its own way by gentleness and love. It is here that we discern the stamp of the new and gentle spirit of Christ. A prophet of the Old Testament, or the preacher in the wilderness, discharges at once his unqualified μετανοεῖτε, *Repent!* over all heads and against all hearts; but a New-Testament evangelist begins as a rule (for no rule is without an exception) in a different spirit. His whole introduction and exhibition of himself, and not merely the first words of his lips, should express the *greeting of peace;* so that wherever he goes, and as far as in him lies, his feet may be hailed as beautiful (Isa. lii. 7). This is the spiritual and internal meaning of this direction, which, as given to the apostles at their preliminary mission, indicated that their commission bore the relation of an introductory, preparatory *greeting*, to the subsequent μαθητεύειν and διδάσκειν, *discipling* and *teaching* (ch. xxviii. 19, 20). But it further teaches us in every age that this latter also should always be preceded by the introduction of the greeting of peace.

Verses 13, 14. *House* is in this place, as in the former verse, equivalent to family, or the occupants, of the house (John iv. 53; 1 Cor. xvi. 15; Phil. iv. 22). That the Lord, after having spoken in ver. 11 of an individual τίς ἄξιος, *who is worthy*, should now enlarge the idea to embrace the whole house, is important as hinting to us that whenever it is possible we should embrace men in their family relations, and make it our object to convert not only souls, but families to Christ; even as the apostles did from the day of Pentecost onward (Acts ii. 39). The Lord speaks of the house as worthy, and thus comprises those who belong to it in one person at the beginning; although afterwards in the decisive progress and result, he could speak the very different words of vers. 21, 35, 36. If it be not worthy —for ye will ofttimes mistake, and bring your greetings of peace to those who are not children of peace—then the error of your love, which is always far better than mistrustful suspicion, will do you no harm, for the peace which they reject, ye shall retain. The Lord does not merely promise this, but the words ἐλθέτω and ἐπιστραφήτω are imperatives which say: So regulate your conduct that both may take place! Let it be in your lips sincere and earnest, that he who will understand and accept it, may indeed find that peace: take heed, also, that ye do not sin against the unworthy, but may be able, with a pure and unsullied conscience, to take back the peace again. This prophecy, that such contradiction would happen to them, conducts us, at the close of the first division of the discourse, to the second period of the apostolical labor: hence we learn that in that period the apostles literally did what the Lord here prescribes for such a contingency (Acts xiii. 51; xviii. 6). And Paul himself did likewise; so that, as is implied in 1 Cor. ix. 14, this instruction of our Lord to his fellow apostles was known also to him. In those narratives we find, at the same time, a plain answer to the question, so difficult ordinarily in special circumstances to be decided, *when* it is permitted us to give up unbelievers, and, free from their guilt, to leave them and go on.

In this preliminary and greeting journey, the matter was at that time more easily and more quickly decided. The Lord says: In case any shall not *receive* you, nor even *hear* your friendly greeting (which pre-supposes that the object of their mission was generally known in Israel), depart out of that *house*, or, if all the houses did the same, out of that *city* entirely, and *shake off the dust of your feet!* This is a symbolical action of stern *testimony* (Mark vi. 11; Luke ix. 5), a sign, that must have its significant meaning. First of all, it is obvious that it declares—We take nothing from you, break off all fellowship with you, as Luke x. 11 explains it. That would give it to be understood—See, we have desired nothing that was yours (for this is only dust); we have not sought yours, but you! (2 Cor. xii. 14). And this meaning we may not entirely exclude. But in the heart of this testimony there lies, as ver. 15 shows us, the further consideration that they, taking back their peace, renounce all participation in the *guilt* of the contemners, and leave with them that guilt instead of their peace—We will not be partakers of your judgment, we have done our part to you, and can leave you with pure hands. Thus we find the explanation, Acts xviii. 6. Many have compared the symbolical

denunciation of judgment in Nehem. v. 13, to which the shaking of the raiment in the Acts *seems* to refer; but that is quite another case, since Luke x. 11 indicates quite decisively, as the fundamental idea, a renunciation of fellowship, and their leaving the guilt behind them for judgment. (In 1 Kings ii. 5, the guilt of blood is regarded as attached to the shoes of the feet.) If, as it is at least probable, since the Lord could have referred so simply only to a well-known custom, it was the practice of the Pharisaical and proud Jews to shake off the dust of their feet when they came out of heathen countries, the Lord's commandment receives a new meaning, of most distinctive and significant force—Those who put from them your tidings of the kingdom of heaven, belong no more to the house of Israel (ver. 6), but are no better than heathen. This admirably suits the transition to the following division of the discourse, which announces the publication of the Gospel to the Gentiles through the Jews' rejection of it and persecution; as it also suits the more immediate transition to the following verse.

Verse 15. The first "*Verily I say unto you*" in this discourse, which forms the first concluding period, in order to pave the way for the prophecy of the future application which it will find in Israel, points far forward even to the day of judgment. For the ἡμέρα κρίσεως, *day of judgment* (especially with ἐκείνη, *that*, Luke x. 12), is evidently, even without ἐσχάτη, the *last* day (comp. Matt. vii. 22). Only at that day can a judgment await the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, long since dead in their sins, which would be more tolerable than that of unbelieving Israel. (Think on ch. viii. 11, 12.) The more detailed exposition of this pregnant expression we reserve for ch. xi. 22–24, where it recurs with twofold emphasis, and is established by the assignment of its ground. We now remark only that the design here is not to say, that all who then rejected the first message of the apostles would thereby incur an irreparable and fearful condemnation, but that with prophetic threats he sees in the beginnings of unbelief its consummation, without cutting off the possibility of subsequent conversion and mercy in particular cases. Yet those instances were probably very rare in which a house or a city (not to say a soul), that would not listen to the first tidings of the kingdom of heaven brought to them by the disciples, afterwards received the Gospel as preached by the Holy Ghost. For we must consider that this Israel is the people prepared by God, through long ages, for faith, and that since the appearance of John the Baptist, the testimony uttered amidst this people, had been confirmed by an ever-strengthening evidence of its divine truth; and consequently, that this unbelief, which had its root in a hereditary obduracy, could only end generally, and as a rule, in entire hardness of heart. It is only over Israel that the Lord commands the dust to be shaken off, and this may have its valid application again in Christendom:* thus to act in the case of the poor, blind heathen can scarcely be justifiable on the part of any Christian missionary.

Verse 16 very significantly marks the return of the thought from the first conclusion which pointed to the Day of Judgment, to another commencement in the words now first uttered, "*I send you forth!*" This expression speaks more openly than before, of a future, proper mission of those whom he has called his ἀποστόλους, *apostles*. It is to this point, consequently, that the distinction belongs, which the Lord himself afterwards made in Luke xxii. 35, 36. This mission he speaks of, from ver. 16 to ver. 23, by anticipation, and, indeed, in such expressions, as literally taken, could scarcely be even preparatorily understood, and certainly were not yet to have a present application; so that there is an actual *contrast* between this and the former fragment of the discourse. This *apostolical* mission, as is pre-supposed in this transition from the former and is expressly stated in ver. 23, was designed prominently, and first of all, *for Israel;* yet there is intimated in vers. 17, 18, a transition to a wider field. The simple relations of the first itineracy, the seeking a reception, with the greetings of peace, are now changed: the *persecution* of those whom he sends, and the rejection of their message is now predicted; this, indeed, is much more than the not receiving, and not hearing of ver. 14. Hence we find that the Lord *begins* now with what in the first address came second; he speaks of their *further conduct* on their rejection, vers. 16–20, and then of the *further issues* of his Gospel and kingdom in Israel (vers. 21–23). In the directions for their conduct the *comprehensive statement* comes first (ver. 16), which just hints at their commission and preparation for it; and in such a manner that a more definite direction is *developed from it:* (1) *Beware!* and that too, *of men* (ver. 17); for ye shall by *Israel* be brought before the Gentiles, ver. 18. (2) But *take no thought!* for the Spirit of your Father will speak in you, vers. 19, 20. And what is the further and full issue of this testimony? Contention and hatred instead of the proffered peace, the op-

* Even in an intenser degree, when the matter is viewed as Roos views it: "If those were punished more severely than Sodom and Gomorrah, who, at a time when corrupt Judaism and Heathenism waged full war with Christianity, did not receive and hear one or two insignificant apostles coming to them for the first time; what shall be the doom of those who have had the entire Revelation of God's will in their hands for years, enjoyed both sacraments, had multitudes of calls and exhortations to enter the kingdom of heaven, and yet remain impenitent?" On the other hand there are circumstances in which all this loses its force, where the Gospel finds multitudes of people who are *scarcely* better than heathen, where, as Lange describes it, "only the steeple tells that Christianity is here."

position of their enemies against the children of peace, who have accepted it, vers. 21–22; nevertheless, salvation and blessedness to all who endure, ver. 22. Finally, a continuous and unceasing preaching of the Gospel, through the permitted fleeing of the persecuted into other cities, until there is once more a retributive catastrophe, through the coming of the Lord following his apostles, and putting an end to this condition of things, ver. 23.

Verse 16. We now have presented to us in the most striking manner, two sharp contrasts, which are designed to excite the attention to the full and far-reaching meaning of the whole prophetic discourse. The former of these is introduced by the intermediate *I send you forth*, and in this the latter also finds its solution. Both are figuratively expressed; the former by a general human similitude, the latter by symbols of its own, which are taken from the deep symbolism of Scripture. *Sheep in the midst of wolves*—thus is expressed the position in which the sent will find themselves; it is an ἐν μέσῳ, *in the midst*, which does not however stand merely for εἰς μέσον, *into the midst*. It is spoken in the style of Æsop, but it was also a well-known proverb among the Jews, as we see in Ecclus. xiii. 18, and the *Shir Hashirim Rabba*, c. 2, §. 14, where God thus speaks concerning his people among the heathen. To send the wolf among the sheep sounds very perilous, but here the poor defenceless sheep *are sent*, contrary, as it would seem, to all right and propriety, into the midst of the wolves! and not merely to live and tarry among them, but even to wage a war of conquest against them.* The *wolves* are, first of all, with a glance backwards to the Sermon on the Mount (ch. vii. 15), the false shepherds and prophets of the house of Israel, whose enmity Matt. ix. 34, shows us had already begun to break out against Jesus, and would be still more furiously excited against the continual Gospel preaching of the Lord and his apostles. But ver. 17 intimates also that it is the nature of *men* generally as well as of the wolves to oppose God's messengers with malicious hatred; and what is the safe-conduct for so perilous a mission, what the equipment for so unnatural a commission, as that of sheep against wolves? This is amply and superabundantly included and promised in the single fact, that the sheep have a *Shepherd*, who *sends* them forth, and cannot leave or neglect them in the mission which he imposes. He does not send them forth as wandering sheep, like those whom they are to seek out, and save from the fangs of the wolves (the mission is not *to* the wolves themselves),—but as those who well know the way wherein he would have them go. It is here—As my sheep! for that most expressive, emphatic, and majestic Ἐγώ must not be overlooked, with which this new section begins. In the preceding, the Lord's "I" only occurred at the close (ver. 15), in the Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, *Verily I say unto you;* but from this point onwards, we find the terms "I—for my sake—for my name's sake—I say unto you—whosoever shall confess me—I am come," etc., in increasing frequency to the end, recurring three and twenty times. He sends his disciples even as he is sent by the Father: thus at last is ver. 40 connected with ver. 16.

With an οὖν, *therefore*, which is derived from the critical ἰδού, *behold*, and carries full conviction with it, prudence is first of all recommended to them; they must consider well in every emergency what is required. Does the sheep put any trust in the wolf? Then the apostles should not merely take care of themselves like simple sheep ordinarily, but actually unite the cunning of the most cunning animal in nature, the serpent, with their own simple nature as sheep. We find φρόνιμος, *wise*, in the Septuagint version of Gen. iii, as the Greek of עָרוּם, "subtile;" and certainly the Lord refers to that fundamental passage for the signification of the serpent. They have to do, in a world which is full of wolves, essentially with that one being, who is elsewhere called the wolf (John x. 12), preeminently; with that one enemy, who is spoken of afterwards in ver. 38; with serpents and scorpions and all the power of the old serpent, Luke x. 19. The great point then is, to see through the cunning of the enemy, to set wisdom against wisdom; certainly to be at least as *wise as* the serpents. Yet not simply so, for they would then be like the wicked, and could not overcome them; therefore is the other in a wonderfully striking way connected with it, to make the counterbalance preponderate, and render them *wiser* unto victory. What words are these, which express the deepest truth and wisdom by a conjunction of images apparently contradictory, but which by that very fact awaken and stimulate the thought to understand them! Who can *forget* a saying like this, after once having heard it? Who can but ponder and investigate it, if he hold it to be of any moment that *the Lord* thus spake? First of all, they are weak, defenceless *sheep* as he sends them forth; then he will have and make them wise as *serpents:* no sooner are they considered such, than he will have them also be as *doves!* What means *this?* The *tertium comparationis* ἀκέραιοι, *harmless*, has been much inspected, though often without that single eye which alone can see the truth in the Scripture. It has been expounded, through a misapprehension of the gloss of Eustath. *ad Homer.* μὴ τινα κεραΐζων *i. e.* βλάπτων, therefore *innocens* (Isa. xxvii. 4, "Fury is not in me," חֵמָה אֵין לִי). And even—a view into which the great Bengel has been misled—κέρας, *a horn*, has been imagined to be the root, as if it

* According to Clem. Rom. *ep.* 2. *ad. Cor.* Peter here asked: What then, if the wolves rend the lambs? and Jesus answered: Then the lambs, when they are dead, will have nothing more to fear from the wolves! an addition the apochryphal and inharmonious character of which is apparent at once.

meant *unhorned*, without defensive weapons, which, however would be ἀκέραστος. (A marvellous idea, that the doves have no horns!) But defencelessness has been already hinted in the word sheep, and surely is not to be repeated. The antithesis to φρόνιμοι, *wise*, not only permits, but requires that we interpret it, as it has been beautifully and perfectly expressed in the German Bible, "simple or single;" though Luther's "*without guile*" is not incorrect, if it is well understood that it only takes away from the φρόνιμοι, *wise*, all *wicked* δόλος, *guile* (John i. 48). As sheep are opposed to wolves, so are doves and serpents, *simplicity* and *cunning*. It seems a necessity, therefore, arising out of the very spirit of the words, that we thus translate, even though there be a very obscure ἅπαξ λεγόμενον (expression but once occurring). Certainly ἀκέραιος is quite equivalent to ἀκέραστος, both being from κεράννυμι, i. e. *unmixed;* in the moral sense pure from all malice, without anger and hatred, without malevolent cunning that inflicts injuries (and what there is of truth in the gloss of Eustathius, μή τινα κεραΐζων, is to be regarded as no more than a consequence of this). Hesych, καθαρόν, ἄκακον—Eustath. ἁπλοῦς πραΰθυμος—as also *Etym. Magn.* and Schol. *ad Eurip. Orest.* 922, cf. Phœniss. 950, have ἁπλοῦς.) The dove is not merely defenceless, but innocent, it knows nothing but that it is only a simple dove, which timidly flies away, and can neither attack nor defend. And as in the *reality* which alone could serve the purpose of the *figure*, this attribute of the dove becomes mere *folly* (see Hos. vii 11, where Ephriam is כְּיוֹנָה פוֹתָה אֵין לֵב, "like a silly dove without heart,") the Lord qualifies this simple innocence by blending with it the serpent-wisdom just as he extracts the false, evil, devilish element from the serpent's cunning by the simplicity of the dove.* Taking both in their proper sense, we have the true wisdom of divine love, in which however, the dove (the Spirit of God, afterwards ver. 20) is superior to the old serpent. The article employed in the second simile—*the* serpents, *the* doves—directs attention to the profound significance of these types impressed upon the animal nature. And now let Rom. xvi. be compared, where in ver. 18 we find first the ἄκακοι, "simple," who are liable to be deceived by fair speeches, because they are only such; and then in ver. 19, in the same sense as our Lord, the ἀκέραιοι εἰς τὸ κακόν, "simple concerning evil," who do not neglect to be σοφοὶ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, "wise unto that which is good;" further, Phil ii. 15, and 2 Cor. i. 12, are also essential parallels.

But what a marvellous *and* is this, which requires the union of the wisdom of the serpent with the simplicity of the dove! This is easily commanded, we may say, but only pursued and attained with great difficulty. Difficult, indeed, it is, and requiring long practice; but he who requires it *bestows* it also—*he* alone who, in sending his servants forth, equips them for their mission. If thou wouldst see this wonderful union in its perfect exhibition, contemplate him; let him ever send thee forth anew, that his spirit and mind may be thine: so will he make thee what he requires thee to be; he will give thee wisdom to neutralize the cunning of Satan, and simplicity for thy single aim in the love and peace of God—a sound and single eye, penetrating without folly the depths of the world's and man's corruption, with a pure and honest heart overcoming every where evil by good; "so that thy wisdom shall never degenerate into cunning, nor thy simplicity into ignorance."

It is true, indeed, in one point of view, as Rothe says in his *Ethik*. (iii. 345), that "the *true* wisdom is the simplicity of the dove." Yet has the Lord, on the other hand, conjoined them by an *and*, and even placed the wisdom of the serpent first. Rothe himself acknowledges this as almost the most difficult of our Lord's requirements, modifies afterwards his former expression, and reproduces it in another form, that for *us* (who are never perfect in full and pure simplicity) the one must ever be the corrective and complementary test of the other—the *true* simplicity of the dove can never be, and may never be, without the wisdom of the serpent.

With this in view the following verses may be thus distributed—Beware of men, in whom the serpent fights against you, with the wisdom of the serpent—But take no thought, speak what the Spirit of your Father speaketh in you, with dove-like simplicity. Prudently taking heed, *assuredly*, *but* yet without care: thus the latter has the emphasis, so that we might say with Braune, "if there be any failure, let it be in the wisdom." It is presupposed, however, that there *need* be no failure, even in this.—On their first mission the disciples found but little occasion for this preparation (although the Lord afterwards, Luke x. 3, 4, in sending the Seventy, repeats, not indeed the word concerning the serpents and doves, but not concerning the lambs and the wolves, in the same sense, connecting it with the prohibition of purse and scrip). This time they returned to him unhurt without having been brought before the judgment or scourged,* but it will be far otherwise in the future, and our Lord gives them to know this beforehand, that when it shall come to pass, and he is removed from them, they may ponder his words (John xvi. 1–4).

Verses 17, 18. We have already seen the significant connection of this warning and prophecy with the whole discourse. This tak-

* The being wise as serpents (not guilty in their cunning) is something very different from being cunning *as Satan* (which should never be spoken of)—see upon this Daub in *Judas Ischarioth*, i. 179–181.

* Scarcely could king Herod have had an apostle seized and brought before him as Braune holds to be at least possible.

ing heed of men—even among God's chosen Israel, not merely of the open or concealed wolves (*προσέχετε* as in ch. vii. 15), but of *human spirit and nature* generally, its contradiction and enmity—is just what had been spoken of as the wisdom of the serpent. True theology teaches that all men are false. God's last and perfect exhibition of grace to Israel, the consummation of all his preparatory dealings, has made it manifest, alas, that the Israelites are only *men*, like all the Gentiles.* This expression already leads the way to the afterwards definitely announced transition of the Gospel to the *heathen;* and it also brings out the great truth, which, though not precisely exhibited at first in the case of *Cornelius*, has yet on the whole been universally attested, that Israel itself, rejecting the Word, turned it to the Gentiles; even as it was at the very beginning prophesied by Moses (Deut. xxxii. 21), with a yet more distant glance at the final re-action of the conversion of the heathen upon the Jews themselves. The Lord repeats in Matt. xxiii. 34, xxiv. 9, and especially almost word for word in Mark xiii. 9, etc., that which he now intimates to the apostles for the first time, as awaiting them in the future—compare especially Mark's tenth verse interposed as a further explanation. The delivering up to the *συνέδρια*, or councils (comp. on ch. v. 22), refers rather to the ordinary judicial process of the magistracy; but the scourging in the synagogues indicates the excited, irregular and tumultuous rage of the people as the impelling cause, and Acts xxii. 19, is a voucher that this generally was their lot:† finally, before *ἡγεμόνας*, "*governors*" (Proconsuls, Proprætors, Procurators), and even *βασιλεῖς*, "*kings*" (as happened to Paul in the Acts, and in Rome, for the Roman Cæsars, it is well known, were often called *βασιλεῖς*). This is, on the one hand, a prophecy of persecution even unto death, which the Jews could compass only by delivering them over to the Gentile authorities; and, on the other hand, an anticipation of the rising grandeur into which his kingdom was to be developed notwithstanding all such opposition. Deeply significant is the antithesis, lowly in its grandeur, between the princes and kings of this world and that "For my sake" which he now utters, and which would remind the disciples of ch. v. 11. He himself, who thus speaks, will stand before the judgment seat and the council, before Herod and Pilate, though he does not openly say so; and thus shall it be also with his ambassadors after him. Their history is silent upon the fulfillment of these words in a multitude of special instances. *Εἰς μαρτύριον, for a testimony*, has a double meaning, according as it is referred to *αὐτοῖς, to* ("against") *them*, the Israelites, or to *τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, the Gentiles*. To the rejecting accusers and persecutors it is a testimony for their own condemnation, for a manifestation of their guilt and enmity to the truth (as Luke ix. 5). To the Gentiles, who thus hear the word, it will be a testimony, instrumental in winning their conviction and believing acceptance when in progress of time the accused (as follows in vers. 19, 20) shall thus boldly and explicitly uphold their embassage and their preaching. In the latter discourse (ch. xxiv.), *εἰς μαρτύριον* takes a wider range, and intimates the unbelief of the great mass of the Gentiles also. Therefore the twofold result of their testimony is blended into one, in order to teach the apostles what their office is to be in all circumstances —to *testify* before every man, whether before kings in judgment halls, or the Gentiles generally. To hold fast this aim with steadfastness is the simplicity of the dove, which knows of nothing but the truth; and this direction to hold fast, under all emergencies, their *testimony*—a direction which is all the stronger because given in the form of an indirect supposition—serves as a point of transition to what follows.

Verses 19, 20. We naturally care more about the *how* than about the *what;* and in the injunction to act with the wisdom of serpents there is included a recommendation of such a careful, thoughtful, discreet management of the *how* of our testimony as will secure its being truly impressive and convincing. The witnesses are bound to prepare themselves, in greater and in lesser things, for the due discharge of their official testimony; as the Lord himself teaches by these directions and warnings so explicitly given long before. The essential *what*, or the substance of their testimony, which must ever be the same and unchanged, the simplicity of the dove itself takes for granted: he who is anxious about that, and fears that he may not understand and utter it aright, may well fear that all is not right with him. Such weakness may however exist, amid the terrors of the world's might: therefore the Lord says in his gracious condescension, *πῶς ἢ τί, how or what*, and includes both in *τί, what*, in his subsequent promise.* In Luke xxi. 14, 15 this is again

* "Sirach's counsel is very good: Take heed of thy friends! (Ecclus. vi. 13). But the warning of the Gospel goes yet beyond that: *Προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων*" (Hamann).

† Thus the explanation of the *συναγωγαί* which Grotius sought in judicial assemblies, is useless and incorrect. Lange, however, comes nearer: "Now in the form of solemn ceremonial, judicial assemblies, now in the shape of zealot tumults"—though this latter is too strongly expressed.

* Hamann lays great stress on the precedence of the *πῶς*, and says, "It is not of so much consequence, *what* or *how much*, children, and we men generally may know; but all important *how*. It shall be given you first of all, and especially, *how*, and afterwards *what* ye should speak. This order seems to us men to be inverted; but it is certainly God's own, and sanctified by his use in all his ways." More ingenious and paradoxical than altogether true: for the *what* must ever be presupposed, and the *how* follows the *specific* what in every particular case.

yet more indefinitely spoken of, and Luther has there made the *how* prominent. Both must be pondered at certain times, the how and the what; yet not in such unbelief of the fear of man as to border on μεριμνᾶν, *being anxious*, "taking thought," or as it is in Mark xiii. 11, προμεριμνᾶν and μελετᾶν, that is, anxiously meditating beforehand for the coming emergency, and in Luke xxi. 14 yet more plainly προμελετᾶν. This is as absolutely forbidden to those who speak in faith and by faith are furnished for their speaking, as the previous provision of money had been; although diligent prayer for wisdom is of course supposed to be enjoined, the neglect and contempt of which would be no other than a vain presumption which blindly looks only at the present moment. The greater the necessity, the more extraordinary, important and unlooked for the circumstances may be, the more careful should be the preparation for them in humble, believing appeal to Him, who sends his servants, who furnishes them for their task, and who works in them. To us poor and infirm successors of the apostles it is not only conceded that we may meditate and even commit to memory our ordinary discourses, but it is made incumbent on us as a duty according to the measure of our infirmity: but when that which is predicted of the apostles in ὅταν παραδιδῶσιν ὑμᾶς, *when they deliver you up*, shall befall us also, then may we too, instead of our usual provision, lay claim to our interest in the promise given to the apostles. *It shall be given you in that same hour*, in which you need it. The same had of old been said to Moses (Exod. iv. 12), how much more confidently may Christ's disciples expect it! *Given you* from above, from God who giveth all that which, we having received, can only dispense (previously in ver. 8): and it is added τί λαλήσετε, *what ye shall speak*, in which στόμα and σοφία, *mouth and wisdom* (Luke xxi. 15), the how and the what are included. The Lord so unites them because the *what* given from above *brings with it* in the confident utterance of the lips, the *how* also in every case (that *how* not being merely the words and their form); or, in other words, out of the simplicity of the firmly maintained testimony, out of the pure surrender of the soul to the influence of the Spirit, the true wisdom as to the medium and form of that testimony must necessarily flow. The promise of the Spirit, who was to speak by the apostles, is here again an exponent anticipating the later, and properly apostolical mission; for in John xv. 26, 27 the same promise is still given as for the future.* The Spirit of *your* Father—for in this discourse, as well as in that on the Mount, and every where else, the Lord can only say, *Your* Father or *My* Father, never *Our* Father. The strong assurance—It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit—pre-supposes as its condition their full consecration in faith, without anxiety and without any mixture of their own work. Here is foreshadowed the great fundamental idea which pervades the whole of the following representations, and especially the third part of the discourse, viz: that in the great conflict and antagonism of Christ's followers and witnesses with the world, their individual personality vanishes. As in all their enemies there is one enemy and adversary (ver. 28), so in the disciples generally it is the Lord himself, it is in their words, the Spirit who testifies to the world—and even in their persons, for their office sake, the Lord is present (ver. 40).

Verses 21, 22. He who in ver. 8 could say, Heal the sick, and cast out devils! will not ensure these embassadors against impeachment and persecution. He who afterwards (verse 29, 30) assures them that not a sparrow falleth to the ground, or a hair from their head, without their Father's knowledge and permission, now plainly foretells that the persecution of his servants and dependents will proceed to the full extreme; and, further, that it will be permitted of the Father, being his counsel and purpose that thus it should be with his kingdom on earth. And what is here predicted concerns not the apostles and first witnesses *merely* as such, but all who with them believe, all who are Christ's in common; in verse 24, this universal application is openly expressed. Ye shall be *hated*, was already spoken in ch. v. 11 *to all disciples*. And see, further, the repetition of it for the most distant future (Matt. xxiv. 9–13; Mark xiii. 12, 13). The too curious investigations, as to whether this or that single expression in these various parallel passages, as we read them in the Gospels, may have slipped back from the later into the earlier discourses, cannot affect the question, it certainly cannot invalidate the truth of our representation given, for it must remain certain, that the Lord in his earlier teaching would more or less explicitly foretell the same things, which naturally were condensed into one great prophecy at the last for his apostles. In verse 21, there is a threefold gradation: first, the brother hates the brother even to death; then, parents their children; and, finally, which most contradicts natural ordinances, even children their parents. The martyrologies of the first age of the Church's history give the fulfillment. Ἐπαναστήσονται, *shall rise up against*, probably refers to their coming forward as accusers or witnesses (hence not sister and mother, but brother and father), which follows the delivering them up, and has death for its result: yet not without the general adjunct idea that they shall *revolt* against them; and therefore it is placed, where its exhibition would be

* We may not, however, say simply with Joh. von Müller (starting from the idea of our present theory): "Here is the evidence of the divinity of the Apostolical Epistles!" For the inspiration of *Scripture* is still, according to all Scripture itself, something more than this, in its narrowest circle yet more unconditional than the guidance of the Holy Ghost in common life and discourse. Compare our exposition of John xvi. 13.

most striking and fearful, in connection with the children's delivering up their parents.* Why, then, are they thus hated? For *my name's* sake, to which ye bear witness, even though there be no other evil thing found in you, but rather whatever is excellent and honorable (Acts xxvi. 9, iv. 17). *Vir bonus, sed malus, quia Christianus;* "a good man, yet a bad one, because a Christian." Wherefore, then, is this permitted? Luther seizes the central idea well in his translation—Ye *must* be hated: for as the third part of the discourse brings prominently forward with detail and emphasis, the fundamental principle of his kingdom, that the fidelity of believers must be *tested* in conflict (vers. 32, 33, 37–39); so is it pre-announced in this concluding period concerning *enduring to the end*, which recurs so emphatically in the subsequent discourses of our Lord. What is the *end?* First of all and especially, though without excluding the wider significance of the typical word (Rev. ii. 10, 26), it is that catastrophe which comes within the horizon of the second part of the discourse, and is indicated as a "coming of the Son of Man;" and therefore the σωζεσθαι is the being saved from the impending judgment; as it is also in ch. xxiv. 22. For that the Lord, up to this point, makes the condition of things, as it will be developed in Israel, the foundation of his prophecy for all times, we see immediately in the termination of this section, which leads the way to the commencement of a discourse that has a wider scope.

Verse 23. *Verily I say unto you*—this occurs just three times in this discourse, marking the close of its three periods: at ver. 15 concerning *judgment*, at ver. 42 concerning *reward*, and here?—concerning a coming of the Son of Man which promises both at once, the punishment of his enemies, and the redemption and deliverance of his people from all straits, and from all oppression. In ch. xvi. 28, and Mark ix. 1 may be seen a clear confirmation of this view, which suits the whole context in this place, as we have traced it. The Lord here (taking us back at the conclusion to his first words, "I send you forth"), speaks of his *coming* as a *judicial and final coming*, as always when it is spoken of as still impending after his *first coming;* nevertheless, he speaks particularly of that day of the Son of Man, which in the destruction of Jerusalem typified the last day. Till the Son of Man come, and put an end to Israel—that end for which ye must patiently wait—and make ready for his kingdom a new and free revelation to the Gentiles. This great catastrophe is in the solemn prophecy of ch. xxiv. regarded throughout as a type of the final doom, so that many of the details in both wonderfully correspond. That great external tribulation which then came upon Jerusalem and the cities of Israel, was already less tolerable than the swift and instant judgment upon Sodom, and thus furnished a historical picture of what the Lord testified above in verse 15. In general, Hofmann (in his *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, ii. 267) is quite right, in holding that only the coming of the Son of Man in judgment, authority, and majesty can here be understood, and that thus the discourse must foretell the opposition of Israel—Verily I say unto you, ye shall not, thus fleeing from one city to another, *accomplish your work* in the cities of Israel (τελεῖν, that is, according to the apostolical aim, subjugate them); my (first) judgment must precede *Israel's* general *conversion.* All very true, but the typical fulness of the perspective figures must not exclude the more *immediate* reference. As the coming of the Lord to Jerusalem points onwards to the last judgment, so had that coming itself its faint type in the Lord's following his disciples to the places whither he had sent them on this first mission of all. This is expressly mentioned in the case of the Seventy (Luke x. 1), as here Matt. xi. has intimated it in the case of the Twelve. Thus much of truth is there in that exposition which feebly and incorrectly refuses to find anything beyond this in it.* How can we suppose this to suffice for the counterpart of verse 15, for the assurance of final reparation, judgment, and salvation, after such things as were to precede in verse 17–22! and indeed, strictly speaking, the Lord was not then to come to his messengers, but they were to come back to him (Mark vi. 30; Luke x. 17). He now speaks literally and strictly concerning the later period (for that they could not in a few weeks travel through, and flee through, the cities of Israel, it was not now necessary to tell them); but by obvious analogy his word would be felt, by those to whom he promises his *coming* after having sent them away, to contain some slight reference to the immediate present. The *fundamental idea*, therefore, in which all relations, the earliest as well as the latest, *reflect each other*, consists in this—Go ye, whither I now send you forth; persevere in patient performance of your duty in preaching and testifying through all persecution; ye may comfort yourselves with the assured hope, that *I myself will come after* for salvation and judgment. For every one sent forth by the Lord only enters again into the office of his *forerunner;* it is the Lord alone who makes every proclamation, confirms all preaching, and demonstrates it with his power, whether unto salvation or judgment.

Let it be further observed that the Lord not merely permits but even *requires* the *flying* of the persecuted from one city to another;† not

* It was taken from the place in Micah vii. 6, afterwards in verse 35 more fully cited—see there the Septuagint.

* Alas, even Bengel, against whose *interdum dormitare* we must, with all our reverence, be on our guard.

† Bengel holds a reading for genuine which adds to this text: And if they also persecute you in this, flee yet to another, a third.

indeed to keep silence and lie concealed, but that they may again preach there also, where new persecution will assail them. Ye shall not have finished the cities of Israel, that is, have been able to preach the Gospel and execute that commission in them all, for which ye are sent (Luke iv. 43)—there is not merely refuge implied, but that it will still be the region of official labor. That Israel remained (not merely, according to the old tradition, twelve years after the day of Pentecost, but till the destruction of Jerusalem) the assigned district of the labors of the apostles of the circumcision, is here declared again in an enlargement, for the second period, of the command given in vers. 5, 6, for the first; and with this agrees the arrangement of the words in Acts i. 8 (where ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς, like אַפְסֵי אָרֶץ in the prophets, designates, first of all, the limits of the land, as a type of the ends of the earth), as well as the practice of the apostles. That only the cities, moreover (equivalent to πόλεις καὶ τόποι, Luke x. 1, καὶ κώμαι, Matt. ix. 35) are mentioned, is to be interpreted (as it may be almost superfluous to intimate again): You cannot accomplish your mission in the cities, much less with all the individual souls that dwell therein.* This then is true in the widest sense, inasmuch as no mission will thus accomplish the design of preaching throughout the earth (and must, after all, be content with at least bringing its testimony to every *people*) *before the Son of man comes*, that yet once more, that is, in an intermediate future time before the final coming, Israel will be converted and by their means not only the πλήρωμα of the Gentiles (for which alone up to this time arrangements had been made; see Rom. xi. 25), but all their might and multitude will be brought in.

The third division of the discourse comprises in its vision the remote and full end, promising by its third "*verily*" a corresponding *reward* to come at the same time with the judgment. And now rises into full prominence, released from the immediate present and the nearest future, the most essential *prophecy*, as concerning Christ himself, whose *cross* (ver. 38) is mentioned *for the first time*, so vital for all his followers in the way of their faith and testimony, and for the great and long enduring *conflict of his kingdom unto victory*. As the second part took its commencement from the conclusion of the first, so it is with this in relation to the second. First we have in vers. 23, 24, the *key-note* of the whole —As it happens to me, the Lord himself, so will it to my disciples! This discourse may be thus distributed: the *warfare* is noticed up to ver. 31, but from vers. 32 onwards the *issue through warfare unto victory* is more definitely indicated, in its necessity and in its security. We must ask permission once more to adopt, in our more detailed exposition, the form of our *arrangement* as before given, whose subdivisions, thoughtful readers, who grasp the form in the spirit when it is rightly given, will not be disposed to quarrel with.

I. The impending *conflict* (vers. 24–31).

1. The *following of Christ* incumbent upon all his disciples in *conflict and opposition*. He who was to follow (ver. 23), *also goes before;* he himself opens and closes the long procession of his people, his true Israel, through the world and history. (Isa. iii. 12: הֹלֵךְ לְפָנֶיכֶם וּמְאַפְּפֵיכֶם, *He goeth before you and is your rere-ward.*

A. The general position precedes: a. Negative (ver. 24); b. Positive ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ, *enough for the disciple* (ver. 25).

B. A single example given for explanation, taken from the past, whereby the disciples might note what was before them: They have called him Beelzebub! (ver. 25). For see ch. ix. 34, xii. 24. Yet he was not diverted by that, but continued his testimony and sent forth his witnesses: hence transition to

2. The *imitation of Christ* in *unfaltering proclamation*, yea, with ever-increasing publicity; so that after his own testimony has ceased the preaching becomes more effectual, aspiring towards, and aiming at, the goal and end which will make every thing manifest.

A. The fundamental note first: *Fear not!* (ver. 26).

B. But speak *out!* a. The general fundamental law, which, in every sense (as the exposition will show) demands this (ver. 26); b. Therefore with ever-increasing openness and clearness.

C. The same in detail: *Fear not!* Now, as the discourse progresses, it discloses more and more: a. That one only fear, of one only and real enemy, is profitable and necessary (ver. 28); b. But in the contest with him, trust confidently in the Father! (vers. 29–31).

II. The certain *issue unto victory* (vers. 32–42). This, however, is not declared immediately and without any enlargement, but is exhibited in a manner to strengthen this confident, fearless faith throughout the hard and protracted warfare, by showing the necessity of the warfare in order to final victory; and the last and most profound answer is given to the question: Wherefore, then, must this be so? Consequently,

1. *The necessity of the struggle in order to victory*, which lies in this, that the disciples must be approved as worthy of their Master—the confirmation of the imitation of Christ by faithful confes

* As Von Gerlach also finds in this word the hint, that we must be ever mindful how far, if not externally, yet *internally*, the circle of our influence extends, and that no power of man can be in condition to make us, the servants of the Lord, inefficient or useless.

sion and adherence even under the cross. This is the fundamental idea which mediates between the contest and the victory, without understanding which we can comprehend neither the entire prophecy of our Lord, nor its long enduring fulfillment. From this point onwards we have positions more universal and of general application, the "ye" being now omitted.

A. Embracing all in one, with a foreglance to the all-disclosing judgment—for this great *end* a test of fidelity is essential; a. Whosoever shall confess me (ver. 32); b. Whosoever shall deny me (ver. 33).

B. Returning now to the intermediate development—The necessary *way* to this, as opposed to the false idea and expectation of the kingdom of God and his Messiah; strife and variance, which lead to the internal discrimination of those who are tested (vers. 34–36).

C. The confirmation which springs from this, from beginning to end; a most clear statement of the ground on which such conflict is necessary.

a. First special examples of this derived from the preceding ver. 37.

b. Then exhibited quite generally; and, *a.* in prophetic figure, taken from the *cross* of the Forerunner (ver. 38). *b.* Finally, that peculiar and most profound expression, which is the very point of *the enforcement of the way of conflict into victory* (ver. 39).

2. To this is appended as the brief but sufficient conclusion, the promise of abounding recovery of all that was lost, in the great recompense, the *participation* of the disciples as well in the *rewards of victory*, as in the *struggle* for them. As certainly as he who is to be crowned must first be tested, so certainly shall he who is tested be finally crowned. Yea more than that, the rewarding compensation as an exhibition of the divine love after so long sorrow, will scarcely keep any bounds, where any are fit for recompense. The promise which winds up all is addressed especially to the apostles, but extends beyond them to all the servants and witnesses of the Lord, yea, to all the persecuted and oppressed disciples generally, down to the very least, and to those who have taken the part of the least. Finally, *nothing remains unrecompensed* (vers. 40–42).

Verses 24, 25. The common proverb, whose immediate and distinctive meaning came before us in Luke vi. 40, is here applied in another sense; and there it is deduced from it as a further consequence, that if the servant should not think himself above his Lord, should not be proud when his master is lowly (John xiii. 16), should not shrink from suffering, when his master has yielded himself up to it—he should also, and this is the meaning here, not expect another and better lot than his master's. It may often be in ordinary human affairs, that the servant is above his Lord (Eccles. iv. 14, x. 7; Prov. xxx. 22), and so the disciple above his master; but then this is an exception to the rule, which the proverb rightly lays down; or, to adhere to our first view, the proverb still holds its right, for such exceptional master was not truly such, and such disciple did not, as a disciple, surpass his master. *Or*, the evil-disposed disciple may only *think* that he is above his master, as the ironical proverb says, which Bengel quotes on 1 Cor. iv. 8: πολλοὶ μαθηταὶ κρείττονες διδασκάλων, "many disciples are better than teachers!" Between Christ and his disciples the word retains, of course, its fullest propriety, for he is Master and Lord in the only absolute sense (John xiii. 13). Passing by the *promise* of victory and reward which lies in the back-ground of this doubtful intimation—for the Lord will not fail to vindicate his servants, the Master will not deny his disciples in the never-failing victory of his truth, the father of the household will not cease to provide for his own—we would remark here, upon the heightened nearness of relation thus expressed: First, master and disciples—as also the Rabbins had their μαθητάς; then Lord and servants—as the disciples of Christ acknowledged him for their Master, and were sent by him as his servants; and then once more, graciously relaxing this last relation, *master of the house* and *they of his household*. Just in this way was the relation developed during our Lord's life; they who found in him a Master and also a Lord, finally became his little children, the family around his table. Contemplating this relation yet more profoundly, the Lord is not merely the father of the household while on earth, but continues such, and is now more eminently such, in his church (as Von Gerlach remarks here). It is this which, with gracious consolation he now *tells them*. The various etymologies of Beelzebub or Beelzebul, about which we may contend, do not affect the subject; for this at least is certain, that it was a name of the chief of the devils, and particularly contemptuous, used by such as would not do him the honor of his more respectable name "Satan, the διάβολος" (i. e. *Accuser*). The charge more than once brought against the Lord, that he too cast out devils by Beelzebub, was the highest exhibition given before the crucifixion, of that most bitter hatred of the truth, of that most daring spirit of outrage against the lofty One, which naturally led to all the rest. Not that they absolutely called him Beelzebub, as the Lord here says; but he pronounces on all its base wickedness, as a judge, according to truth, and with the deepest consciousness of their insults, the true meaning of their words. He who is in league with the devil, hath a devil (John viii. 48), is himself the devil! Finally, let the πόσῳ μᾶλλον, *how much more*,

not be overlooked; by which the Lord intimates at last, that his disciples and household must expect yet worse than he. And why? Because the disciple is beneath his master in the dignity of right and truth and power, cannot, in full innocence like him, resist and attack the enemy, and consequently must lay his account to be much less spared. Did they fail to respect the Holy One of God, and push their outrage even to the bounds of the sin against the Holy Ghost; how then shall we his disciples escape that scorn, which through our failings is seldom simply reproach for Christ, but too often our own desert? The innumerable and ever-renewed names of reproach cast upon Christian men, have for the most part their origin in some error or apostacy of their own, and point in warning and reproof to the guilt which gave them birth.

Verse 26. The *οὖν* is a real *therefore*, deducing the conclusion from the foregoing premise, though it may not immediately appear to do so. For we must discern and extract the *promise*, or at least the re-assuring intimation, which lies latent in the foregoing saying —They have hated and scorned your Lord, and *yet he is still your Lord*, he has not suffered his mouth to be stopped, has still built up his household and his kingdom. The full force of such a consequence appeared, indeed, first when that time came, in anticipation of which the Lord now speaks, after he himself through shame passed to honor, through the cross entered into his glory. Since then the firm foundation of the Church's confidence in defying the threats of men has been what is expressed in the apostle's prayer, Acts iv. 27, 28. But with this glance backward upon the Forerunner's way through conflict to victory, there is instantly connected a second glance forwards to that certain and final termination of all history, which finds its expression in a saying that recurs elsewhere in our Lord's teaching as a fundamental axiom for profitable application in many ways (Mark iv. 22; Luke viii. 17, xii. 2). The double form of the maxim may be explained as an intensive parallelism, or as referring the things covered which are to be revealed, rather to *facta;* and the things hid which shall be made known, rather to *scibilia*, as such. Or, again, what no man could see, shall become visible; what no man ever heard or knew, shall become audible and perceptible—in brief, there is most assuredly coming a universal revelation of all hidden things, a boundless assurance, the full meaning of which in relation to particular things, no human intelligence can exhaust or even conceive! But what means the *For* which makes this prospect the motive cause for the "Fear not?" First, it expresses the *obligation* to conform to this master principle of the divine government in our present conduct, and so to preach boldly the whole truth without reserve. (It is thus applied in Mark iv. 21, 22.) Next, it is a *warning* given to God's messengers, against that *hypocrisy* which comes from the fear of man (Luke xii. 2); for all faint-heartedness, unfaithfulness, neglect of his ambassadors, will be disclosed with the sins of the world, when both the one and the other shall be made manifest in the light of truth. Finally, it is a *promise* and consoling hope for the faithful, inasmuch as they may reserve every thing for the great day of revelation, and refer every thing to it (Col. iii. 3, 4; 1 John iii. 2). And if the whole world reject and misunderstand and scorn you, ye shall one day shine forth as the children of the kingdom and preachers of righteousness (Matt. xiii. 43; Dan. xii. 3) to their condemnation (Luke x. 11; Ezek. xxxiii. 33). Judge ye already, then, the wicked world by the world which discloses secret sins in the conscience (2 Cor. v. 11; iv. 2). Not merely in themselves before God, and in the conscience of believers, are the ministers of God's word approved as sent by him, but in the consciences of all men, even unbelieving men *in the sight of God;* and this will become fully manifest when the Lord shall bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and judge *τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, the secrets of men* (1 Cor. iv. 5; Rom. ii. 16). What a prospect and expectation is this, to enforce on the one hand, the renunciation of all the *κρυπτὰ τῆς αἰσχύνης, hidden things of dishonesty*, in ourselves, and on the other, the declaring without restraint through fear of man, the whole counsel of God, which we are bound to preach!

Verse 27. "The Master bids his most confidential disciples reveal his most secret things, his most hidden ones to announce from the house-top his most hidden things; house-top and market-place are the lodgment of the voluntary carpenter from Nazareth" (Pfenninger). *What ye hear:* this refers in so far as the discourse is spoken for the future, as a prophecy, to what they were to hear from the Holy Spirit, who was to tell them what they should speak, as in Acts iv. 20. For the speaking of the Holy Ghost is addressed to the opened ear (Isa. l. 5; 2 Sam. vii. 27; Job xxxiii. 16, xxxvi. 10). It is, however, immediately parallel with the former, *what I say unto you;* for it is the Lord who ever speaks by the Holy Ghost, and before the Spirit spoke he spoke it himself. He, the great *Revealer* of all secret things, commenced in secret his testimony; uttering, indeed, plainly enough for all ears which could hear, much of that entire system of truth, which without restriction should be afterwards preached upon the house-tops and streets (Jer. xlviii. 38). It is designedly and strongly expressed, that he said to his disciples, especially to his apostles, much *ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, in the darkness*, as if shunning the light, secretly for temporary secresy, to *them* alone *in the ear*, and not yet to all the people.* But when these lights were kindled

* Sepp very strangely and here inappropriately derives this form of speech from the custom of the synagogue, where the presiding elder first whispered the original text into the ear of the interpreter, who gave the sense in the dialect of the country!

from his light, *they* became lights of the world in ever-increasing diffusion of their light (ch. v. 14, 15). Ever-increasing, say we, and rightly; for this preparatory secresy of their Master, teaches the disciples that verse 27 is not to be followed with strict literalness, but between the beginning of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, which the disciples' ears alone might hear (ch. xiii. 11), and the final revelation of all hidden things (verse 26), there must be conceived a gradual development and advancement of revelation. All truth should no more be preached every where and at once, than the Lord's peace, according to verse 34, should be cast abroad at once and instantly, through the whole earth: that would be a judgment of the world before the time. There is here, again, a similar relation of the apostolical preaching to the yet more public testimony of later times, as the Lord forcibly and clearly announces in Luke xii. 3, with the same expressions as are used here. The truth must be spoken, and nothing but the truth; this is enforced, against all reservations which might spring from fear: but there is also a wisdom of love, which knows how much of truth to teach, and when and where and how it should be taught.* This is not expressed here, because it does not belong to the fundamental idea, and because this third section deals in great universal principles and laws, without giving, as in the former, preparatory instructions of special application, which the Spirit in due time should provide for.

Verses 28–31. Our general summary and plan has already shown in what light we regard the connection of thought in this passage. In verse 26, the *Fear ye not* is connected with *them*, but now in verse 28, it is critically opposed to another fear, which is commanded as alone profitable and necessary. In this command that *warning*, which we before noted in the reference to the revelation of all hidden things, comes out into fuller prominence. A *promise* follows, which demands a confidence in their heavenly Father, that should be the counterpart and resolution of that fear. First there is the assuring figure and example derived from the slightest thing which could compass the destruction of a living creature (verse 29); then comes the application to Christ's disciples, in another figurative example of the slightest injury that might befall them (verse 30); and finally, sounds out most impressively the third—*Fear not therefore!* established upon the ground of that promise and assurance (verse 31).

Verse 28. Thus, then, they actually *kill* the body—it is not merely *can* kill. So much is permitted to them, and it is pre-announced to his disciples, as it had been already in verse 21, and in John xvi. 2 This is more than was expressly mentioned in verse 25; but it is all that they do or can do: μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ ἔχουσί περισσότερόν τι ποιῆσαι, *after that have no more that they can do* (Luke xii. 4). And is that to be feared, and does it touch the proper *life?* The immortality of the soul, its undying continuance when the body dies, is here, as throughout the Scriptures, not merely taught as a dogma, but pre-supposed and taken for granted by the *consensus gentium*. He only, who as נָבָל, *a fool*, has gone so far as to say אֵין אֱלֹהִים, *There is no God!* and in denying the living God has contradicted the inner voice which teaches even the heathen to know a divinity and a hades, can persuade himself that his death is an annihilation of his personality. But this sense of the word concerning killing the soul, is itself only a foundation on which to build something further and distinctive, that immediately follows. The Lord already uses the ψυχή, *soul*, as we perceive, with the same transition from the lower to the higher meaning as afterwards in verse 39. He speaks directly of a possible killing or destroying of the soul. The former member of the verse contains a perfect exhibition of the utmost injury that can be inflicted on body or soul. Thus viewed, the question arises, May not wicked men, through their malice, kill the soul by seducing us to backsliding and perdition? and the answer is, Assuredly, but not of themselves, not by any power of theirs to which ye are surrendered as victims, as in the case with your bodies; they cannot do it without your own will and concurrence. Beware, therefore, be on your guard, so shall they not touch your souls! Herein is the transition to the remarkable *second member* of the verse, which, so far as we remember, stands alone in Scripture; for as to the same word it has been, and is still contested, whether *God* or *Satan* be signified. For our own part we hold this contest to be possible only so long as we fail to penetrate into the heart of the passage as standing in its connection. We have already signified more than once our assurance that we can only understand by him whom we must fear, the one pre-eminent and proper enemy and destroyer of the soul. Indeed, we are as firmly persuaded of this, as of any point in all exegesis, that the Lord here means Satan.* And these are our five reasons:

First, The ground-tone and fundamental idea of the whole of this portion of the discourse tends to confidence in the *Father*, who takes the life of the meanest sparrow under

* According to which sense Hamann wrote to Lindner—"One must first speak to the ear, and afterwards make the house-top his pulpit!"

* If possible more firmly so in this second edition, although the now deceased Von Meyer wrote me that I had by no means convinced him—that it was never any where said in Scripture that we should fear the devil! I take, however, *e. g.*, 1 Pet. v. 8, as having the same sense: and Rom. xi. 20; 2 Cor. xi. 3, with some others, deeply pondered, give the same idea. Lange (p. 721) has done justice to my argument. [Yet the mass of interpreters will no doubt, despite the author's arguments, continue to adhere to the spontaneous reference in this passage to the Almighty.—Am. Ed.]

his charge, and much more, will not permit any evil to befall either the bodily or spiritual life of his children through any wilfulness of man. The correspondence then is exact: *Trust* only in him who can *protect* you; but *fear* him who *would destroy* you, and both can and will *unless* you fear him!

Second, As the two members of the sentence run quite parallel, it is not permissible to take *φοβεῖσθαι, fear*, in two distinct senses, namely, to understand it in the second case of the fear of God, which could never in the New Testament at least, and assuredly not in this passage, be thus made equivalent to *φοβεῖσθαι ἀπό, stand in awe of.* No, the Lord is speaking of an essential, proper *fear*, similar to what might be felt in regard to those who kill the body, but in the latter instance with the more emphatic *μᾶλλον, rather.* It is just this *parallelism* of the sentences that is most decisive against Alford, who thinks it a valid objection to the reference to God that the construction is changed, and that it is *not again said φοβήθητε ἀπό τοῦ δυναμένου κ.τ.λ.* (The *δὲ μᾶλλον* following upon *μή* makes *φοβεῖσθαι* the same in both cases.)

Third, Who is then the real destroyer of the soul, just as men destroy the body? and so much more to be feared than they, as the destruction of the soul is a greater calamity? Let it be observed that *ψυχὴν ἀπολέσαι, destroy the soul*, is something quite different from *ἀποκτεῖναι, kill;* it is the casting it into damnation on account of sin. The death of the body as such is not the death of the soul, but conducts it rather to blessedness, if the soul lives in God: so that persecutors rather benefited the martyrs than otherwise, by speeding their way to heaven. But *to destroy the soul:* that is never throughout the entire Scripture spoken of God, and to attribute this to him here, would be indeed a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον horrendum.* Bengel, indeed, compares James iv. 12, but the simple *ἀπολέσαι* as the antithesis of *σῶσαι* (to deliver over to condemnation and ruin) is far from being equivalent to *ψυχὴν ἀπολέσαι* in such a connection as we find it here. God, indeed, *destroys* all flesh by a judgment of death, but not till all flesh has corrupted its own way (Gen. vi. 12, comp. Rev. xi. 18). But the destruction of the soul, its *death* distinctively, proceeds not from him: he *cannot* be said to inflict it, but only, as in the former case, to let that ruin manifest itself, which has taken place without him (Ecclus. i. 12–16). Further it does not *here* read: *Εἰς γέενναν* (although in Luke it stands under another aspect, as we shall presently observe: *ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν*) but *ἐν γεέννῃ*, that is, *in* hell as in his province and domain. But hell is Satan's kingdom, and there, as we know from Matt. v. 29, 30 (which should here be brought to mind), the *body* will, together with the soul, be tormented and destroyed. Should we, finally, take objection to the *δυνάμενος* as too strong to be applied to Satan, we may say in answer, that this, so to speak, euphemistically significant paraphrase of the horrible nameless one who is yet well known, all the better suits the character of Satan, who has actually *ἐξουσίαν, power* and permission from God (Luke xii.) first to hurt the soul as a tempter, and then to destroy both body and soul in hell as a tormentor (Heb. ii. 14). He is, indeed, according to Matt. v. 25, the officer who casts those who are delivered to him into the prison.

Fourth, Thus only, inferentially, does the true, and more profound sense of the whole saying appear: Fear not men, the enemies *of divers kinds*, who, if ye are true to God, can at least but *kill* the body (as man in his vain fear so terms it); but fear that *one* real enemy, with whom, beneath and behind all flesh and blood, ye have to do (Eph. vi. 12), who alone can inflict the real irreparable hurt! the essentially *wicked* enemy, to whom ver. 1 had already pointed, as of most import to take heed of and overcome. Take heed to your soul, and save it from him; the death of the body at the hands of men need not then be feared.* We may conceive how such a word must have smitten the heart of a man like Judas. But we must also reflect that such a warning would be always necessary for all the disciples of our Lord, over whom is ever impending the danger of treachery and apostacy, and especially in the heat of persecution even to death. It would be very strange, however, and inexplicable, if he had united in one the command to *fear* God, who casts into hell, and to *trust* in him as a merciful Father. Our faithful Master and Forernnner, who had himself known by experience the tempter and destroyer, in our flesh and amid the enmity of the world, here exhibits to us in its perfection the highest master-piece of simplicity in wisdom; that we should see in all other wolves *the one* Wolf, amid the whole generation of vipers the One Serpent, and with so much humble fear of the *Destroyer* as firm confidence in the Saviour and *Preserver*, pursue and make good our way towards the end.

Fifth and last, What we have found in this place is entirely confirmed in the parallel passage (Luke xii. 3–7), and the expressions there used indicate to us yet more significantly the evil fiend. Ver. 3 predicted, that the fearless and free publicity of proclamation would, even after the apostles' testimony, go on to increase; and this is spoken as an encouragement to them. In ver. 4 the Lord speaks to them further as *his friends*, certainly with an affectionate and assuring tone, with which the immediate transition to fearing before God could scarcely harmonize. As *my* friends,

* "Yet in the dens of the murderers, who can rob them of the mantle of the body, they tremble not; their souls unwounded and unrestrained, soar into the light of heaven. *Another fear*, of another death, has thrown its holy protection around their hearts, so that the wicked fiend has no power irretrievably to destroy their souls." Thus beautifully speaks Lange in his *Biblische Gedichten.*

my trusted household, ye have nothing to fear either in *me* or *the Father;* yet I say unto you, in faithful love as your counseling friend—Think not therefore that ye may be above all "fear!" The great enemy is still near, and will desire to have you to the end—forget not that. Ye need not indeed fear man, *but*—and what now follows so emphatically and fearfully might suggest already to him who has ears to hear the frightful name of the Unnamed One—*but I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear!* (How is this a fitting lesson about the fear of God, for ages known to the least in Israel as essential!) Fear *him*, who, *after* he hath killed, *hath power* (through the wonderful permission and delegation of the Almighty) to cast into hell; *yea, I say unto you*, τοῦτον φοβήθητε! We know not with what ears he can hear this, who can think of the Father in heaven.* It is *Satan* who hath killed wherever there has been death, for all bodily death is from him (John viii. 44); especially where men have killed out of hatred—and the subject of the discourse is of such ἀποκτεῖναι (1 Cor. v. 5), entire humanity in a certain sense is concerned, over which the destruction of the flesh impends in death: and even as the Prince of Death is Satan considered a minister of the divine righteousness, as well of its mercy as of its wrath.

Verses 29–31. Στρουθία, "*sparrows*," are πάντα τὰ μικρὰ τῶν ὀρνίθων, *all the smaller birds*, corresponding in the Septuagint to the Hebrew צִפּוֹר; and ἀσσάριον, *a* "*farthing*," also taken up in the Hebrew as אִסָּר, אִיסָּר, אַסְפַּר, is the smallest coin, and hence was in Jewish as well as Latin proverbial use to express the smallest value (באיסר, בבאיסר). Now even *two* sparrows are only worth one ἀσσάριον; indeed in Luke xii. 6 (spoken a year later) the expression is made stronger, and for two farthings the fifth bird may be obtained over and above: yet in the *providentia specialissima* of God not one single such little creature, not the slightest worm, is forgotten or left to be the sport of chance! There *shall* no *sparrow fall on the ground* exhausted or starved, or by any cause killed,† *without* the knowledge and will of the Father (not of the sparrows but of men, who are his children). The Lord brings to our mind again—we have found many reminiscences of the Sermon on the Mount in this discourse—that precious word (ch. vi. 26) to which rejoinder might be made—Yet the fowls of the heaven do often fall upon the earth because they have found no nourishment; and in like manner—Yet the confessors die, and many of them even by the hand of the enemy! It does, assuredly, so happen, only not *without* the Father: this is the comforting assurance which the Lord gives. So far from *your* life being taken away without the Father's counsel and will, not one hair falls from your head without him (Luke xxi. 18; Acts xxvii. 34; 1 Sam. xiv. 45), or as the German proverb runs —*Niemand euch ein Haar Krümmen mag, No one shall bend a hair of your head.* They are all *numbered* by a providence which cares for all and forgets nothing; as much so as the stars of heaven are, which man can no more count than the hairs of his head.* Thus the example of the slightest hurt, which we should not even spend a thought upon, is brought into juxtaposition with the being killed in ver. 28, in order to embrace whatever possible injury might lie between these two extremes. The concluding inference of ver. 31, already found in the Sermon on the Mount, is a Jewish proverb also,† but is here invested with a higher meaning. The emphatic ὑμεῖς, *you*, which so strikingly closes this sentence and corresponds to the ὑμῶν, at the beginning of ver. 30, refers to those who are addressed, not simply as they are *men* (comp. Matt. xii. 12), but as they are children of God, disciples of Christ, heralds and witnesses of his kingdom, suffering for his name's sake. Shall one of these be forgotten? Shall not He, who numbers the hairs of your head, keep your head and your life in the hollow of his hand, so that *whatever* might befall them, shall not be without him, but shall, according to the gracious counsel of his will, be for your final good? Thus does the Lord graciously condescend to reason them out of all fear; and further, as he often founds his encouragement and exhortation upon that regard for ourselves which our own pride will never allow to be contested. Ye cannot doubt, surely, that ye are, each of you, of more value than many sparrows; then ponder well what follows from that! But the Lord utters this word with a profounder reference to the proof and testing of the children of God in the sight of the Father, to that *internal and precious value*, which is to be *developed* and *heightened* by sufferings. Apply it thus, he intimates, and know that just *because* ye are better than many sparrows, do men encounter opposition, giving occasion for that firm and resolute confession, in virtue of which

* Just in the same way as ourselves, with the same, indeed greater zeal against the wrong apprehension of this passage, does Reichel set it forth in his *Jesaias* (on Isa. xlix. 24): "Are not those horrible notions which men are taught to conceive of God the Father, as if he were an Apollyon, a destroyer of bodies and of souls; and which would impute such a meaning as would make him inspire and inculcate a real dread of his Father! Frightful exposition—the Lord Jesus speaks of the devil, and his words are referred to God the Father!—the Father, they seem to think, is a hard man, who strikes one, body and soul, into hell! About the devil it is of little consequence, all is right with regard to him. Is not that a sin and a shame?"

† Evidently this is meant, and not a flying down which resembles falling.

* The counsel and will of God are often contrary to our thoughts. Therefore, writes Hamann: "Let all *our* speculations fall like sparrows to the ground."

† *Talm. Hieros.* (tit. *Shebiith*, fol. 38, col. 4): A bird perishes not without God, much less a man.

you will one day be publicly confessed by your Lord, as is seen in what immediately follows.

Verses 32, 33. Just as in the Sermon on the Mount (ch. vii. 21–23) a prophecy of rejection from the judgment-seat of the Son was uttered against those who call him Lord, Lord, yet do not the will of the Father. There it was said, *τότε ὁμολογήσω αὐτοῖς, then will I profess unto them*, and the word has the general signification, to speak openly of any thing, according to its true character, comp. John i. 20 (*ὡμολόγησε καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο*); Titus i. 16. We find it more definitely in relation to Christ in John xii. 42 (*ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡμολόγουν*), comp. 1 John iv. 15. Here in Matt. x. and also in Luke xii., it is not followed by the Accus. (as in John ix. 22), but by *ἐν*, which, although founded upon the usage of the Greek, answers more probably to the Hebrew הוֹדָה with בְּ,* which first indicates acknowledgment, then praise, and finally the honor and glory which are paid to the Lord God. While our Lord sublimely attributes to himself judicial decision and decrees, and that highest personality, also, on the confession or denial of which all is suspended, he yet softens and qualifies the assumption by equalizing the relation and rendering it mutual: He who confesseth me, shall be confessed by me! The profound condescension of this expression is only appreciated when we reflect upon the Old Testament הודה ביהוה.* He confesses the steadfast confessors as his own, that is, in reality, for it cannot be otherwise, as he is himself in them. And that, indeed, not first at the last day—no, he confesses (or denies) *at once*, and with a reward which begins, at least when our true confession is made. The significance of that great promise with which the great warning must run parallel, is now, we should hope, made so plain, and its place in the progressive connection of this discourse so entirely vindicated, that it will not be possible to persuade us that it has been transposed from the later passages in which it occurs, to this earlier place. The *οὖν, therefore*, binds it closely with the preceding, for that test of fidelity is still the question! Be ye only so faithful, that the enemy may have no power to turn you away from me; so may ye be also assured of an eternal recompense, and let that be your consolation and encouragement *before men!* But let it be also observed, that the discourse becomes ever more general in its tone—*πᾶς ὅστις, whosoever*, with the "me" set over against this as the sole substance of all confession that is demanded. That no vain confession of the lips is signified, but the maintenance and consistent exhibition of discipleship in the whole life, in spite of the world's enmity and even unto death, is clear from the whole discourse, as well as from the passage in the Sermon on the Mount. Consequently, the *denial*, against which the threatening is directed, is not a transitory lapse of personal weakness, such as was forgiven to Peter, and such as very few of the Lord's disciples are free from, but the entire renunciation and abandonment of communion with the Lord (Luke ix. 26; 2 Tim. ii. 12). He who may have denied him, yet without persistent obstinacy, shall find grace through repentance. "He who said to the adulteress, hath no man condemned thee, neither do I condemn thee! will also say to us, and be more faithful than Peter was to him, though all men reject thee, yet will not I!" (Baxter). It is obvious, also, that while he requires the confession of the heart unconditionally, he demands the confession of the mouth only where duty and usefulness require it; and where its failure would be a denial. Finally, the conditions between us and him are in this matter the same as in the forgiveness of sins (ch. vi. 14, 15). *First*, He acknowledges us in his grace, when he receives us with all our past unfaithfulness and denials upon us; then it is essential that we confess him before men; otherwise, his confession of us as his own, will be retracted and denied.

Verses 34—36. What now follows down to ver. 39 forms "a circle of ideas which," as Wizenmann says, "never came from the mind of mortal, before Jesus." It is the transfiguration of all the prophetic expectations concerning the kingdom of God into the transcendent and future and heavenly; in perfect correspondence with the true sense of all prophecy, which never could, however, till now be so clearly apprehended and expressed. This is a testimony which is effectually thrown in the way of all who would build up the kingdom of peace *on this side*; from the Jews, whose great delusion it unsparingly overturns, down to the last foolish builders in the last days. In Luke xii. 51–53, the Lord once more repeats the same saying, and in connection with the reference to his own sufferings and death in ver. 50, which we have here in vers. 38, 39. Nevertheless, although every thing in his kingdom looks forward to what is beyond and to the future, to the finding of *life*, by all who are worthy of him, this heavenly kingdom does not give up the earth. Upon it, and in hot conflict, must the heirs of everlasting peace secure and prepare for their inheritance. "I came not to send peace, but a sword!" a terrible saying as it first sounds, but in the lips of him, the Prince of Peace, easily to be understood. None but he, the gracious and meek one, the Son of the Father's love might venture to speak so startling a saying as this. That he does not mean the sword of Mohammed, is declared by the consentient testimony of his word, his life, and his death. From ver. 16 downwards, he has been speaking of nothing but the violence of the world's might directed against his own; but not one word has he said of their opposing force to force. *Sword*, as figuratively the opposite of peace,

* [This construction however does not occur in the Old Testament.—Am. Ed.]

signifies, first of all, *war* (see, *e.g.*, 1 Macc. ix. 70, 73 in the Greek; and Jer. xiv. 13). But the war, which the Lord pre-announces, is the διχάσαι, *division* (Peshito, אפלגו) between those who accept, and those who reject, his peace. (In Luke xii. this term is διαμερισμόν, for which Tertullian in that place reads μάχαιραν.)

First of all, the Lord gives a general declaration, in opposition to the delusion which sprang from a misunderstanding of the prophecies concerning the Messiah's kingdom of peace. He then sustains his own true interpretation of the prophetic word by a special citation from prophecy itself, using the language of the Prophet Micah. The prophets prophesy, indeed, of *peace* (*e.g.*, Psa. lxxii. 3, 7; Isa. ii. 4, ix. 7; Hagg. ii. 9; Zech. ix. 10), but you must not so understand them as to suppose that at my first *coming*, and without any further process, peace can be immediately *cast* upon the earth: for this is the meaning of the emphatic βαλεῖν, with which in Luke xii. 49, a second βαλεῖν is contrasted. "Glory to God in the highest!" necessarily precedes "peace upon earth!" This last can be attained only by a contest for the glory of God; therefore Christ, because he is come to bring true peace, is first of all *come* to disturb all false peace, and to excite a contest which is as profitable as it is indispensable. The *peace of the house*, family concord, is the noblest and most precious peace upon earth; but even this, if it rests upon a false foundation, cannot be left inviolate, but must be disturbed, though our "weak household-ethics" would preserve it at all costs. Peace is to be announced to the house, according to vers. 12, 13; but that very announcement effects the disruption of peace. Let the whole connection be examined in Micah, where in harmony with this (ch. v. 1–4), the Messiah is predicted as the Peace, and his kingdom (ch. iv. 1–8) as a kingdom of peace; but then a preliminary war is indicated in the travail of the daughter of Zion, which precedes her bringing forth. The sin of corrupted Israel (ch. vi.) is the great obstacle, and the kingdom of peace can only come as the late and final goal of a series of severe developments (ch. vii.). The Lord takes the words of this quotation from this last chapter; regarding rather the general scope of the prophecy as a whole, than the individual reference of the words themselves: for whereas the prophet speaks of sinful discord as already existing (though not without a glance, in vers. 5 and 7, at the enmity which God's faithful ones experience), the Lord here speaks of that discord which his coming *excites*, even where peace had been before; and hence he adds this meaning to the words of the prophet. He would seem thereby to express the anomalous idea that his Gospel was to have no new effect, putting the circumstances and relations effected by it on a parallel with the hatred and discord of men in their sins generally. The ἄνθρωπον, *man*, at the beginning, has a specific reference to the close of the citation, ἐχθροὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, *enemies of the man*, and contains a variation from the prophet's words which indicates a deeper meaning. In Micah it is only אוֹיְבִי אִישׁ, Septuagint ἀνδρός, that is, of a particular man; but the Lord more accurately describes by ἄνθρωπος, used as in vers. 17, 32, 33, men generally, as he finds them upon earth, when he comes and offers them his peace. The ἀνθρωποι, who persecute, and before whom the confession is to be maintained, and any individual man who will become his disciple, and confess him, are in themselves alike. But when the Lord comes between them, there is a *separation* effected between that man who receives him, and all other men, whether father, mother, or any dearest relatives: and his own household become the *enemies* of that man, who, though he hates none, yet dares not love any *more* than Christ; the *enemies* of such ἀνθρώπου who cannot consent longer to maintain a false peace with ἀνθρώποις generally. The great necessity then is to give up every earthly human relationship for the sake of the household and kingdom of God! The widening circle of connections is just the same as in Micah: first children and parents, then relatives, of further degree (κύμφη after the Hebrew בַּלָּה), then acquaintances (οἰκιακοί, אַנְשֵׁי בֵיתִי) in the widest sense. It has been incorrectly assumed that there are here three examples of disciples, two being of the female sex; because the young receive the Gospel, and maintain their steadfastness in following Christ sooner than the old, and women rather than men. But the Lord takes the words directly from Micah, and consequently the significance of the selection must be found here as well as there, in the idea that these cases exhibit the discord in its most aggravated form; and the concluding sentence of our Lord confirms this. Once more, let it not be forgotten, though hasty readers of the Bible overlook it, that the *man* here is the confessor of Christ, and that this passage is the *counterpart* of ver. 21, looked at from the other side.

Verse 37. Understand once more in parenthesis—Such division it is quite necessary to permit, nay to occasion; for my faithful ones must thus approve themselves worthy of me!* This oft-repeated and severe saying (Luke xiv. 26, xviii. 29) is grounded upon the word of Moses concerning the true priests and Levites (Deut. xxxiii. 9, 10), as this again upon the history in Exod. xxxii. 26–29. That which the Lord God demanded in the Old Testament, with a strictness that required such an outward exhibition, Christ now demands for his own self, and here again takes the place of

* No sophistry can evade this. Roos remarks with sprightly truth, that the Redeemer did *not* say—The unskillfulness, singularity, undisciplined speech of my disciples will, alas, attract to them hatred and scorn; ah that they were wise enough to come off well with the world! He rather takes it all upon himself, that he himself excites men, etc.

God.* Only he who is one with God could thus, like God, place himself above father and mother, and demand an exclusive love, which should sacrifice even parental instinct. The principle of Matt. vi. 24 in the Sermon on the Mount is strictly applicable here. The rigor of the requirement, however, is abated by the perfect promise involved in the ἄξιός μου, *worthy of me.* Christ himself is the exceeding great reward of those who love him, the most lovely and the most to be loved, above all else. Because he is and ever will be such, he can and thus must speak.

Verse 38. A new and different meaning of the ἄξιός μου, *worthy of me*, discloses itself here, inasmuch as the most loving one has himself loved us even to the death of the cross! One thing is worthy of another by corresponding to it (which ἄξιος also signifies): we should therefore follow and cling to him even to disgrace and death. We, to whom that future, for which the Lord then prophesied, has become past and present, understand this well; but how marvellous must have been the sound of this word concerning the cross from our Saviour's lips, to his first disciples! *This* was not, like other sayings which he applied, a Jewish proverb, and was no where found in Holy Writ.† This was more anxiously brooded over by his followers than all that had been intimated in the sermon, or expressed in Matt. viii. 20; it remained inexplicable to the disciples, as oft as he repeated it (ch. xvi. 24; Mark x. 21; Luke ix. 23), and they could never be induced to receive it even figuratively in the full force of the figure. He who will submit to the death of the cross, will establish also a *kingdom of the cross*, before the kingdom of peace and of glory can enter in. He might have said—*My* cross, but he only intimates this in the word—*Me* (see ver. 25); he does not openly express it himself, but leaves it to his apostles and disciples afterwards to speak of their cross as *his*. The λαμβάνειν, *take up*, is a strong expression derived from the custom, according to which malefactors on the way to execution were required patiently to take up and carry the cross on which they were to die. Even so must *every* follower of Christ *take up* the cross, which on that account is properly *his own*, and essential to his following the Lord. It is already prepared and laid upon him; that he should make one for himself is unnecessary and forbidden. But the following verse teaches us that something deeper is meant* than merely bearing external afflictions for Christ.

Verse 39. The *cross* involved the idea of the deepest *disgrace* and ignominy, which man could then speak of; and the Lord therefore made it imperative that his followers should submit to its infliction, when the wicked for righteousness' sake, and the unbelievers for his name's sake, would have it so. The *cross* also was the most painful *death*, consummated through the most tedious agony: his will is, therefore, that we should stand ready and prepared to endure this or similar death, in the steadfast confession of his name. All this is strictly correct, but does not exhaust the meaning of the general and unconditional declaration, that *every* follower of Christ is to have *his own cross* which he must bear; for not all the disciples of Christ are so evil entreated and scorned, still less crucified or cruelly put to death. That the Lord speaks not merely of preparation for extraordinary conjunctures, but of the regular, and indispensable daily course of his disciples, is evident from the letter of the expression in this passage, and especially from the remarkable addition to it in Luke ix. 23: Let him deny himself, and take up his cross *daily*, καθ' ἡμέραν. We find such a saying only in this place, but its genuineness is most decidedly and certainly confirmed by the Syriac, Arabic and Latin versions. What then is that daily cross, which should never fail to await the follower of Christ, any more than the trial of every day (Matt. vi. 34) fails to await every man? Ver. 39 gives us the answer, and by this conclusion the former saying concerning the cross must be interpreted, and not conversely.

We have once more ψυχή, *life*, in that deeper sense in which we found it at ver. 28, pointing from the life of the body to a yet higher life. The striking declaration—He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life shall find it—contains, if both sayings are taken literally, a perfect contradiction; consequently the *finding* and *losing* must obviously, in the first place, be understood in different senses. We endeavor to extract its meaning thus: He who is εὑρών (one finding) to find it, and who *thinks* he has found it, by avoiding death, and who makes it *his aim* to preserve his temporal life (Mark viii. 34, ὃς ἂν θέλῃ σῶσαι; John xii. 25, ὁ φιλῶν), shall lose, shall forfeit it. But does this suit the second member—is ὁ ἀπολέσας he who *thinks* to lose it, or he who aims to lose it? Here something that actually takes place is intended, especially through the ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, *for my sake. Consequently*, in the second place, ψυχή, *life*, also must be taken in two opposite senses—He who gives up his life in the one sense, shall receive it again in another higher and better sense, as *his true life*. Now, since

* Ah that there were not an effeminate Church discipline, and household morality for God's own house too common among its rulers, who would at all hazards, maintain peace, even at last, between Christ and Antichrist!

† Neander brings forward a passage out of Plutarch (*De sera numinis vindicta*, cap. 9) where a similar expression, "to bear his own cross" is found. But we are far from concluding thence with him, that *Christ* could have spoken or did speak without any conscious reference to his own death upon the cross—for we have other evidence in abundance concerning Christ's consciousness.

* This saying signifies very much more than that they must be ever prepared for the punishment of death! (Schleiermacher, *zu Luc.* xiv. 27.)

the most obvious reference seems to be the cross immediately preceding, shall we harmonize it thus—He who loses his bodily life through bearing witness unto death (ver. 28), shall yet keep his life, shall find another; for he has only lost his body, not *essentially* his life or his soul? This will not suffice; for the promise would then have no distinctive relation to those who die *for his sake*, since in that sense the soul can never be killed or be lost. It is now time to think of Luke's καθ' ἡμέραν, *daily*, and of the ἀρνησάσθω or ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτόν, which is connected with it (as also in Mark viii. 34; Matt. xiv. 24)—*Let him deny himself!* It is in this word that we are to seek the key and explanation of the cross, the meaning of that life, which must absolutely be lost, and be continually surrendered to a painful death, in order to the finding of the true and better life. The *cross* is the death of the old life for the putting away of sin, that the resurrection of a new life from God and for God may follow unto holiness. The ψυχή or *life* which is to be killed, which must be crucified, is the sinful self-life of the old man, which is truly death; and this dead life must be mortified and lost by an internal, continual crucifixion and self-denial (of which the taking up of the external cross is only an external expression), in order that we may find the living life, our sanctified, glorified, and eternal life. Our Lord's teaching, therefore, is precisely the same as that of Paul afterwards, in Rom. vi. 4–11; viii. 13. The promise, therefore, of an abounding, compensating life to all who are put to death by man for Christ's sake, however true this superficial sense of it may be, is only the confirming sign and symbol of an inward meaning, which has its application for all. This, then, is the last and deepest *ground* on which the necessity of the διχάζειν, *variance* (ver. 35), is based. For that which must take place in the world as a whole, must also be accomplished in the microcosm of every individual inheritor of peace and eternal life—the separation and abolition of what is sinful. He who does not comprehend and submit to this, who consequently, in the retaining of his old self-life, regards himself as having found his ψυχή, is lost; but he who gives up, in the fellowship of the cross of Christ, all that must die and pass away, has by such loss obtained the gain of eternal blessedness. Thus the great εὑρήσει, *shall find*, forms a transition to the promise of *reward* and *victory*, after the struggles and the pains of the great finished warfare, whether viewed as external or internal, in the macrocosm of the world, or the microcosm of the Christian's life.

But at this concluding point our Lord's design is to lead back his discourse to the point from which it started, and with which it must close, and to wind it up as one entire whole, which, commencing with the first mission of the apostles, rose gradually to these high prospects. After having, therefore, spoken more especially, from verse 32 onwards, with reference to all his future disciples, with the formula πᾶς ὅστις and ὅς, he now returns once more to his first apostles, in whom he beholds all their and his own future successors. Hence the promise of verse 40 stands simply as it does, addressing the apostles particularly by the *you*, and yet setting forth the promise as only *implicitè* for *them*, for he passes on to a universal reference—*He that* receiveth you! But he immediately generalizes what had been said to the ἀποστόλοις or apostles, distinctively, and in their highest dignity, and descends by three stages; confirming in the promises which he addresses to those who receive them and believe, his ambassadors and witnesses of every degree as those in whom he will acknowledge himself to be represented. The first word ascends even to the ἀποστείλας, "*He that sent*," from whom he came forth into the world; the last condescends even to the μικροῖς, "*little ones*," whom he nevertheless regards as his messengers.

Verse 40. The δέχεσθαι, *receive*, refers back to verse 14, and has now fully unfolded itself as meaning no longer the mere external harboring and hearing of those who in their preliminary mission brought the first peaceful greetings of the kingdom nigh at hand, but the acceptance and following of their whole message and preaching, with faith which leads to full discipleship. The *and* is a progression of the promise, and is at the same time equivalent to *as;* for in John xx. 21, when the time of special fulfillment was fully come, the Lord repeats the same impressive words to his apostles—As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. The words which we have here, had before that been literally repeated (John xiii. 20), and with the additional intimation that the authority, which in its fullest force appertained to the apostles alone, should be shared in his degree by each successor (ἐάν τινα πέμψω). As in Luke x. 16, the same is said to the Seventy, with the addition of the opposite despising, and its consequence, which would not have befitted the character of *promise* which here marks the conclusion. But the *first* member—He that receiveth *you*, receiveth *me*, is only true through grace; the second—He that receiveth *me*, receiveth *the Father*, is essentially and fully true in itself. For no man, not even an apostle, can predicate of his relation to Christ the words and meaning of John xiv. 9, 10; it is not so much in their case the person, sinful and infirm, that is concerned, but the *office*, in which the Lord acknowledges his heralds, and will have himself acknowledged in them. He himself even, in a certain sense, demanded to be honored, not so much in his human personality, as in being the Sent of the Father; and thus it is that though one with the Father, he here humbly places himself on a level with them. He draws his own up to himself, while as the first and highest ἀπόστολος (Heb. iii. 1), he stoops down again to them. It is the same humility, always going side by side with his majesty, with which he places his "Me" un-

der the ἀποστείλαντα or Sender, even as he had said (verse 32)—Him will I confess also *before my Father* which is in heaven. The Son bears witness upon earth, by testimonies which perfectly accord, both to his sovereignty over all things, and to his dependence upon the Father.

Verses 41, 42. The three descending stages below the ἀποστόλοις or *apostles* are: first, a servant, ambassador, witness sent of God, in general, who might be called in the New Testament, προφήτης or *prophet*, because the new apostolical dignity had now reduced what was once the highest, to the second place (hence ch. xxiii. 34; Luke xi. 49); next, a δίκαιος or righteous man before God, one who belonged *to his saints* (Acts ix. 13), though without special mission; finally, a μαθητής or *disciple*, even though he were a μικρός or weak beginner, for out of these μικροῖς the δίκαιοι and the προφῆται spring, and the Lord will have ἕνα τούτων ("one of these") received also εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ ("*in the name of a disciple.*")* The *promise* is now given to the receiving and to the received in one, just as in ver. 22. ἐσεσθε μισούμενοι, *ye shall be hated*, was pre-announced at once to the preachers, and to those who believed their testimony. The δέχεσθαι or *receiving* is also regarded in the different corresponding degrees, from the believing obedience which is paid to the testimony received, down to the slightest refreshment which is afforded in the love of faith to the needy man because he is a disciple of Christ. All is embraced again within these two extremes, as in vers. 28 and 30 we found it to be between death and the losing of a hair of the head. Εἰς ὄνομα, "*in the name*," means, as freqently in the Mishna לְשֵׁם, עַל שֵׁם, מִשּׁוּם, מִשֵּׁם, *for the sake of any thing;* and in this that faith is pre-supposed even in the least exhibition of love, which makes its subjects capable of the reception of Christ in his servants, of the acknowledgment of *his* name, and only thus of the confession which will be rewarded. He who has done good to the confessors of Christ, from merely natural feeling, *quand même* not *parceque* (*although*, not *because*), derives not from thence any connection with his legitimate and finally victorious kingdom. Yet does this "in the name" descend in its comprehension to the lowest grade of faith, even to that which simply fears to deny to a disciple of Christ the cup of cold water; and the reward, as it is expressly declared, bears a strict relation to the reception which his disciples meet. He who can perceive and acknowledge the prophet as a prophet, and the righteous man as a righteous man, will partake of *his* reward—for through such reception he characterizes himself as likeminded with him whom he receives."* In the case of the μικροί, *little ones*, whose ποτίζειν, *giving to drink*, is here something different from, and less than what is meant in ch. xviii. 5, the Lord descends below the actual δέχεσθαι, *receiving:* therefore he does not promise to such the reward of a disciple, but simply (as Mark ix. 41), that he shall not lose *his* reward, that reward which is appropriate to him for that act. For every deed actually performed in love has its future reward (ch. vi. 2), if the right to it is not extinguished by preponderating sin: which brings to mind Luke xvi. 9 (the preparatory reception into the kingdom of peace, even though only as a Gibeonite and drawer of water *cum spe ascendendi*), as well as Matt. xxv. 40 (where mercy will rejoice against judgment, James ii. 13). Suffice it that though the manner of the fulfillment of those sayings remains among the mysteries of the last things, thus much is clear in this most gracious conclusion of far-reaching promise, that the Lord designs to comfort *his own* with his assurance that they are *regarded by him as precious*, and that the estimation in which *they* are held by man, will be matter of man's final judgment; that the least thing as well as the greatest in the development of his struggling kingdom, and in the fates of those who struggle for it, is regarded and recorded in their favor! There will come finally a day of reckoning, which will superabundantly reward all that shall deserve reward. Against that day the Lord gives his disciples the bond of his third, "verily I say unto you," as the seal of his eternal Amen—"I Jesus have said it with mine own mouth, I will repay it" (Philem. 19). Thus speaks he in his grace only of *recompense;* but he also leaves an undertone of denunciation to be inferred against those who despise—ver. 15 (Luke x. 16).

* We do not feel ourselves under obligation to give up this interpretation, so conformable to the context, on account of Lange's opposition, whose profoundly abstract *ideal* exposition we willingly leave our readers to compare with our own, and prefer it if they may. We refer, on our part, to the digest which we have given above, of the third portion of the discourse, according to which the great *conclusion*, that extends to *all* the messengers of the Lord, naturally requires such "various degrees beneath the apostolical dignity."

* Krummacher's *Elias*, (third Bandchen, p. 210).

THE REPLY AND DISCOURSE CONCERNING JOHN'S IMPRISONMENT.

(Matt. xi. 4–30; Luke vii. 22–35 [xvi. 16, x. 13–22].)

The opinion was first broached by Tertullian, that John himself in his prison became subject to weakness and obscuration of faith, and admitted into his mind doubts concerning Christ's person,—an opinion which was often refuted in earlier times, and, indeed, might seem to be very easy of refutation. We might be disposed, if it were urgently demanded, to allow thus much as possible in fact, viz: that the manifestation of Christ's kingdom was to his mind too long deferred, and that he would, by this public and solemn question, challenge the Lord to answer him by quicker action. Scarcely could we declare this, however, but we must again retract it, in deference to our own clear convictions. Pre-supposing the contents of John i. and iii. 27–36 to be true, it seems impossible, both on grounds of human psychology and divine administration, that this witness to the coming Light, created by God and sent as such, in order that all might believe in it, should have afterwards scandalized the world by his own unbelief. It is, moreover, just as impossible, that imprisonment should have proved too severe for the man of the wilderness, or that the meek and lowly One, whom his forerunner had instantly felt, when he came to his baptism, to be the Lamb of God, the appointed *atonement*, should ever have been thought by that forerunner too meek and too lowly in his journeyings of mercy. It is equally impossible that he who from beginning to end, bowed in such undoubting and profound homage before Christ, as the servant before his Lord, as the earthly before the heavenly, should ever have ventured to think of interfering with the lofty One, by the slightest word of human impatience. But let us now directly observe how the Lord in his discourse immediately commenced in honor of John. He disclaims for him (not without a design to contradict the misunderstanding of his message, which might possibly arise), in ver. 7, all inconstancy, and in ver. 8, all impatient desire of better days than he then saw, with a reference to his well-known character from the very beginning. Let us go on to hear, with ears rightly disposed, the impressive confirmation of vers. 11–19, where *the testimony of the forerunner already come, is made the foundation for the assurance that the Messiah is also come;* and we can no longer permit ourselves to regard the warning of ver. 6, as a hint which the Baptist himself required, and which might meet his own case. They who still think so, have not yet understood aright the whole discourse of our Lord, which indeed as a continuous answer most decisively explains the meaning of the question which had been sent. No, John acts in the prison, where he had heard from his disciples what he had received as no other than the "works of *the Christ*" (Luke vii. 18),* in precise conformity with his own great function, to point his disciples to this Christ. Because, while they are dependent upon himself, they are not thoroughly disposed to trust his own words alone; he therefore sends them to Christ that they may ask him themselves: and for their encouragement in going, He meekly permits them to do this as from himself, and by his commission; careless of any misconstruction which might ensue, and leaving its solution to his Lord who well knows his mind.

Nearly thus was the question viewed by Chrysostom, Euthymius, Theophylact, etc., among the fathers. Now, indeed, I stand almost alone (even since the first edition of the present work) in the maintenance of this opinion; since most even of the later orthodox expositors, with strange earnestness declare themselves for an actual doubt on the part of the Baptist, a wavering or defeat of his faith, a "reaction from his earlier position," etc.† They can bring many arguments for their view, and some of them containing much truth in themselves. As a general position, for instance, we are willing to admit that believers, men of God, may fail, and from time to time have fallen, into such obscurations of faith; but we cannot, by any means, admit the application of it to the present case. This would not be a sudden paroxysm of weakness in faith, such as *every Christian* knows by experience,‡ but would involve the deliberate, palpable, public scandal of the retraction of the testimony, officially given at an earlier time, and of the utmost importance, by the same person "who came for a witness" (John i. 7); and such an anomaly would be without precedent among all the prophets, messengers, and witnesses of God.

The excellent Neander, even, expresses his

---

* Alford is not quite right when he says that "this is the only place where that name (τοῦ Χριστοῦ), standing alone, is given to our Lord in this Gospel." Properly speaking it is not so given here, but it is only designed to say, that John heard "the *Messiah* works (of this Jesus)."

† Lange adheres undeviatingly to his opinion "that even the Baptist must be regarded as having been, for a moment, among those who *misapprehended* Christ"—against which, the second verse of Matthew, well weighed, already protests. Ficker, in his *Sermons*, "The Doubters of the New Testament," devotes to our text the third of his sermons, and places the Baptist himself among the doubters.

‡ Thus Hengstenburg in his *Christologie*.

opinion, that while "scientific knowledge and judgments, once obtained by logical induction, can never again be lost, so long as the powers of the mind remain unimpaired," the convictions of faith, which spring from processes of the higher life, are not so secure and lasting; but what shall we say to this, in view of the shifting, changeable scientific positions and logical inductions of our learned philosophers before us! We rather maintain, with the fullest assurance of right, that what comes to us from above as *revelation*, is far more immovably rooted in the mind than our philosophy and logic; and that most assuredly what is revealed by official testimony of the highest importance could never be left exposed to the consequences of the human infirmity of the witness, and thereby to the eventual public contradiction of that testimony. The divine permission may allow it to be so with us preachers and theologians; but the Baptist whose prerogative it was to be the herald of the Messiah to the Jewish nation and the world, occupied, in the counsels and plans of God for his kingdom, so high an official position, that we cannot suppose him to have been permitted by God to sink below it for a moment. We beg that *this* point may be carefully observed, as generally, in consequence of a want of adherence to the entireness of this plan, it is most unwarrantably overlooked. When John the Baptist testifies of Christ as the Lamb of God, that testimony must rest upon unclouded and distinct knowledge, penetrating into Scripture truth, and firmly held in the spirit; a knowledge and assurance, to say the least, as little likely to be lost as any logical induction. In Neander himself we perceive traces of a *suspicion* that his view is untenable, since he ventures to affirm that the author of the report of the doubting question could not have been acquainted with the earlier testimony borne by the Baptist to Jesus, else he would not have failed to notice it in his account! How little disposed *we* are to concede such ignorance in the Evangelists, our readers well know.

According to Von Gerlach, "John, notwithstanding his illumination for the earlier testimony, stood yet within the economy of the Old Covenant, and had *the same* internal conflict, as the disciples of Jesus had afterwards; for he found that, quite contrary to his *supposition*, the kingdom of God did not appear in external manifestation of power." Actually *the same*, does he think, as that of the disciples while yet receiving their training and not yet installed into their office? And did not his *prophetic* illumination, about which we hear nothing in the case of the disciples, his *official grace* and *official consecration* make any difference in his favor? The ambassador and his public character as such are too much lost sight of in the mere personal man. Nor is there the slightest trace in his earlier public testimonies of any proof that he did *intend* to announce a kingdom of external authority. It is also said that "in his temptation he lost the traces of the divine enlightenment"—but I would ask again whether an Isaiah in the economy of the Old Testament would have lost such tokens? Now the Baptist is greater than all the prophets before him, and stands upon the very *threshold* of the New Covenant. That single word concerning the Lamb of God reveals to us a degree of certain knowledge, which, while in harmony with the illumination of all former prophecy, left no room for those Messianic expectations to which even the disciples in some degree still clung. If the utmost were granted, that he for a while doubted, pondered, wavered in his prison (which, however we do not believe); yet the open and public question could never have been permitted of God. Von Gerlach again makes a concession, when he says that "it was his desire, at *the same time*, to direct his disciples to Jesus, through the resolution of the doubt"—to this we also adhere; but if he had desired the satisfaction of any *mere* doubt, for *his own* sake, he would not have asked, in a plain, broad question—*Art* thou or art thou not the Messiah? It is rather the very *striking point* of the question, which appears to be in conflict with his own previous testimony (This is He!), that in this background it presupposes him to mean (as all the people, after the discourse of Jesus would observe)—For my own part, I know and have borne my witness, but let him tell you himself, my disciples, that ye *may believe* (John i. 7). Every thoughtful mind must have thus understood *this* question put by *this* witness, must have supposed that another meaning lay beneath it; somewhat as if the minister of state should let the king be asked, if he were really king.

Finally, it is said that the "obscuration" which befell the "witness of the light," did not consist in any uncertainty as to the person of the Lord (this, however, is the literal sense of his question, which, consequently, is given up in its letter), so much as in a kind of "impatience" which could not await the critical time:* but we have radical scruples about this; for not only must it necessarily have sprung from a grievous lack of spiritual perception in John, but it would further involve a contradiction to that ever humble relation of John to the Lord, which rendered such reminding and prompting utterly impossible to him. Lösselt has lately put this in the most objectionable form: "Scarcely was he in the prison than the time began to seem already long, before Jesus began to glorify himself *in him* (?); and thus failing, he not only entertained doubts himself, but infected his disciples also." This is thoughtless and foolish language concerning the greatest prophet, who himself well knew his fate as a

* To Hase "it was not doubt but *monition*." So Lange thinks, "the question of John has not been sufficiently considered in the light of an impatient desire for Christ's open manifestation."

† In his *Wochenblatte*—"Der Fischer" (1845, No. 50).

prcphet, and suffered patiently, all the more patiently as he had announced for the Messiah only the death of a victim.

In opposition to all these various hypotheses, whether strongly or firmly held, of otherwise orthodox men, I cannot but take my stand with Niemeyer, who, in his *Charakteristik der Bibel* (new edit., i., p. 57), firmly adheres to the right, against all these untenable views, and though not following the traditional orthodoxy in other respects, does so with great simplicity of judgment ; and with Schleiermacher, who sets out with the assertion that "John himself *could* not have entertained doubts as to the Messiahship of Jesus," although he then hazards the supposition that the words of the messengers have been by abbreviation placed in that false light. We think this latter idea not at all necessary. As those words lie in the record, John does not merely permit a question to be asked "for appearance," an idea that is to be instantly rejected, but with an earnestness which both Jesus and the people understood, bids his disciples *go and ask him themselves.* We cannot see any thing inappropriate in this view, and its acceptance *alone* makes the whole procedure conceivable and comprehensible. "To direct his disciples to Jesus, *nothing more would be wanting* than distinctive explanations from their master," is the opinion of Braune ; but we cannot agree to this, for in the case of the greater part of John's disciples, who were not induced to go to Christ, the direct contrary was the fact. Nor was it a "circuitous way," but the only one which would succeed, to send some of them directly to the Lord.*

But enough of preliminary polemics and defence ; let us go to the text. What Matthew communicates in this entire chapter, is a progressive series of sayings, spoken continuously, and forming one great concerted discourse, gradually advancing towards its climax, which, in vers. 27–30 gives the most complete answer to the question that had been received. The Evangelist plainly asserts this in vers. 7 and 20 (in both cases alike ἤρξατο, *began*), and in ver. 25, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἀποκριθείς, *at that time he answered ;* and it is no objection to this that Luke, who, in ch. vii., gave the greater part of this discourse in literal unison with Matthew, has afterwards recorded sundry repetitions of it as actually uttered on another occasion, ch. x. and ch. xvi. 16. We do right, therefore, to regard the whole, as it here lies before us, as the *discourse of Jesus on occasion of the message of John ;* and shall take a general glance at the process of thought in its advancing development, before we enter upon the exposition itself. The well-disposed reader, to whom our summaries may have already commended themselves, will find this arrangement confirmed, by reading it again after the exposition has been read. The one fundamental theme from beginning to end may be thus expressed: The Lord speaks of the faith and unbelief of his own generation, in the twofold testimony extant in it, which both prepared for and offered the kingdom of heaven ; the kingdom which was as assuredly come as the two ἐρχόμενοι, or *comers* were.

The whole resolves itself into three main sections—for in the things of God, we find almost every where a trichotomy. First is the direct answer to those who were sent (vers. 4–6), as an introductory preface, which already intimates all that follows ; then (vers. 7–19), the continuous discourse to the people concerning John and Christ, in their harmony with one another, and consentient testimony ; finally, from verse 21 onwards, the conclusion addressed to the faith and unbelief of his own age, uttered with the highest contrasts of severity and gentleness.

I. The answer to the messengers points out the manifest *signs of him who has come*, both in his *dignity* and in his *humility*—as shown in miracles and in preaching, whose agreement both with prophecy and with each other, should be evidence enough for faith ; and in that lowliness, also prophesied, at which unbelief takes offence. In this the two following sections are already sketched and prepared for, which may be defined as first, *exposition* of the testimony now among them, but which so few believed, and then *warning* against unbelief ; at the close of the whole, however, there is an additional invitation to faith, proceeding from most obvious mercy and grace. The indication of the signs in word and work is directed apparently *to John* at first, from whom the question came ; as the gracious One was not willing harshly to unveil before the people by any word of his the state of things in the messengers themselves, to their shame and offence. First, it is given generally, *those things which ye do hear and see ;* then follows a specific statement in consistency with prediction. In verse 6, however, there follows another sign of the appearance of the Messiah, also the subject of prophecy, but which is a stumbling-block to men ; and the Lord uses such an expression as must refer to the *disciples of John*, first of all (a slight *contrast* with their Master being implied), and, at the same time, to all who are unbelievers. *Warning* and *promise* to unbelief and to faith, are here interwoven ; and consequently we may regard μακάριος, "blessed," as being a prelude to the gracious invitation which in vers. 28–30 forms the conclusion.*

* Alford will not altogether accept my view, but concedes that "the idea of his faith being weakened by his imprisonment, is quite inconsistent not only with John's character, but with our Lord's discourse in this place." Be it so. If he now, being himself convinced, only desired a *declaration* from our Lord's own mouth, this declaration certainly was not intended for his own sake, but for his disciples to quiet them, to "set them at rest" as Alford says. Wherein, in that case, do we differ ?

* Not that our Lord himself consciously and purposely so ordered it. The harmony and signifi-

II. In order, however, decisively to prevent all misunderstanding of the mission, and that he may take the question, in the sense in which John put it, as occasion for a further and true answer to it, the Lord proceeded, when the messengers had departed,* to speak to the people *concerning John*. But he speaks of John as the forerunner who had come, and consequently, at the same time, and afterwards more expressly, *concerning himself* as also come. This is, so to speak, the predominant *instruction* and *exposition* in the middle of the discourse, which lays the foundation for the *warning* and *promise* of its decisive close. The substance of its contents is: the public, though generally discredited, *testimony of the days of John the Baptist, and of Christ for their contemporaries*, in its convincing connection and harmony. *Specific instruction* (vers. 7–15) precedes, and a progressive *reference to unbelief and faith* (vers. 16–19) prepare for the following most emphatic threatening and promise.

1. The instructive comment speaks in vers. 7–11 of *John*, in vers. 11–15 of *Christ;* but the latter reference is veiled, as always, before the people, so that the name "Christ" is avoided: yet all who had ears to hear must have heard in his words evidence enough as to who that "Son of Man" (ver. 19) could be, who came as John had come. *Concerning John*, first, *what he is not*, convincingly to refute the misapprehension which might arise among the people then (and among expositors now); by a natural figure describing the *earlier* John, the unshaken man of the wilderness (ver. 7), and then, in plainer and stronger terms, describing John as he then was, and *now is*, the same man in imprisonment, who even there is *consistent with his former self*, and does not, through inconstancy or desire of freedom, put a *question* concerning that *now*, which he had *then* so fearlessly *testified* (ver. 8). Assuredly, a most plain and undeniable argument! Then follows positively, and based upon this, *what he is:* not only *a* prophet; like one of the prophets (still in transition from the negative, ver. 9), but *the greatest* among all, and after all the messengers of God down to this time: the forerunner of Christ (ver. 10), himself predicted by other prophets, the only one enjoying this honor save that One, who is emphatically ὁ ἐρχόμενος (the Comer), and therefore the greatest of all the prophets, *the Baptist* (ver. 11). And if this man has fulfilled his function (for in his prison he is even now drawing nigh to the end of his mission), who then am I? The Lord does not now utter this openly, yet it is decisively involved in these words, which only derive their full exposition from a general view of the whole connection and spirit of the context.

And now, the *kingdom of heaven itself* arises before us in its altogether new dignity, so that he *in* it who is least, is greater than the greatest who are without and at its threshhold, as we find it still in ver. 11. It *enters in with power:* such is the meaning of the designedly obscure sentence (ver. 12), which is so arranged as to embrace the mighty, constraining witness which had been borne, and its results, both in the mighty opposition of unbelief, and the mighty pressing in of faith; blending the whole into one vivid description of the great crisis, which has plainly arrived. It is *the time of fulfillment!* The time of prophecy, of preparation is past (ver. 13); the forerunner, who is himself a portion of this fulfillment is come (ver. 14); and therefore—but the remainder scarcely needed to be expressed: *He that has ears to hear, let him hear!* (ver. 15). This is the conclusion of the comment upon the present circumstances which had transpired.

2. There now follows a reference to the unbelief and the faith which responded to that mighty testimony which was so publicly given to the kingdom of heaven in this important age. That reference, however, is predominantly to the *predominant unbelief* of the generation as a whole; for the circumstances of the case required this, the few who believed in the midst of so overwhelming a majority of unbelievers not being in the first instance regarded at all. The universal unbelief of the *childish* children of this age, which had nevertheless beheld and heard the most wonderful things, appears as uttering its own condemnation, dishonoring itself while dishonoring God. The *two who had come* are placed in opposition to their own generation, which, in its infatuation, would neither hear the law nor the Gospel, neither submit to repentance nor accept the kingdom of heaven; this opposition being first exhibited in a vivid and convincing simile (vers. 16, 17), and then in a direct, explanatory declaration (vers. 18, 19). But, finally, there is an encouraging glance at the *rare and infrequent faith*, by which the *childlike* children of wisdom—her truly docile and instructed scholars—*justify* the revelation of God in the twofold unity of its exhibition, and are themselves evidence and seals of the truth of the testimony both of John and of Christ (John iii. 33).

III. The sublime and impressive *conclusion* is now sufficiently prepared for, which is put by the Spirit of the Father into the lips of the Son, his soul being first moved to holy *wrath*, and then by quick transition to gentle and inviting *meekness*. That which, in ver. 6, was expressed as a combination of threatening and promise, *warning* and *invitation*, is now distributed in detail; the "*blessed is he*" being resolved into *woes*, denounced against those who have been offended in him, and gracious *invitation* to corresponding *blessedness* for such as come to him and accept his yoke.

cance which are preserved in a poetical work of art through all its detail, is not regarded as the result of an elaborate arrangement marked out either before or during the writing of it; but our comments upon the organism of the words of the Holy Ghost have been foolishly misunderstood, as if some such thing as this was signified.

* As Matthew significantly does not omit to remark.

1. The threatening of impending judgment upon the general *unbelief* is as yet confined within the limits of *Galilee* (with allusion to ch. x. 15), the immediate scene of our Lord's first wonderful works; the towns being named first (two of them selected as examples, vers. 21, 22), and then the proud capital (vers. 23, 24), the specification of which contains a latent reference to Jerusalem.

2. The *invitation* to blessedness and rest for the soul, which does not cease, even in the midst of general unbelief, to sound forth in accents of meekness and patience, is put by the Father into the mouth of the Son, through an *internal* consolation, which he received at the same moment, stilling the holy zeal of his indignation by the view of the Father's never-failing honor in his simple ones. Hence, the Lord first *answers* this secret inspiration (vers. 25, 26), by a lowly yet sublime *glorification of the Father*, which submissively sees the good pleasure of God's counsel as the *ground* of the procedure depicted in vers. 16–19, and of the resulting faith and unbelief, though its wisdom the wise cannot comprehend. This is followed by the preaching of the Gospel to the poor and the wretched (verse 5), bursting as a stream of love from the depths of this profound and mysterious principle. The Lord descends from the high contemplation of his eternal dignity, and the Father's eternal counsel, to the wretched objects of his Gospel of mercy. The Father hath delivered all things to the Son, he reveals and imparts blessedness only through him; but the Son *invites all*,* all, that is, who feel their misery and their need of him, in order that they may find refreshment and rest under his easy yoke, and his light burden!

Here, then, the *answer* to John's question reaches its fullest emphasis and expression—I verily am He; come unto me, and wait for no other! Here, also, the Gospel of Matthew (which being the first, was yet written with the same aim as the last, to produce the belief that *Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*), reaches its first impressive concluding point, so that we may fitly make it the close of the first portion of our exposition.† We might pause here to remark and to adore the divine wisdom, also, in the arrangement of the Gospels; especially to observe the significant conclusion of Matthew's chapters, as they progressively follow. Ch. i. closes with the most holy name of *Jesus*—ch. ii. with that of the despised *Nazareth*—ch. iii. gives the voice from heaven, which testifies of this Jesus of Nazareth, *This is my beloved Son!* Upon this trilogy of introduction, ch. iv. follows at its close designating and opening up the scene of his words and works—ch. vii. gives the grand conclusion of the first great discourse—ch. ix., after the first cycle of examples of his miraculous works, which already excited the enmity of the Pharisees, casts at its close the glance of mercy upon the great harvest then waiting in the land—ch. x., at the end of the first mission, directs that glance into the far future, where *nothing should remain unrewarded*—and ch. xi. closes with this sublime, *Come unto me!* And so also may it be seen in the same way how ch. xii. (chs. xiii. and xiv. in contrast with each other), chs. xvi., xix., xxii., xxiii., xxv., terminate respectively in the most significant conclusions.

Verse 4 is indeed spoken, corresponding as it does with the words of the message, as if the Lord regarded the pregnant question as actually the question of John himself, and directed to him, also his answer. But this is only the result of his gracious condescension to the weakness of the messengers, with which he sympathises even as their master had done; and we cannot so regard it as to say (with Alford) that the Lord would not have thus answered, had not the question come directly from the Baptist himself. Or, are we to receive the words of Luke (vers. 18, 19), according to their plain letter, which in προσκαλεσάμενος ἐπεμψε, *calling to him—he sent*, and yet more in δύο τινάς, *a certain two*, seems to intimate that the whole matter proceeded directly from John? No, Luke, although he has not recorded the Baptist's earlier direction of his disciples to Jesus, and here appends an explanation of the subject in all its relations (vers. 29, 30), yet pre-supposes, from his earlier (ch. iii. 22), as well as from the immediately following discourse of Jesus, that his thoughtful readers will understand him aright, when he thus objectively relates the circumstance. The individual Evangelists naturally pre-suppose and take for granted rather too much than too little in their compressed narratives, without comments; and *we* must remember that we now have the whole under our eye. Nothing was nearer the Baptist's heart, since the first public manifestation of Jesus, than to direct his own disciples to him, with an incessantly repeated—Behold the Lamb of God! this is He! We perceive this once and again in John i. 29–37, and John iii. 24–36 is an example and testimony *instar omnium*, of the manner in which John from that time to his imprisonment, dealt with and spoke to those of his disciples whose minds were not yet clearly convinced as to the claims of Jesus. Consequently, those who were *still* his disciples, who remained attached to him, and would rather adhere to him in his imprisonment than go over to the Nazarene, were *eo ipso*, only such as could not and would not believe that that Nazarene was the Christ. When Luke, therefore, writes δύο τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ,* "a certain two *of his dis-*

* Not merely the Son of David, and the seed of Abraham (ch. i. 1).

† Although in another, and more formal relation, the beginning of the *Parables* in ch. xiii. might have well formed the commencement of a section.

* The reading διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν, in Matthew, though now preferred, is to us doubtful. At most

ciples." He takes it for granted, by a pre-supposition natural enough to himself, though perhaps, if we may say so, not sufficiently mindful of Theophilus, that the forerunner had on good grounds sent these men to Christ. John, who had said before—But I must decrease! and who had a clear perception from beginning to end, of his one only duty to prepare the way, in his own entire course, for him who was to come, knew that he was to fulfill his course only through imprisonment and death, that thus he must contribute to destroy all carnal expectations of the Messiah, and then make way for him to whom his own mission referred. It is an object deeply impressed upon his heart, to send, before his own expected death, all such as were not convinced by him of the Messiahship of Jesus, to Jesus himself; and he selects, of his own accord, two among the number of those thus situated, possibly two pre-eminent doubters, for this decisive mission. His question, like that of the Lord himself, in Matt. xvi. 13, has the benefit of the disciples in view. But when the Lord makes answer—Go and *show John again* those things which ye do hear and see, he only refers them again, for their conviction and humiliation, to what they had already done—Tell him again, that he may again tell you—these are the works of *Christ!* The question was, Do we *look for* another? are we, by renewed weary waiting, to expect a Future which never appears? The answer cries in impressive response—No! *He is here*, he whom ye look for, all that was to come, is *manifestly before you*, to be *heard*, and *seen:* prophecy has become reality and history before *your* eyes and ears, as well as those of all the people (Luke iv. 21). The *hearing* refers first of all to the rumor which (according to Luke vii. 17) had gone forth throughout all Judea, and throughout all the region round about, concerning the wonderful works of Jesus, and which had been reported to John. The *seeing* adds to this the then present confirmation to their eyes; for in *the same hour*, Luke tells us, he cured many of their infirmities and plagues, so that no further answer was in reality needed than—Open your eyes, and ye find it so! But then the words which follow, further embrace both the *hearing and the seeing* in one; and it is not without significance that what they *hear* comes first, thus placing the last-mentioned preaching of the Gospel before the seeing of the miracles. (For here Matthew is more exact than Luke, who inverts this order.) To speak quite strictly, the seeing must turn to hearing, the miracles must become words, and the works must be witnesses, that so, by hearing them, faith may come. The miracles confirm the preaching, but the preaching explains their significance: hence, in verse 15 it is *only*—He that hath ears to hear, let him *hear!*

Verse 5. The Lord had indeed, in a certain sense, said all in this first word, but he graciously points with his finger to evidences of his mission, even in deference to their desire, performing himself the work of the Baptist to John's disciples. In exhibiting these in detail he refers to passages in the prophets as fulfilled; but with a grandeur of application which should be evident to our modern scribes, in proportion as it is free from any such petty exhibition of personal marks and signs, as their wisdom, in a certain sense, rightly repudiates. The same Isaiah, to whom the Baptist had appealed when his authority was questioned, out of whose prophecy he had taken his testimony to the Lamb of God, is on that very account brought forward again by Jesus himself. He predicts in ch. xxix. the siege and destruction of Jerusalem (but not merely of that which was immediately impending, comp. ver. 3 with Luke xix. 43), then the blinding and delusion of Israel, then the great change that will twice take place between the forest and the field, the fruitful field and the wilderness—first in the rejection of Israel and the admission of the Gentiles, then finally when Israel's hardness shall pass away, so that the *deaf* again *hear* the words of the book, the eyes of the *blind see*, and the *meek* (πτωχοί) have joy in the Lord. The same prophecy recurs with additional emphasis in ch. xxxv., the sublime concluding chapter of the first portion of Isaiah's prophecies. When Idumea is judged, the desert shall blossom abundantly, and the salvation of God shall appear; when the eyes of *the blind* shall be opened, and the ears of *the deaf* shall be unstopped, then shall the *lame man* leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing praise! That which in these two passages, pointing far forward to the final restoration of Israel, is obviously predicted, as we say, in a *spiritual* meaning, as *typical* of internal spiritual healing (though the second of them includes external prosperity), our Lord here indicates as having received also a physical fulfillment, or as *embodied* in his miracles of healing. He quotes in the same manner as his Evangelist does (Matt. viii. 17); for in the living relation between prophecy and fulfillment there is a reciprocal alternation, so that prophetic announcements which were delivered in sensible figures, are illustrated in their spiritual reality, and on the other hand, predictions not intended in their external sense, are nevertheless fulfilled in physical embodiment (The entrance of Christ into Jerusalem upon the ass, as the Prince of Peace, is an instance in point.) The Messiah's miracles of healing, as such, and as physical in themselves, could not be predicted, since prophecy deals with the internal meaning and mystery of things; they could only be contemplated beforehand in the same signification which they bear to those who behold them in their external and actual appearance, viz: as *symbols of spiritual healing.* The accordance, first, between Christ's preaching of salvation to the poor and the miserable, and his beneficent miracles of healing, and

it only freely describes the circumstance as it appeared—the disciples were permitted to ask as in John's name.

then the accordance of both these, of what is both heard and seen in him, with what is written concerning him who was to come, constitute his works a *sign* and testimony that *it is He*.

The Lord, proposing to give examples (of course not complete) of his works—the *miracula, prædicta, beneficа, multa, varia* (Bengel) which testify of him, constructs a succession of three members, each of which embraces two parts joined by the conjunctive *καί, and* (which Luke does not observe). He mentions the *blind* and the *lame* first, out of the prophecies, one being taken from each; he then connect the *deaf*, found in both these passages, with the *lepers*, found in neither. Isaiah's saying concerning the *dumb* is passed over, as also much else in the detail of fulfillment; for instance, the casting out of devils (which in Luke, ver. 21, had just taken place before their eyes) is included in the healing of the sick. For the Lord who takes no delight in the detailed relation of his own works, though he must now condescend to it, hastens with profound meaning to that greatest act, which transcended all prophecy or expectation—*the dead are raised up*—in order to connect it, for its right interpretation, with the πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται, *the poor have the Gospel preached unto them*. For it was already a proverb among the Jews, that God always goes beyond his promised grace, and gives ever in addition something new and still greater. There must of course have taken place more awakenings of the dead than *one*, when the Lord said this; we read of the first in Matt. ix., Luke has recorded the other at Nain, and this also was included in all those things which the disciples of John showed him of.* Now, because the works of Jesus had gone so far as the raising of the dead, and yet he did nothing further for the advent of his kingdom or the deliverance of their imprisoned master, the disciples of John told him of these things with some mixture of displeasure and offence at such a state of things, just as before in John iii. 26. The Lord penetrates all this. He does not now say—And captives have deliverance preached to them, according to his quotation from Isa. lxi. 1 at Nazareth, where the spiritual meaning was plain. Still less does he say—And the kingdom of God is made manifest, which, *uttered now*, neither the people nor the disciples were capable of understanding. But he quite unexpectedly, though rightly, according to prophecy and fulfillment, appends to the greatest miracle of raising the dead that last *and greatest of all testimonies*, which itself exhibits the true significance of all the former—*the preaching of the Gospel to the poor!*† This last is taken at once from Isa. lxi. 1, and xxix. 19: the εὐαγγελίζονται, *have the Gospel preached*, falling at the close of the answer, has the chief emphasis, that the kingdom of heaven is come: the πτωχοί, *poor*, are, first of all, the externally mean, to whom, without money and without the Rabbinical price for teaching, the joyful tidings are announced as a free gift, but also, and essentially, the poor and mournful in spirit, such as those of which Isa. lxi. 1 speaks.† The *preaching of repentance* went forth also to the rich and exalted, yea, rightly understood, to those distinctively; the Gospel belongs to the low and the miserable. The preaching continues ever to this day, and produces in men's souls all these *works of Christ*, of which history is full, and more abounding and truly than could then have been heard and seen with bodily eyes and ears. The blind see (Acts xxvi. 18), the dead arise, hearing the voice of the Son of God (John v. 25), which is immediately connected with the former by καί.‡ Those who sit in the prison-house hear of it when it is announced to them by those who yet know not themselves the meaning of what they say; or those who will not know and embrace it: for there follows one more καί, which introduces the critical *seventh* member of the paragraph.

Verse 6. This καί is not *but*—the *offence* of many at the humble circumstances of the Messiah, notwithstanding all his wonderful works, is also a token and sign of his person derived from prophecy (Isa. lii. 13–14, liii. 2, viii. 14). The Lord gives utterance, thus, to what he had ofttimes experienced since his first manifestation in Nazareth, to what had, alas, become now as well known as his works themselves; yet it is *not* included in what they had heard and seen, and should tell *John* again; but (as if to intimate that) this manner of speaking passes into *warning*, which might be applicable to the *disciples* themselves whom he addressed:§ I know well that *ye* have yet somewhat in your hearts against me; else would ye not have come to ask, when the

* It is made equivalent to certainty, by internal evidence, that the young man at Nain was raised *after* the daughter of Jairus; and so the various reading τῷ for τῇ ἑξῆς, Luke vii. 11 (overlooked by Ebrard), acquires a decisive significance in the harmony. [In this transposition of these events, however, the author stands almost alone among harmonists. He is still influenced by his theory of exalting the accuracy of Matthew at the expense of that of Luke.—Am. Ed.]

* For thus must it be translated, comp. 2 Sam. xviii. 31, Septuagint; and with another subject in the passive, Luke xvi. 16. That the poor preached the Gospel, cannot be the question here.

† Certainly not, as Schleiermacher supposed: "Those who are not in condition in the *legal* sense to shine out, πτωχοὶ κατὰ νόμον καὶ παράδοσιν."

‡ This is the truth in Schleiermacher's strange idea that the raising of the dead is to be taken only figuratively, since otherwise there would be a tone of *vain-glory* quite foreign to the manner of Jesus. How has this great theologian stumbled and lost his way, when the true exposition of *Scripture* is concerned!

§ There is no ground whatever for referring this warning to the Baptist himself, and thence to derive a supposed *proof* that he himself had been offended in Jesus.

answer which ye have received had been already so plainly given. The truly *poor* understand the Gospel message, and receive it in faith, so that they rejoice in the Lord. To all others the works testify aloud: *This is He!* yet the preaching which they also hear, being no more than preaching, so that even the raising of the dead is no more than a call to dead souls to life in God, shows them the great truth, that he is *not such a Messiah* as they expected and would have. To him who gives not his heart to the preaching, all miracles are vain for its explanation, and remain themselves misunderstood. Thus, then, the Lord gave a plain and concise answer to a plain and concise question—and the concluding words touch precisely the spirit that put the question. Instead of crying—*I am He!* (which indeed would have been but of little service), he searches out in these disciples, and in the people (with regard to whom this last saying was a transition to the following discourse) all that unbelief and delusion which stood in the way of the acknowledgment of himself, in order that their faith might be excited to overcome all offence, and respond to him—*Yea, thou art He!* to Him who sometimes proclaims his wonderful *I* in kingly majesty over all things and over all persons, and sometimes restrains it as here, though with all his humility it cannot but come out in the final words of his reply; in the σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί, "shall be offended in *me*."

Verses 7—11. Now first, as the disciples departed or when they had gone, Jesus began to speak *concerning John:* by which the Evangelist would assure us, in an undertone, that he had not referred to the Baptist before, especially not in his last saying touching offence. But *why* did he let them first depart, and not utter what follows in their hearing? The Evangelist's observation makes a latent design perceptible, without anticipating, however, the thought of the reflecting reader by any direct reflection of his own. The disciples of John had obtained what they wanted, a decisive answer to the desire of their question, which, if not directly expressed, was plain enough for their after-meditation. Any thing further said for them or done in their presence, would have had an evil effect. Would it have been fitting that the Lord should endeavor, by detailed and continued explanations, to ripen or hasten the development of the slowly struggling faith of these not insignificant "men" (Luke ver. 20), upon whom their master had already expended much pains? This would have been far less effectual than the brief message with its piercing point at the close; and would have assumed before the people the unbecoming appearance of exceedingly sedulous anxiety concerning them on his part. Or, was anything further requisite to be communicated to John? Assuredly not, for both the angel of preparation and the Angel of the Covenant understood one another perfectly well, according to a far better plan of common operation than that which, as is the opinion of many fools, they had concerted in the lodges of the Essenes. What our Lord goes on to say concerning John, it was needless that his disciples should carry to him for his consolation; and its appearance would have been that of adulation to the people. But so much the more necessary was it that the people, in whose minds the great question had excited many thoughts, should have a further testimony and assurance that John was not, as at first sight it might have seemed, in doubt concerning Jesus.*

The entire history of the Baptist, which at the time caused so great a sensation, had now to a great extent faded away and become old; the Lord, therefore, wisely takes this occasion to bring it back to the people's thoughts, and speaks concerning it in a manner similar to ch. xxi. 24, 25. He commences by giving his due honor to the man who in this inconstant, childish generation had fallen into unhonored oblivion; and by pointing out the permanent dignity of the prisoner, whom he, however, does not release. He founds upon the testimony of his forerunner, which, without miracles (John x. 41), had awakened so universal a response, the evidence of his own Messiahship, and of the presence of the kingdom of heaven. The general concourse of the people to the preacher in the wilderness, however little permanent effect resulted from it, was a public confession on which an appeal to them might always afterwards be founded; they had willingly heard the announcement "Repent ye," they had for the most part submitted to baptism, and thereby confessed not only that they were sinners, but that they admitted *repentance to be the only way to the kingdom of heaven.* All this they are *reminded* of by the Lord's questions, and by the sharp sayings which recall the scene, and vividly paint it before their memory. How was it then, when ye flocked to the wilderness? While he thus speaks concerning John, he is in reality speaking also concerning them, and piercing their hearts and consciences.

Verses 7—9. These words of our Lord belong pre-eminently to those of his discourses which most illustriously exhibit his wisdom in *teaching.* Under a simple and popular expression, the essential meaning of which every one who heard it must have understood, and the strongly marked form of which would cleave to the memory, there is concealed an endless fulness of deep thoughts and of interwoven relations, which only by degrees would rise before the thoughtful attention. The *thrice repeated*—What went ye out for to see? is itself a most *emphatic* reference to the impulse which urged them to go forth, and also to what they learned from thus going forth, bringing forcibly to their minds both the one and the other. But what follows each simi-

* This correct view is found distinctly and expressly maintained in Chrysostom (*Hom.* xxxvii).

lar question in progressive development, is arranged with a precise and specific purpose. The discourse proceeds from the *reed* of the wilderness, from the *external scene* thus vividly recalled, to the *man* or the *person* who was to be seen there, and then advancing still further, to the dignity of his personality, as a *prophet*. The great point here to which the rest leads is this—to mark out this man in the wilderness in the well-known, deeply-stamped character of his whole life, first in his constancy in opposition to *men*, then in his self-denying severity against *himself*, and finally, in his high office and calling of *God*. Nor is this enough—a third climax is observable. The *first* question joins issue with the secret thought and expectation of many, that the rigor of this new preacher of repentance would soon relax, and that he would not stand immovably firm to his first appeal.* But the *second* question, after the former has shamed their secret suspicion, introduces by the ἀλλά, *but* (which thus receives its full force), another application and turn of his challenge. The under tone of the first was—"Is it not true, that such was your first thought, and that it would have well pleased you to find it so?" The second, on the other hand, conversely signifies—"Is it not true, that ye assuredly did *not*, and could not have desired *that*, when ye sought the man in the wilderness, having already heard of his clothing and manner of life?" Finally, the *third* question does not like the second merely seize their external impression of his personality as they found him, but takes hold of the *conviction*, which the preacher's words produced in all their minds, that he was a *prophet* (ch. xxi. 26)—"*Is it not true*, that ye found in him a prophet, and were constrained to acknowledge him as such? But rising above all is the circumstance that the Lord only says they went out to *see* somewhat, using, indeed, first the strong θεάσασθαι, *to gaze* (as if they had gone to a spectacle), which is afterwards softened to the more customary ἰδεῖν, *to see*; while he does not say, though it would have better befitted the going out to a prophet, that they went out ἀκοῦσαι, *to hear*. This is spoken with the same tone in which the Lord formerly rebuked the superficial, inconstant, and capricious conduct of the people (John v. 35); and prepares the way for the similitude of the sporting, childish children given below. Men should go forth to *hear* a prophet; but this was far from their thoughts: and here lay their great fault, in spite of all their crowding forth, their astonishment, their confession, and their baptism. Again, taking the other side—they went to *see*, and yet did not rightly *see*; for in a true prophet the prophet is really to be seen, and in this case the whole manifestation of his life showed and preached something pointing to his great message. All these thoughts the Lord's words would excite—how much he could say with his few words! (John vii. 46).

The *reed* shaken with the wind, in the first question, should be understood at once literally and figuratively; for the expression, which is certainly taken from the locality of the wilderness near the Jordan, just beforementioned, included *both*. Assuredly it was not to see the reeds out in the wilderness that ye went forth—or did you suppose, did you wish, to find in the man that was there a compliant, changeable prophet of the people, a man like yourselves, and not a firm and steadfast prophet of God? (Eccles. v. 11). That would have been, in its kind, no better than a mere reed. *No*, though there was the appearance of this, it was, at the same time, another impulse which sent you out, a presentiment of that which you actually there saw and found. This first question is followed by no such responsive antithesis as the others; for the answer is sufficiently understood in itself—The man in the wilderness stood like an iron pillar, and like a wall of brass against the whole land, against the priests and councillors as well as against the common people (Jer. i. 18); he adhered immovably to his first—*Repent ye!* This the people well knew. And this of itself was convincing testimony that this same man could not have been moved by the temptation of persecution to exchange his witnessing—"*This is he!*" for a doubtful and questioning—"*Art thou he?*" It was not, then, from doubt that he put the question. But that it was not from impatience to be released from prison, what follows goes on to show. He who was so severe against others, was equally rigorous against himself. Ye remember well that as the sedges of the desert were around him, so also his garment was of camel's hair, with the leathern girdle about his loins: there was no μαλακὰ ἱμάτια,* *soft raiment*, no ἱματισμὸς ἔνδοξος καὶ τρυφή, *gorgeous apparel and delicacy* (as Luke explains). Assuredly ye did not expect a worldly forerunner of a Messiah coming in worldly pomp? Such a one would not be sought, would not be found in the *wilderness*; and if the man of the wilderness is now imprisoned by Herod, he did not fall into this imprisonment as a courtier, whose desire was upon worldly good living (though there he would fare better than upon his locusts), but in consequence of his rigid preaching of repentance to the king. *Behold*, yonder in Herod's court are worldlings and flatterers enough, for king's houses are the place for them:† there the rule still holds good, which ordered in the time of Ahasuerus

* Roos: "We shall see how long this new preacher of repentance will carry on his preaching. He will presently become tired of it, will abate his severity, and become again like one of ourselves."

* Which phrase appears similarly in Homer. *Odyss.* ά 437. *Iliad* ώ 796, and other Greek authors, *e. g.*, Diodor. Virgil also designates the *Serica* as "molles lanas." Plautus, *Bacch.* i. 1, 38, speaks in the same way.

† There is no evil in his wearing the costly garments, who is born for and called to the court. Comp. Hamann, i. 324, and iii. 75.

that none might enter into the king's palace clothed with sackcloth (Esther iv. 2); there cry they to the prophets as they did to Amos —Prophesy not here, for it is the king's court! (Amos vii. 13). But John has been the Elijah of this Ahab. The Lord's words thus graze on the edge of condemning the thoughtless court of the day, though without letting fall a single expression which might have been capable of an unseemly construction in the minds of the people, as spoken against *the king* himself, for he does not speak in the singular at all. His only care is to obviate the people's offence against the imprisoned John. He only intimates briefly—Such are in kings' *houses* well received, but come not into kings' prisons; and thus, regarding the man of the wilderness and the man imprisoned as one, and consistent with himself,* he paves the way to the third great word—*A prophet!* In this he only gives expression to the truth which was at last admitted by all, but he confirms it with his own ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, *yea, I say unto you*, and immediately goes beyond it by his still greater—*More than a prophet!* (περισσότερον is here, as always in the New Testament, neuter, and thus corresponds with the threefold τί). This was something new and unexpected, a text which instantly required further illustration. The people might immediately, if the Lord had paused here, have hurried his words to the conclusion—Is he then the Messiah himself? And yet has he sent to ask thee, and challenged thee as the Messiah? What dost thou say, and *which is it* of the two? For what is there between prophet and Messiah? But the Lord leaves no space for their foolish imaginings, but immediately adds his own impressive solution of the mystery—*For* he is, what he himself testified in his question of deep meaning, the forerunner who *prepares the way* for the Messiah!

Verse 10. As such he is περισσότερον προφήτου, *more than a prophet*, in a twofold respect, according to the external designation of the Scripture, in the internal relation of his office, the one corresponding to the other. It is his pre-eminence among the prophets, that *this is written* by them *concerning him*, so that he is also consequently an ἐρχόμενος, one who was to come. John had with his uniform humility included himself in the expectant "we," and by speaking of looking for *another*, if Jesus were not he, had once more said—*I* am not. He had formerly chosen of the two passages which predict his coming, that one in which the humble and unpretending character of *the voice* is given to him, not that of a prophet or a servant sent of God. The Lord now graciously rewards him for this by placing himself on a level with him (afterwards vers. 18, 19), as sent like himself, and by giving prominence to the other passage which calls him the *angel* or *messenger* of God. Ὁ ἐρχόμενος was the general expression for the Messiah, derived from many such places as Psalms cxviii. 26, xl. 8; Hab. ii. 3, etc.; but the fundamental passage which at the close of all prophecy, brings into prominence and finally seals this appellation, is Mal. iii. 1.* The Baptist could not but have thought of this Scripture when he framed his question, and therefore our Lord emphatically shows that John is there exhibited, with himself and before himself, as also a מַלְאָךְ, or *messenger*, and in the very place where the מַלְאַךְ הַבְּרִית (*messenger of the covenant*) is spoken of; and thus he gives him back the οὗτός ἐστι, *this is He*, which the servant had formerly applied to his Lord. But as it refers to himself, the prophecy in the Lord's lips is curtailed, and its full meaning concealed. He speaks in precisely such a manner, as to utter the consciousness with which he beholds himself in this Scripture, while, at the same time, his humility as the Son of Man is involuntarily and undesignedly exhibited—he so changes the text that instead of the Hebrew and Septuagint reading לְפָנַי, πρὸ προσώπου μου, *before me, before my face*, standing alone, it is thrice said πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὁδόν σου, ἔμπροσθέν σου, *before thy face, thy way, before thee.*† The *Lord* who speaks by the prophets, in Malachi announces *himself* as the coming angel of the covenant—*My* messenger shall prepare the way before *me* (comp. Luke i. 16, 17, to go before the Lord their God, and also verse 76); but *this* the Lord who is come as the Son of Man may not as yet openly declare, it is enough that by the threefold σοῦ, *thee* or *thy*, he signifies that he is marked out and referred to by the Father. See how, without directly uttering it, he nevertheless announces his ἐγώ εἰμι, *I am He*, in his sublime humility! And note how that necessary humility by which he exalts the Baptist to the highest point of honor, by placing him on a level with himself, becomes the loftiest testimony to his own dignity: for that greatest thing, which makes John more than a prophet, consists in nothing but this—"because he is my forerunner!"

And this is the internal relation of his office, for the sake of which the Scripture distinguished him and wrote beforehand concerning him. The prophets prophesied *from afar* (ver. 13), but this man announces the instant coming of him who was already born, testifies of him who was already in their midst, points with his finger to the Messiah as he walks, stands as the friend of the bridegroom by the bridegroom's side (John iii. 29). He *prepares his way*—that is the substance in common of both passages, which were written

* We cannot understand how this can intimate, according to Schleiermacher, that John was not yet in prison.

* Compare Hengstenberg's *Christology* on Malachi.

† The perfect harmony of the two Evangelists, in a citation so strikingly daviating, is very remarkable.

concerning him. In uttering *this* finally, our Lord gave the key to the preceding words concerning the preaching to the poor, and the offence taken against himself, and likewise paved the way for what subsequently follows concerning the unbelief of the present generation. Repentance! repentance! that is the preparation of the Lord's way, and the way of his kingdom, as the voice in the wilderness testified loudly enough to all consciences. They only who through *repentance* have become poor take no offence against the Gospel. This great word which recurs to the mind continually in this discourse concerning the *preacher of repentance*, finally appears in ver. 21, as the point of final decision between God and men. Let it be further noted in connection with the next verse, that if John, the *preacher of repentance* κατ' ἐξοχήν (by eminence), understood the whole relations of his preaching more fully and profoundly than all others before him, so also he could not have been, in the knowledge of the *humble* Messiah, who proceeded to spiritual victory through the path of suffering and self-renunciation, less than some of them, for example, Isaiah.

Verse 11. "The Baptist" was a cognomen which John had soon received among the people and his disciples, from the striking and hitherto unheard of character of his public function. Probably at first a name of reproach or blame on account of his presumption (John i. 25), it had passed into a general descriptive appellation, and among his own disciples (Luke vii. 20), was used as a title of honor, since their master had included his whole mission under that term (John i. 33). The first three Evangelists give him this name; but here the Lord's own mouth confirms twice in succession, this *title of honor* as the highest and best designation of this man's dignity and position. He does not say—The preacher of repentance; for this would not have distinguished him from other prophets, and the Lord would leave that to speak for itself in the consciences of the people, till, in ver. 21, he plainly utters it himself. The *baptism* of John, that to which the people submitted, involved the general confession of the people, which was forced from them by the divine authority (Matt. xxi. 25) of this forerunner; and thus they justified God (Luke vii. 29). Concerning this baptism, the Lord now utters the impressive word, confirming it by the single Ἀμήν, *Verily*, in the midst of this discourse (stronger than the ναί, *yea*, ver. 9, afterwards vers. 22–24 only πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, *but I say unto you*)—Among them that are born of women (earthly, mortal men like יְלוּד אִשָּׁה, Job xiv. 1, xv. 14), there hath not risen *a greater than he*, none greater hath been especially raised up, sent and commissioned of God;* ἐγείρεσθαι, *to raise up*, being used as by the prophets (Luke vii. 16, John vii. 52), hence also of Jesus himself, Acts v. 30 (as also *per catachresin* of false prophets, Mat. xxiv. 11–24), as itself closely connected with being born (Mat. iii. 9), inasmuch as God provides and appoints his servants from their mother's womb, summons and sends them forth whensoever he will, already qualified by nature according to his predetermined purpose. In this הֲקִים, *to raise up*, according to Old Testament language, both the human birth and the divine ordination, are included. Among all those who were born of women and called by God to their office and its function, there had been none greater than the *Baptist*, whose difference from all his predecessors is defined by that one word. He is not simply regarded as the greatest among them, but as standing alone. We shall hear presently in ver. xii. 13, that "his days" are already the introduction of a new period, and that he stands contrasted with the law and the prophets, being beyond their circle. And yet even this high elevation of John is only a transition, in this discourse which rises from greater to yet greater things, to that final and highest utterance: *Notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he!* Not so much for John's own sake has all this been said, but for the sake of the testimony to the kingdom of heaven now come. Not that the people were to attach themselves to John as his disciples, when they could no longer go forth to him, because the Lord had called him from his work; but that they should come to him, whose way the Baptist had prepared.

And is he then, is Christ himself, the μικρότερος, *lesser*, who in regard to the Baptist is yet more externally humble and unreputed than he; who coming after him is yet preferred before him; and in his existence from the beginning is in a superabounding sense μείζων αὐτοῦ, *greater than he?* The words were thus understood by such fathers as Chrysostom and Augustin, and by old expositors as Euthymius and Theophylact. Menken also has lately undertaken to support this view, with ingenious and specious arguments. But, however this might seem to suit ver. 6 at the first glance, a deeper penetration shows that it does not in reality; and a thorough and full exposition overturns it altogether.

First, let it be observed that the comparative may not be thus immediately and absolutely taken for the superlative; and this of itself undermines all those views, which elsewhere rightly enough, but inappropriately here, speak of Christ as having humbled himself to the uttermost. Thus understood, the comparative must, in any case, immediately refer to John; and it cannot be regarded as strictly correct, that Jesus was inferior among the people to John, who had now declined, or had been so when John was the centre of the people's concourse (for see John iii. 26; Matt. iv. 25, viii. 27, ix. 26, Luke v. 1, vii. 16, 17). Further, it will commend itself

* Let the progression of the whole discourse referring to him be well observed: A man—a prophet—the greatest!

to all right feeling, as quite dissonant from the whole spirit and tone of this discourse, that the Lord should now throw off the veil of humility which he had assumed from the beginning, and suddenly break forth with the open declaration—*Verily, I say unto you*, I am nevertheless greater than he! The less can he be supposed to say this, as this and more than this is self-understood in the sacred dignity which pervades the whole discourse. Again, it is not external manifestation and repute among the people which is spoken of in ver. 11; neither as it regards the Baptist nor the μικρότερος, for it immediately follows—*In the kingdom of heaven.* Thus it is an actual position and estimation before God in that kingdom, or in relation to it, which is referred to. We have it significantly in Luke—μείζων προφήτης οὐδείς ἐστιν, "there is not a greater *prophet*," and John is thereby not simply placed in the rank of the prophets, but before them and above them; consequently, that which is placed in contradistinction and superiority to *him*, must indicate an altogether new, and yet higher, degree and dignity. It is not the Lord's design to decide whether John is greater, in his own proper personality, in his nearness of communion with God, in the degree of his holiness, than Abraham, or Moses, or David; he only assigns to him a peculiar and pre-eminent rank as it respects his office* as Baptist, and forerunner of him who was to come. (He does not say directly—John is greater than all these; but merely—No one among them is greater than he: not expressly—No one is equal to him.) As the "greater" in the former part, being a proper comparative, pre-supposes the less, just so the distinctly contrasted ὁ δὲ μικρότερος, or "lesser" implies the greater with respect to itself, and that too in the kingdom of heaven. It is decisive, finally, upon this point that Jesus as its king could never speak of himself (no parallel can be found of the kind), as being *in* the kingdom of heaven, even the *greatest* in it—just as a king might be termed the highest in the state. He is not in the kingdom, he comes not into that kingdom; but the kingdom itself comes in, and with, himself. We have examples of the Lord's use of the expressions concerning the greater and the less in the kingdom of heaven, in the plain parallels of Matt. v. 19, x. 42, with which the question of the disciples, and this answer in ch. xviii. 1, 4 harmonize. Consequently, ὁ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ does not signify one that is externally and apparently less in regard to the ancient prophets or the Baptist; but, according to its obvious and literal sense, *every one that is less* in comparison with others greater by his side in the kingdom of heaven. Then comes in the natural significance of the article, making the comparative equivalent to a superlative—He that is less than *all* others connected with him, must, consequently, be the least. As we might say—Which is *he who is wiser* (than all others) in this room? But the emphasis falls sharply upon the contrast of the two comparatives: the *less* and the least *in* the kingdom, is yet *greater* than all who are without, even greater than he, who among those *without* has no *superior*.

And thus we find the simple and weighty thought of the whole saying, in the emphatic ἐν; in the contrast between the within and the without. Now, but also now first, is *the kingdom of heaven* come, present, and thrown open to the entrance of all (ver. 12). There are then two ranks—all the prophets raised up by God, and John at the last immediately before and at the introduction of this kingdom; but now also the disciples of Christ, who are the first *within* this kingdom, its actual subjects and citizens upon earth. Here comes in a new birth above the being "born of women" (John iii.), here is that better thing provided for us (Heb. xi. 40), here do the disciples of Christ *see*, and *hear*, and *possess* all that so many prophets and righteous men were obliged to *wait* for (Matt. xiii. 16, 17), which John himself, who dies in prison without becoming his disciple to whom he sent all men, received not upon earth. Let the remarkable passage in Zech. xii. 8 be compared, to which we may almost suppose the Lord was referring. It was the high prerogative of Moses to hear the Lord's words mouth to mouth, and not in dark speeches, and to behold his similitude (Num. xii. 6–8); but now every disciple in this respect is already as Moses the greatest of the prophets (Matt. xiii. 11; Mark iv. 11). He hears and sees, however, in addition, much greater things than ever Moses did. A Christian scholar and catechumen, who has in childlike simplicity learned his "Our Father," knows and enjoys more than the whole Old Testament could give; and so far stands nearer to God than even John the Baptist, whose position was the threshold between the Old and New Testaments, standing at the door without himself entering in. This holds good, however, not *merely* of knowledge" (Von Gerlach), but of the whole position as before God, of the possession of the better things of grace, even though in connection with little knowledge. For the *having* and *being* is here the true knowledge.

Verse 12. By this, which is the only correct exposition of the preceding verse, we have laid the foundation for a thorough comprehension of that which follows. The *kingdom of heaven*—this is still in continuation the fundamental idea, that is, the kingdom of heaven as come, and among them. It is not *doctrine* only that the Lord brings and offers to his hearers, but a new, long-promised long-prepared, *now* first established institution. A

* Thus much, in any case, must be supplied after μείζων in Matthew, if not just προφήτης in the strict sense, since in the New Testament there are no more prophets, properly speaking. The discourse here runs upon official position and corresponding degree of knowledge; it is *that* which is meant by προφήτης in Luke, which addition, therefore, is not correct.

new condition of things begins with this, the *kingdom of heaven is come upon earth!* This is the meaning of the great *now*, ἄρτι, νυνὶ δέ, which he cries from this time forward. It began, properly speaking, with his *own* days, the days of the Son of Man (Luke xvii. 22); yet he reckons, in his gracious lowliness, *the days of John the Baptist* as included in them, between the ἀπό, *from*, and the ἕως, *until*. The days are of course the whole period of his official activity, which now drawing to its close in his imprisonment, might be spoken of as concluded. It may, however, be asked, whether the Lord reckons the ἀπό from the beginning or from the end of this period. But when it is considered that the Baptist appeared to Israel not very long before the Lord himself, and that for a certain space their testimonies ran together, and that the forerunner was distinguished from all the other prophets as the *coming one* belongs to *him who was to come*, we cannot hesitate to include the Baptist's term in the great new age. It is the *prelude* to the *opening* of the kingdom, the actual beginning of the immediately following *now*, and John's announcement of the kingdom of heaven as *nigh at hand* was already an invitation which the Lord himself, and by his disciples, only took up and continued.

The Lord goes on to say, that in this great era now opened, the kingdom of heaven βιάζεται, *suffereth violence*—and what is that? Verbally, it is uncertain, whether it is in the passive or middle voice, and in what signification it is used. First of all, βιάζειν or more commonly βιάζεσθαι means to use violence upon a person or thing, to overmaster, constrain, do violence to; hence also, to pursue any thing with the greatest earnestness and zeal (Ælian, *H. V.* xiii. 32; Josephus, *Ant.* vii. 9, 2; Philo, *Chernb.* p. 127 c.). In the passive voice,* the meaning here might be, as Luther gives it, and either in a good or bad sense—The kingdom of heaven is outraged and opposed, or, They *strive* and use violence to *enter into it*. But then βιάζεσθαι in the middle voice signifies to do any thing with *vehemence*, *to use violence*, in the accomplishment of any thing, as Luke xvi. 16. (Hence βιαζόμενος or βιαθάμενος is connected with the verb as an adverb—*powerfully*.) Let us now first compare the parallel in Luke xvi. 26, where the word is commonly received in the good sense (εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται equivalent to βιαζόμενος ἁρπάζει, that is, breaks into it, may press in unhindered, as the counterpart to Exod. xix. 54 in the Sept., which Grotius refers to), and *there* it must indicate an *unfriendly violence against* the kingdom of heaven. For, first of all, the πᾶς, *every one*, in that passage can thus only be properly explained. The language of John iii. 26, that all men came to him, might indeed be the exaggerated words of the envious, but the Lord himself could not possibly have said that—*every man* presses with violence into the kingdom of heaven,* which would ill accord with the lamentation over the prevalent universal unbelief that Matthew records. Further, this interpretation would contradict the whole connection of Luke's discourses from ch. xiv. to ch. xviii. We shall at that place show in detail, but must now take it for granted, that the sayings recorded there were not unskillfully gathered together from a variety of occasions, but were actually connected together by the Lord himself, introducing designed repetitions with new meanings and connections. The parables of Luke xv., xvi. form a complete whole, to which the intermediate and interposed words strictly belong. The sinner's repentance or punishment, how he is either gained or is lost, is spoken of first in parables addressed to penitent sinners and self-righteous Pharisees. In the third parable, and at the end of the first three, the love of God in seeking the sinner is exhibited as yet bearing with the eldest son; then does the householder set before the new and unconfirmed disciples the wisdom of the sinner, to save him from the danger which threatens him even after his conversion, by a lesson of fidelity in earthly and heavenly good; the last parable, finally, exhibits the punishments which will all accrue, when the sinner, like the Pharisees, in proud, *practical unbelief in God's retribution*, despise the love of God which seeks him and calls him to *repentance*—and this last the Lord introduces by some preparatory words to the mocking Pharisees: Ye self-righteous ones are all the worse sinners before God (ver. 15), for ye despise the revelation of the divine love! Law, Prophecy, Gospel are all before you, *but* ye receive nothing aright, ye rage, and blaspheme *against* the kingdom of God which is preached to you, because ye have for your lusts (ver. 18) weakened and set aside that law (ver. 17), which the kingdom does not abolish but establish. With regard to *you* it may be said—all men outrage and oppose that kingdom, instead of meekly hearing and accepting it. Certainly, even if this deeper connection is not admitted, the *but* which in ver. 17 follows the πᾶς, *every man*, decisively shows that ver 16 can only be designed to blame the conduct of the Pharisees. Consequently Luke's meaning is like Matthew's in ch. xxiii. 13; compare ver. 12 in the latter with ver. 15 in the former.

But hastily to conclude that the βιάζεται, *suffereth violence*, here in Matthew must *consequently* have the same bad sense—that the kingdom of heaven suffereth the violence of opposition, and is mightily repelled—would be to set out with the false supposition, that the two places must necessarily use the expression in one and the same sense. When our Lord repeats his earlier utterances in another connection, it is rather his wont to apply them in

* The preference of which Schweizer (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, 1) has maintained.

* To qualify it (as Bengel does) with the addition —πᾶς βιαζόμενος—every one of the few who seek to enter, attains it only by violence—is in the highest degree forced.

a different way, to exhibit another aspect of their comprehensive and many-sided meaning. And one of those pregnant and *profound* sayings we have here in this *βιάζεσθαι*. In Matthew the Lord proceeds immediately afterwards to speak of the *believing acceptance* of the convincing and public testimony then extant concerning the kingdom of heaven now present; but the one-sided reference to the violent resistance to that kingdom would have been an irrelevant introduction to that topic, would rather have diverted the thought from it. The view which Luther takes, and which has predominated in the interpretation of the church, viz., that men struggle to enter into the kingdom of heaven (as Luke xiii. 24, And they who use violence obtain it and take it by force—Hesych. *βιάζεται. βιαίως κρατεῖται*), suits the connection to a very great extent, better indeed than the former, *but not altogether*. The essential and fundamental thought, which pervades the whole passage, vers. 10–15, is the mighty and convincing witness which the kingdom of heaven bears to itself, and not the resulting faith or unbelief, which first begins to be spoken of in ver. 16. Further, we must regard the *first* member—*ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται*, as referring to something pertaining *of itself* to the *kingdom of heaven* now published; otherwise the second meinber would be only a tautological repetition which would be utterly out of keeping with the pregnant, pointed brevity of these striking and new announcements. The Lord is speaking of the great assured *fact* that the kingdom of heaven has come, that it openly proclaims and offers itself (ver. 15); and it is this which he places in opposition to the prophesying of the prophets, and the preparation of Elias. Luke's *εὐαγγελίζεται*—it is *preached* as joyful tidings, by deed, and word, and all the signs of this great crisis—is the proper parallel of the first *βιάζεται, in this place;* this is the central, all-comprehending, and fundamental idea, which would be without its corresponding expression, if that is not found in the *βιάζεται*. What, then, is its full meaning? The word has here no more and no less than its active sense, which passes into the middle—The kingdom of heaven proclaims itself *loudly and openly, breaking in with violence;* the poor are compelled (Luke xiv. 23) to enter in; those who oppose it are constrained *to take offence*. In short, *all things proceed urgently with it*, it goes with "mighty movement and impulse" (as Dräseke preaches about it), it works effectually upon all spirits on both sides and on all sides. Bengel well says, though somewhat one-sidedly, *sese vi quasi obtrudit*—for the *βιάζεσθαι* embraces as well the drawing as the repulsion of men's minds; both are at once its one mighty working.*

It may be hoped that the first member of the paragraph is thus made sufficiently clear by lexicon, parallels, and context, and the second now remains to be investigated, *καὶ βιασταὶ ἁρπάζουσιν αὐτήν, and the violent take it by force*. It is immediately evident that the *βιασταί, violent*, are not robbers by violence (perverse expositors have actually thought that such, converted from their former life, are intended; for what do we not find in exegesis?); but *βιαστής* has its usual Greek force, one who shows and uses his own strength, one who applies violence to any thing consequently in the obvious transition of the continuous discourse, it is strictly equivalent to *βιαζόμενοι*.* Must we then, *now* at least, translate with Luther in a good sense? But the *ἁρπάζειν, take it by force*, for *cupide et violenter arripere* only in a praiseworthy and commanded sense, will not alogether harmonize; in that case we might have expected the more precise and distinguishing *οἱ βιασταί;* and the parallel in Luke *εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεσθαι, press into it*, altogether fails to accord with this *ἁρπάζειν*. It is our opinion in consequence, as the two *vocabula* so entirely correspond, that *βιασταί* must have the same full and double meaning as *βιάζεται*, as indeed is indicated by the absence of the article, which leaves it indefinite. In a case where exegesis perseveringly disputes which of the two views of a passage capable of two senses is correct, it is *generally* found that both are one in a third deeper meaning, and that the disputants in both cases have both right and wrong in their argument. Our view does not necessitate any tautology in the two sentences. The first speaks of that mighty excitement which the breaking in of the *kingdom of heaven in itself occasions;* the second *points out inferentially* (and this is the tendency of the whole discourse) the *result* as seen flowing from this cause in the present age, and thus constituting *signs* of the time. The kingdom of heaven breaks in upon the age with power; and what this signifies with regard to its first and proper introduction, we find continually repeated in narrower circles, as it approaches a land, a town, or a house, and begins to *spread its fame*. Its constraining power does violence to all; but it excites, at the same time, in the case of many, obstinate opposition. He who will not submit to it, must be offended and resist; and he too who yields to it, must press and struggle through this offence. Thus the kingdom of heaven *does* and *suffers* violence, *both* in its twofold influence: it exerts a mighty power itself, and a mighty power must be put forth towards it, whether it be of faith or of unbelief; for its testimony produces an instant separation between these two. When the *preaching of repentance* precedes, and the Lord himself comes after, then is the critical time for such *βιάζεσθαι*, as is

* Von Gerlach's expression—"it spreads itself abroad with power," adheres rather too much to one side.

* As no *article* is prefixed, the two personalities of Jesus and John cannot (as Lange thinks) be intended, as if, by their means, the kingdom of heaven was "violently brought to light."

seen in the βιασταῖς for and against. Then men begin to *contend about it*, and no man can keep aloof from this general movement. This contention and strife, ἁρπάζειν αὐτήν, is consequently in both directions, for and against: it is the common expression of the enmity of unbelief and the struggle of faith together; and in Luke xvi. the Lord takes only one of the sides for his immediate object. The best translation into German is—The kingdom of heaven *braucht Gewalt*, requires force, and those who use force, *seize upon it;* and the intermediate struggle between unbelief and faith, the false ἁρπάζειν of the Messiah, John vi. 15 (as if his kingdom was to be thus ἁρπάγδην set up), is also included. If this twofold meaning (which is explained by a reference to Matt. x. 21 and 35) is not quite clear, we must finally consider, that not only do both exhibit themselves *in fact* connected, but that they necessarily in their mutual influence occasion one another—When some would enter, others oppose them; and when those oppose, the former struggle all the more vehemently against them. Bengel, in order to maintain the exclusively good sense of ἁρπάζειν (in Neander, "to struggle for it with all the soul"), says that the lamentation over unbelief and opposition only begins with ver. 16; but this is not true, inasmuch as the whole discourse in its two aspects as exhibited in the paragraphs beginning with vers. 20 and 25, is *prepared for* and given in germ, not only in ver. 6, but also in ver. 12. Nitzsch (*System*, § 141) will not let Schweizer keep him from finding in this passage a commendable violence put forth, and we perfectly agree with him, concurring also in his position, drawn from the depths of our Lord's discourse, that "the seizing with violence, of which the Lord speaks (Matt. xi. 12), pre-supposes the *days of John and of Christ*, or their *calling*" (we would rather have said—their drawing and seizing men, their *doing violence*), and that thus nothing Pelagian is to be attributed to the proper power of man; but when he discerns in the βιάζεσθαι, and ἁρπάζειν only this one meaning, actively and passively opposed, only the kingdom of heaven suffering violence from those who seize upon it violently,* we must demur, and assert that the Lord signifies *also* the excitement which it creates, as seen in the opposition, and that in the βιάζεσθαι of the kingdom of heaven there is first of all an *active* sense of *its* coming and influence, even what Nitzsch is obliged to *presuppose* in the call of the days of John and of Christ.

Verses 13—15 John has been from ver. 9 more expressly designated as standing alone in his relation, now he is most decisively so; he is not included among "all the prophets." They *have* prophesied, continuing to do so after their death, in their Scriptures; their prophecy came to an end, first of all, with Malachi, until Zacharias the father of John, and Simeon spoke the last prophecies, of which the last of all, Simeon's word, already passed over into an announcement of him who was come: thus, *until John*, that is, looking at the time (as before ἕως ἄρτι), until *the days of the Baptist;* but also, looking at the substance of their prophecies, until this point of boundary between time past and the after time, between prophecy and fulfillment, between the Old and the New Testaments: for the messenger who prepares the way, the Elias in Malachi's last words at the end of the Old Testament, is actually its winding up and transition to the New, the preaching of repentance in order to the kingdom of heaven is the internal unity of the law and the prophets, inasmuch as both announce the future time and him who was to come. Hence, Mal. iv. 4 comprehends all in the one word—*Remember ye the law of Moses!* We have shown at length on Matt. v. 17, in what sense the *law*, as well as the prophets, *prophesied;* in Luke the law precedes, according to common usage, but here it follows, partly because the sentence passes on from speaking of the prophets, partly for the sake of giving emphasis to this point—And *also* the law! The man who stood on the threshold between the two economies represents both; as the preparer of the way for the Messiah he is on a level with all the prophets (to whom in a certain sense Isa. xl. 3 already applied), and yet as the distinctively last forerunner of him who was to come, he is himself the beginning of the New Testament, of the new time of fulfillment (Mark i. 1, 2). Ver. 14, as the fullest conclusion of all that had been said, signifies this; and gives its most significant explanation by means of *and*, which is here equivalent to *for*. But the open declaration, that John is himself actually (αὐτός) the Elias prophesied in Malachi, is again mysteriously* limited by the formula—εἰ θέλετε δέξασθαι, that is, if ye will receive it and understand it as it was intended, if ye will receive him, as ye should, temporarily as such; that is, until in a second later fulfillment the actual Elias shall come. For our Lord will no more contradict John's negative (John i. 21), than his own declaration (Matt. xvii. 11, 12), where he himself testifies both that Elias *will come*, and that in the person of John he has *already come* once. The definite article in Malachi (אֵת אֵלִיָּה הַנָּבִיא), must indicate the actual, historical person of the Tishbite, and the Jewish expectation expressed in Ecclus. xlviii. 10, has its foundation in truth. This the Lord designedly leaves open, by not only saying Ἠλίας without the article, but also by pointing in ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι to a yet future, and proper coming of Elias.†

* As Von Meyer, also, wrote to me: "I prefer decidedly the passive and good sense."

* With an intimation which did not, as was formerly thought, contain an accommodation to Jewish expectation and mode of speech, but involved something quite different.

† Our Lord was far from intending to say—Ye shall expect no other Messiah! (As according to

(*Αὐτός ἐστιν* is less than *οὗτός ἐστι*, ver. 10.) Thus much only will he say, that in the person of John "the Elias *to come*," exhibited himself *for this time;* and he thereby uttered the last word on this subject that was to be uttered, for Elias and the Messiah pertain to one another, as the mockers under the cross (ch. xxvii. 47) also knew. The question had not been expressed openly, *Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, Art* THOU *the Christ?* and the answer does not openly express what was yet to be veiled from the people on account of the carnal expectations which hung around it, but it went far enough to enable every understanding hearer to think the rest, and to hear, as if it had been spoken, *Καὶ ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός, And I* AM *the Christ.* Then does the word break off, saying all by saying nothing, and by expressive silence crying aloud the truth—He that hath ears to hear, let him hear! This formula, in common use among the Jews, and which often recurs in the Apocalypse, does not challenge to *obedience*, as many, reaching too far, would interpret it—*qui intelligit, obediat;* but at this point only *qui audit, intelligat!* Enough is given for faith to hear, and yet something remains for personal, voluntary hearing, understanding, and accepting; for the spiritually deaf cannot be made true hearers by any operation of power from without. All the mighty pressing testimony of the kingdom of heaven leaves yet room enough for that wonderful *coguntur volentes*, which applies to the relation between God and man, and which was previously expressed in *εἰ θέλετε, if ye will.* "The kingdom of heaven is matter of conviction, conviction is matter of conscience, conscience is matter of freedom" (Dräseke).

Between this first pause in the discourse, which ver. 11 in Matt. defines, and the complaint and reproof which then begin in impressive contrast—*But* the men of this generation *will neither* receive the Elias *nor* the Messiah, have ears to hear but hear not—Luke interposes a paragraph which is not recorded as spoken by Jesus himself.* The *εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος, and the Lord said*, is at least a correct gloss, if not the genuine reading, in order to indicate the end of the parenthesis inserted by Luke. It is his purpose to explain, for Gentile readers especially, the name *Βαπτιστής, Baptist*, and the relations of the whole subject to which the Lord's discourse is directed. He places the Pharisees and Scribes in opposition to all the people and the Publicans, or the multitudes and the private man.† This was the report of Luke in his third chapter, and does not contradict the other account (Matt. iii. 7), which does not say that the Pharisees were actually baptized, but the contrary—compare ver. 6. A mere coming to this baptism like that of the Pharisees, John did not accept; their coming proudly and hypocritically, and yet *not* truly coming, was their rejection of the counsel of God, and their sin: on the other hand, the common peoples hearing and justifying God was good in itself, a confession which all the more surely came from their conscience, as the preacher of repentance had without any preliminaries, and contrary to all expectation, commenced his severe and stern announcement of the kingdom of heaven. *Notwithstanding*, if this *vox populi vox Dei* made the unbelief of the Pharisees all the more blamable, it only served, as regards the people themselves, who did not persevere, but after their first submission abandoned John again and believed not in Christ, to condemn them by their own acts, as a foolish generation, in earnest about nothing.

Verses 16, 17. What kind of men are these, what kind of a generation is this? To go out into the wilderness, to hear, to justify God, to be baptized with the baptism of repentance—and not repent! to be baptized with the baptism of repentance for the *remissiοn of sins*, which the gracious Son of Man immediately comes and preaches to all the poor as his Gospel, to flock around him, to behold his miracles, to hear his words—and then be offended in him because he is not a Messiah after their mind, and does not preach a kingdom of heaven *without* the condition of repentance! Is there any thing like this by which it may be understood, with which it may be compared? Thus as it were in his astonishment, the Lord uses the Rabbinical formula of which the first traces are found in the Old Testament (Lam. ii. 13; Ecclus. xxv. 15, in the Greek, ver. 11) —*Τίνι δὲ ὁμοιώσω, as we find it also in Mark iv. 30; Luke xiii. 18–20; with an echo of it in Matt. vii. 24, and elsewhere. In Luke is added: Whereunto shall I liken it? for the Lord will only use a comparison which is strictly according to truth, and in his mouth the corresponding Rabbinic phrase (*To what is it like?*) has its full and perfect meaning, לְמָה אֲדַמֶּה or לְמָה הוּא דּוֹמֶה. And what is the answer in the following similitude? Strictly only this—They are like themselves, a *γενεὰ αὕτη, this generation*, unique in their kind! But if they are spoken of in the gentlest terms, the similitude of the folly of their own children, when perverse and fickle, would suit them, though far from meeting the case in its *deep reality:* for when the old exhibit the childishness of children, it becomes something far more than mere childishness. It cannot but be noted, further, that the Lord, *nihil humani a se alienum putans*, as he took notice of the rending of the mended garments (Matt. ix. 16), and the domestic concerns of the children in their bed (Luke xi. 7), so also observed the children's play in the market-place, and finds in every thing material for the analogies of his wise teaching

---

Bengel's interpretation *μέλλων* is spoken simply *tanquam e prospectu Veteris Testamenti in Novum*—to which Alford correctly opposes Matt. xvii 11).

* Although Grotius, De Wette, Meyer, for example, unnaturally maintain this.

† *Ἀκούσας* of course refers to the people, who once heard *him*, the Baptist.

As the play of the children represented the actions of their elders (here counterfeiting wedding and funeral, the merry music and the dirge after their manner), the Lord sees in it an instructive and real pattern and likeness of human nature; as we might often say, looking thoughtfully at the doings of the *children*—Even such are *men!*

The general reference to the common dispositions of mankind Luke retains in the ἀνθρώπους, *men*, but the more specific reference to which Matthew adheres in the γενεὰν ταύτην, *this generation*, was to the generation living in that then extant and most important age. To this generation both John and Jesus belonged as having come to it and been born in it, and this so far justifies the simile, in which the complaining children must signify those, whose severe or gentle preaching was displeasing to the residue of the age. It has been attempted, though without any foundation and with no result, to explain away this most striking application. Olshausen understands by both classes of children, those who make advances and those who reject them, the capricious contemporaries of Jesus; and will have the meaning to be, that *the one-half* of this generation desires this, *the other* that, and thus no concerted influence can be brought to bear *among them*, for they are like a band of peevish children: but this is in direct contradiction to the explanation immediately and suitably given in vers. 18, 19. *Lange** would reconcile the explanation with the simile by an *inversion* of the relation—As the one set of children requires from the other dancing or lamenting, according to the tune, so *does this generation desire that their prophets* should be guided by its caprice; but this is foreign to the simplicity of a popular similitude, and explains away the deep meaning of this simile, which is not altered by the Lord himself in application. To compare the preaching of God to the world with the play proffered by children to children, and thus to place the two personages who had come to it in the very midst of such a generation, is a profound exhibition of their lowliness and condescension, and is in perfect accordance with the actual fact. Was it not thus with them both? did they not stand thus as men among men, each in his own way condescending to the age, to its need and its desire? It was, indeed, with full *publicity* that they proclaimed their offers, ἐν ἀγοραῖς that is, in the streets and broad ways (Cant. iii. 2, Sept. for רְחֹבוֹת), instead of which a various reading derived from Luke has in Matthew also ἐν ἀγορᾷ, in the market-place. The fundamental idea that first strikes us must be this—Play, foolish child's play without earnestness or perseverance, is the characteristic of the spirit and doings of this age. But there follows immediately a second thought—He who has come from God to this age, a man among men, comes into the midst of them and offers them a most solemn and earnest play. Then finally comes the complaining conclusion—He is, alas, only regarded and treated as one who has invited them to mere pastime, and on that account he is not understood, and therefore is rejected. For it is implied in the background, that they cannot but observe that *this* dancing or weeping is something different from, more earnest and real than *their* play: therefore they are *not pleased* with it now, though otherwise pleased with so much in him. The children who invite, and play to the others, are not, when we narrowly investigate it, designated as the foolish and self-contradictory ones;* but the *blame* falls upon the others, who in both instances are displeased, to whom nothing is right, not even their just explained self-will. We must adhere to the plain explanation which the Lord himself gives in vers. 18, 19; and must not be diverted by the turn of the language, which less logically than picturesquely, includes all in one—This generation is "like unto children"—for this is only designed to say in general, as we often find in the other parables—It so proceeds with this generation, that this is the effect produced.

Piping and mourning, a gracious invitation to joy and to peace, or a rebuke commanding repentance; these are the two alternating and blending key-notes of all God's preaching to man—the preaching of the Gospel, and the preaching of the law. The preaching of the law reached its most rigorous conclusion in John, the Gospel began to sound forth its richest grace from the lips of Jesus. But both these methods approve their perfect *accordance*, in these two, whom the wisdom of God sent in succession yet together, into an age of crisis and decision. The Baptist baptized unto the forgiveness of sins, proclaimed the kingdom of heaven, and spoke of the bridegroom; Jesus, on the other hand, refrained not from crying, at the beginning, through the process, and at the close of his ministry, Repent ye! and denounced his woes upon the same generation of vipers which had heard the same denunciations from John. The unison of the two preachings is ever this, *Through repentance into the kingdom of heaven!* But this internal unity of the law and the Gospel the world understands not, and therefore rejects both. *We* have piped and mourned unto you, according to one concerted plan—thus rightly speaking, they cry together; and to this juxtaposition with John the Lord again condescends, when he proceeds with the ἦλθε, *came*, used alike in both cases. But why, finally, does not the mourning stand first, as the preaching of repentance had taken precedence?

* In the *Biblische Dichtungen*, which generally give such admirable exegesis, more, indeed, than many a commentary; but on this occasion the point is not hit.

* As Lange (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 2, 761) has said in opposition to me. They are not, by any means the *same individual children* in the application, but by the "children" generally, first the former, then the latter proposal is rejected.

Because the offer of the *kingdom of heaven* has been from the beginning the joyful groundnote of all; it led the people into the wilderness first. God can say, now as ever, that he *begins with grace:* even the Ten Commandments were prefaced by—I am the Lord thy God!

Verses 18, 19. The γάρ, *for*, as demonstrating ὁμοία ἐστι, *is like*, indicates a simple and apt interpretation of the simile, in the sense in which we have already explained and defended it. It is not now said—John *the Baptist*, for that would have required a corresponding epithet for the Son of Man, which it is not his purpose now to assume. Further, it is not said expressly—*Christ* came. The two *who had come* present themselves before us in their entire personality, and according to all that had been predicted of them, the one who should come, before the other who should come. This designation would at the same time assure the people, if it were necessary, that the one who had come must certainly know who the other is, and did not put the question from any private doubt. Ἐσθίων and πίνων, *eating* and *drinking*, in both cases the present participle, not as in the German Bible, distinguished as preterite and present; for the two forms continue in conjoint testimony before the eyes of this generation, just as their twofold preaching is in strict accordance: Now in his imprisonment John has not become an eater and drinker!* The hyperbolical expression—Neither eating nor drinking, probably thus spoken by our Lord, receives in Luke the covert explanation by adding bread and wine; and in this we discern a reference to his food in the desert (which Luke has not mentioned elsewhere), as well as to the word of the angel which dedicated him to be a Nazarene with spiritual power, even as Samson had been a Nazarite with physical strength. He did not eat and drink ordinarily like other men: No man ever *saw* him eat; so that he stood as it were, *above and confronting* all other men, just as Jesus *walked in their midst.* It was the same condescension in John as in Jesus, only in another form; the contrast and unison of both constituted the fullest exhibition of the condescension of God to the need and the cry of this generation. The legal, strict ascetics received the man of their choice, who should have suited them; though it was only to humble their pride by telling them that all their strict severity, wherein none of them could excel him, would not avail for the kingdom of heaven, without repentance! They who were waiting and longing for the consolation and joy of the kingdom of heaven received their preacher in Jesus, who, with all his Messianic ἐξουσία, *authority*, in word and work, yet dealt with them so entirely as the *Son of Man* (and not as מַלְאָךְ, *messenger*), that he must have been after their mind, if they had been in themselves, or had been made by John, poor in spirit and prepared for his Gospel. But they would only play; and that *their own* old play, each one after his own fashion, only seeing and never *hearing!* They who, at other times, were so easily moved to dance or to mourn at the sound of any pipe; now that God proposes to them the true play, find neither the one side of it nor the other, after their mind. Of the severe they say—δαιμόνιον ἔχει, *He hath a devil!* Not indeed immediately, for at first they were constrained to say—He speaks truth, he is a prophet! for his words of lamentation sunk deep into the heart. But they would not smite upon their breasts, and therefore they soon came to say—But he carries it too far with his enforced and strange mode of life, he is altogether too gloomy; and finally, as the result of all, they stopped not short of—He is possessed, he hath a devil and is mad, *why hear ye him?* (John x. 20). We learn here, though it is not elsewhere recorded, that such was the way in which John was spoken of among the mass of people after he retired before Jesus in the narrative. As he declares it, this must have been as notoriously true as what he, in his patient humility, said concerning himself, that they scorn him as φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, *a man gluttonous and a wine-bibber* (with a *behold*, however, preceding), a friend of publicans and sinners. Thus God could not please this generation; what they find wanting in John, they condemn in Jesus, and conversely: they defend themselves against the severity of the one by thoughtless levity, and against the graciousness of the other they pretend to assume a godly strictness; and what befell these two central representatives of all God's ministers, has its historical parallel in all ages. The legal element is too rigorous, too earnest, too morbid, for the people; the evangelical too lax, free grace being, to all Christian Pharisees, a suspicious and too liberal charter for all kinds of sinners. To this day the servant of Christ tries now the one and now the other in his preaching and the manner of his life. One, according to the spirit with which God endues him in sending him, has more severity in his tone; another more gentleness, though both agree in one. But those who have no ear, no heart to receive the truth, have all the more mouth and boldness to condemn its witnesses, and to pronounce their rash verdict upon them, or upon every thing else—This or that is too violent and forced, too severe or too soft, too earnest or too mild, too narrow-minded or too expansive—and if they have nothing else to say, too ordinary and human! To such a generation as this the true Messiah never comes, though with his forerunner he long since came; for it ever thinks of still *another* than this true one, and they *look for* this other, or do not! It *appears*

* To conclude from this present tense, that John must have still been actively engaged in his baptism, is entirely wrong. Yet Sepp, who knows nothing of the harmony, brings this forward, for the sake of casting an aspersion on the German Bible!

as if, like foolish children, they know not what they would have; but in fact they are not children, and know very well what they would *not* have—neither *repentance*, nor the *grace* which repentance obtains.

But are *all* men actually such, so that God has sent this preaching upon earth altogether in vain? Did no man justify God, who sent John and the Son of Man; did no man submit to the truth of God? Did all stumble at the offence, so that none were saved? Did not the *βιάζεσθαι, violence*, of the kingdom of heaven awake a corresponding *good βιάζεσθαι* in any hearts? The parable leaves this question unanswered; but as the preceding discourse had already given the encouraging answer, we must suppose, in order to harmonize this sorrowful lamentation with that, that the Lord would add some complementary word which would intimate that he spoke of the generation as a whole, *but not absolutely without exception.* With such a well-founded anticipation we pass on to the concluding sentence, which has been as much confused by expositors as ver. 12 itself. First, what is the *wisdom*, which is thus, in one word, so plainly contrasted with the childish folly previously depicted? Assuredly as is self-evident, the wisdom *of God*, or God himself, as he is wisdom, and therefore is personally spoken of as having *τέκνα, children.* The whole similitude as before viewed was a profound development of the saying of Solomon (Prov. xxix. 9), that "if a *wise man* contendeth with a foolish man, whether he rage or laugh, there is no rest," he cannot gain his point; and our Lord's expression evidently points to that same book of holy writ, in which so much is written concerning "wisdom." (Let ch. i. 20–33; viii. 1, etc. etc., be consulted.) Thus *God* now comes before men, that is, in the person of those whom he sends; just as in Luke xi. 49, the wisdom of God is expressly indicated by the Lord as the wisdom *which sends* the prophets.* This is all that is meant here according to the whole connection; and we cannot refer the word to the Son of God as the essential wisdom, however true that is in itself, for such a reference is less suitable here than in the passage just adduced in Luke. For how can we suppose him, who has just exhibited himself as the eating and drinking Son of Man, who had humbly placed himself through the whole discourse in juxtaposition with John, thus suddenly speak of himself, and especially in the presence of all the people? That wisdom of God, which sends prophets and apostles, Elias and the Messiah, now *ἐδικαιώθη, was justified.* Now, though in the Greek this word often signifies to give a man his due by correction, even by *condemnation* (as in Rom. vi. 7), it never signifies *blaming* unjustly. Many expositors have perversely forced this meaning upon it, and even Luther, who quotes the old adage about the egg being more cunning than the hen—as if the lamentation still continued, and the Lord would say that wisdom must be content to be thus condemned and opposed by her children. The New Testament *δικαιοῦν*, like the Old Testament הִצְדִּיק, permits no such signification. Thus wisdom is *justified*, that she *is* wisdom, she is acknowledged, and her due honor given to her (Scholium: *ἐτιμήθη*), just as Luke (ver. 29), had previously expressed it. And who are *her* children? Solomon tells us, in whose words wisdom so often addresses her disciples as—My son, my children; and who (ch. xxvii. 11) says, "My son, be wise, and make my heart glad, *that I may answer him that reproacheth me!*" This is strictly applicable to our passage. Yet not as many turn the thought, that she is justified and *defended*, and approves herself in the end in the person of her children; that is, in the tone of lamentation still —*She must thus be justified.*† The emphatic *πάντων, of all*, of Luke might indeed be adduced for this—It is incumbent upon them all to stand forth in her demonstration and defence.‡ But *ἐδικαιώθη*, as something already past, is opposed to that interpretation, which would have required the future—They will justify themselves, even the publicans and sinners, whom ye now so much scorn! Still less may it be understood as if the *τέκνα* were the prophets and witnesses, *on account of* whom the justification should follow; for the *children* of wisdom are her *disciples*, not her preachers and teachers, and assuredly Christ himself, could not be included under that designation. The word is thus simply reduced to this—The truly childlike, docile *τέκνα* (preparatory to the *νήπιοι*, ver. 25), are opposed now to the childish *παιδίοις*;‡ such children of wisdom, who yield themselves up to her motherly care to be nursed, and even are new-born of her, *understand her*, acknowledge her, whatever *the evil world may say:*

* This is decisive against Sepp's application, who, combining this with Luke vi. 40, would read —Yet the wisdom of both these masters (John and Jesus) is justified in all *their* children.

* In which sense we might have understood Luther's translation, if he had not unhappily himself explained it otherwise—as we have mentioned before.

† As Braune says: "Thus the weakest Christian must help to assert the honor of his Lord, and to stop the mouth of wickedness."

‡ Consequently we can least of all understand, with Von Gerlach, and the ancient Greek expositors, *δικαιοῦν ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων*, as if the persons here stood instead of their charge or accusation—Wisdom shall be absolved from the charges of her children, that is, of the perverse Jewish people! The objection that *καὶ* is not *but*, has no force when the usage of the New Testament and its Hebraizing proverbial forms are considered, although Nitzsch, who is generally so exact in his dealing with the word of Scripture, holds (*Predigten V. Auswahl*, p. 123) that "wisdom must justify herself *against* her children"; but this is in opposition to the whole context, and to Solomon, to whom reference is also made.

and the ἐδικαιώθη simply expresses this internal acknowledgment, which wisdom receives from them. It is put in the past tense to add to its force—It has been so from the beginning, whosoever has become a true child of wisdom has known and acknowledged her (thus giving the πάντων of Luke its full meaning): consequently even in this foolish generation there will not be, there are not wanting, docile souls who give God his glory. Thus the καί is to be taken as ἀλλά—*but* they do not all speak thus, some there are who wake up from the frivolous sport, and observe God's earnest dealings, the truth of God; find in *repentance* (ver. 21), the key which unlocks the preaching of John and the Son of Man, experience the refreshment which is promised to the weary and heavy-laden—in short give wisdom her due as her true and genuine children. There is couched in this ὀξύμωρον (*oxymoron*), by which *wisdom*, that should approve herself to all, is said to need justification even to those who acknowledge her—an undertone of *lamentation*, which by the καί is still connected with the preceding words, and which has confused the best expositors (as Bengel's obscure and diffuse comment in Luke shows). And *in this* is also implied the great grievance, that those others (as Job xxxviii. 2) have condemned the wisdom of God, and darkened it by their revilings,* so that their offence must be pressed through in order to that justification, which ought never to be necessary; and the children of wisdom, having inwardly acknowledged her, must outwardly also bear witness in her defence against that opposition (for this also as an inference is included in the δικαιοῦν). But this defence is far from being successful in any γενεά (*generation*); for the same offence is taken against the τέκνα or *children* as against the ἐρχομένους or *those that should come*, and the Pharisees ever continue their taunt—Look at the publicans and sinners, his only dependents! or the Sadducees—See the people who fast and who pray, the disciples of the master in the wilderness! What remains then in such a state of things? That one thing which the Lord simply declares—The docile and obedient, at least, whether many or few, acknowledging and confessing the wisdom of God with their hearts and their lips, have justified that wisdom, and have known how to discriminate all varieties of God's preaching like true hearers, and to harmonize like true disciples the diversified methods of the preachers. If this is concealed from the mass of a whole generation, if they deny it or utterly reject it, yet is this ἐδικαιώθη, "*justified*," a permanent and steadfast fact. Thus have we already the prelude, in the soul of Christ, to that consolation which the Father reveals to him in ver. 25; and this *solace* is the fundamental key-note of that rest and calm which concludes the whole discourse.

* "We must justify wisdom, though such ought not to be the case, and is itself a reproach to man; for he who requires that wisdom should be justified to him, is himself a fool" (Roos).

Matthew has more reasons than one for not immediately proceeding with what follows, but interposing as it were a new heading to his discourse—a practice which, we well know, he very sparingly adopts. He makes here a little more emphatic the pause which here and there is sometimes to be understood, in all the longer discourses: he further impresses it upon us by the ἤρξατο, he *began* (which is not merely a note that the suspended discourse goes on again, but is closely connected with ὀνειδίζειν, *to upbraid*), that the Lord now assumed a tone of severity in condemnation which he had never assumed before. He thus gives an explanation, by the way, concerning those many miracles which his Gospel had not specially recorded; and, finally gives a very significant intimation that the μετανοεῖν *or repentance* afterwards mentioned by the Lord was the great and essential point. On the other hand, the τότε ἤρξατο,* "*then* he began," leaves no room for the supposition that sayings uttered on other occasions are collected here, more especially as the internal connection of the whole of the chapter is entirely opposed to that supposition. According to Luke x. 13–15, 21, 22, the Lord repeated all this on the mission and return of the Seventy, nor can we see any reason why that repetition might not have taken place; for the discourse there as well as here is consistent and connected, and we find within the limits of each individual Gospel, evidences that it is our Lord's method often to repeat what he had spoken before. We find that in Matt. x. 15 a prelude was given of what in ch. xi. is expanded in detail: now when that prelude occurs again in Luke x. 12, what could be more natural than that the same detail should follow it once more? and that not in the thoughts of the compiling Evangelist, collecting together the sayings of the Lord, but in the spirit of the Lord himself, who in his pædagogic wisdom and condescension, had already begun to repeat some of his most impressive and important sayings.

Matthew's exhibition of this discourse would have been without its full and perfect close, if to the simile of vers. 16–19, there had not been added a yet severer denunciation of their guilt (vers. 21–24), followed by the return to gentle and affectionate invitation (vers. 25–30). The Lord first lightly condemned the unbelief

* Which Alford also correctly urges, as proving it to be "quite impossible that this should be a collection of our Lord's sayings uttered at different times," and regards it with perfect truth as rather "a token of the report of an ear-*witness*, and as pointing to a pause or change of manner on the part of our Lord." [This whole theory of a repetition of our Lord's discourses, is a mere shift in order to make out that Matthew's *topical* arrangement is also a *chronological* one.—Am. Ed.]

of the generation as childish folly; but that must not suffice, for these unbelievers are no children, and their deeper guiltiness he must more severely denounce. His ὀνειδίζειν, *upbraiding*, as it is on that account ntly designated by Matthew, is not merely a lamentation over labor expended in vain, although that belongs to human zeal of rebuking love, but is pre-eminently the jealous anger of holy truth against their sin. Gracious as is the Son of Man in his exhibition of himself as the friend of publicans and sinners, he can also insist upon repentance, and threatens judgments upon the impenitent as severely as John himself: yea, more rigorously and severely than he, since he is himself the Judge. There is *no other who will come* after him, but he that has come will *one day come again* to judgment!

Verses 21–24. The Lord utters a *woe* which is the antithesis of the *blessed* in verse 6; just as in the Sermon on the Mount, according to Luke vi. 24–26. He gives a preintimation of what the desolate end will be (Matt. xxiii); but now he goes not beyond Galilee, where the great light had hitherto shone most brightly into the darkness. The *Chorazin* here alone mentioned, and the well-known *Bethsaida*, are specified as representatives, for the reason which Matthew gives, of many other κωμοπόλεις, *villages*, standing in similar case: in contradiction to these the capital stands alone, with its more definite and impressive καί σύ, *and thou*, as we said before; that is to say, not as the capital of Galilee, properly speaking and in the ordinary sense (for this was Tiberias, the residence of Herod, whither the Lord on that account more seldom came), but *Capernaum* as in reality greater and more proud, which had taken the place of Nazareth as "his own city" (ch. iv. 13). He does not rebuke Nazareth by name, though so malevolent towards himself; the affectionate and sorrowful love with which he ever thinks of it forbids that, as also his wisdom, which would avoid every appearance of evil. He does not rebuke such as have injured and persecuted himself personally, but such as have refused to repent. We read of no enmity or persecution to which he was subjected in Capernaum; but the careless and indifferent reception of his word and works was yet worse, and more condemnable than any eruption of malice would have been; it bespoke that slothful, dead, impassive indifference, for which nothing more could be done. The exaltation of Capernaum to heaven is generally regarded as referring to the honor which had accrued to it from being the dwelling-place of Christ; but though this was the immediate cause of the special allusion to its name, we cannot admit that allusion in *this* expression. The Lord's humility would have prevented that; besides which the contrasted *bringing down to hell* points to another interpretation. The words do not refer to any honor which he had put upon this city, but to a state of external prosperity which would come to a frightful end, to the imperious and sinful pride with which she had exalted herself. According to Benjamin of Tudela, Capernaum lay so high, that at first sight it appeared higher than Carmel; and Nonnus on John vi. 59, calls it βαθυκρήπις Καφαρναούμ, "deeply founded Capernaum." Probably it was not without figurative allusion to this external pre-eminence that the Lord indicated it as the Galilean *Jerusalem*, and in such a manner that the unnamed city on the hill must be thought of when he announces its coming fate. The expressions themselves, however, are taken from prophetic Scripture, and point back to the pride and ruin of Babel or *Babylon* (Isa. xiv. 13–15; compare as to Jerusalem and Israel, Isa. lvii. 9).*

The δυνάμεις, *mighty works*, which were done in you, which were done in thee, refer back to vers. 5–12; since the wonderful works of our Lord were a most decisive testimony and demonstration of the offered kingdom of heaven, and they constituted in themselves a most effectual preaching of repentance and faith. How much that is not recorded may the πλεῖσται, *most*, of ver. 20 include! All *the works of Christ* are a call to hear, a confirmation of the word so strong, that unbelief is by them rendered the more inexcusable (John xiv. 10, 11, 24, x. 37). It cannot be sophistically explained away that the Lord manifestly, both here and there, assigns to the miracles which their eyes beheld, the highest place among the external means of grace appointed of God. As he indicates in the μετανοεῖν, *repenting*, which lays the ground of the πιστεύειν, *believing*, springing also from a preparatory degree of it, the decisive and distinctive turning-point on the side of man, (and this explanation is also essential to the understanding of vers. 16–19), so does the judgment take its rise from the despising of God's miraculous works, a judgment, therefore, more fearful than that which will fall upon the heathen cities, to which no such signs were given.

With the two cities, two others are first contrasted; and then one city to one of them: *Tyre* and *Sidon*, laid waste, according to prediction, by Nebuchadnezzar and Alexander, lay in the neighborhood, and their judgment was the less as they still *stood* restored in a measure from their ruin (Acts xii. 20, xxi. 3–7, xxvii. 3).† Hence it could only be said

* We find traces of the once celebrated city Capernaum in the earlier records of travellers; but no ruins of it are discernible now. (Comp. Robinson's *Palestine* on this point.) [The latest researches tend to identify it with the modern *Tell-Hûm*. The author's reasons for abandoning the usual reference of our Saviour's expression to the distinguished privilege of his teaching, are unsatisfactory.—Am. Ed.]

† But it is obvious that the Lord does not intend these new cities (to which Sepp thinks he might, in his obscure visitation of Phœnicia, have paid an acceptable visit!), but the ancient cities, which the prophets rebuked, and which had been laid waste · for these are the proper parallel with Sodom.

of *Sodom* afterwards, with increased emphasis, that it would have remained to this day. The guilt of unbelieving, contradicting Israel had even in old time been represented as surpassing that of Sodom and Gomorrah, bye-words among the prophets for wickedness; how much more may the Lord so speak, now that they have consummated their unbelief! In Deut. xxxii. 32, Israel is likened to Sodom, as also in Isa. i. 10; but in Lament. iv. 6 and Ezek. xvi., it is further added that Israel's abominations were greater! Let the *pride* of Sodom, as it is depicted in Ezek. xvi. 48–50, be especially observed; and it will commend the view of the exaltation of Capernaum, which we have given above.

They would long ago, in *their time*, when the judgment was coming upon them, have repented in order to avert it; and, indeed, in *sackcloth* and *ashes*, like Nineveh, which thus escaped its judgment (Jonah iii. 6; comp. 2 Kings vi. 30; Jer. vi. 26; Dan. ix. 3). Many regard this latter addition, not as strengthening, according to the tone of the whole discourse, but as softening the expression—They would at least externally, have humbled themselves, and thus, like Ahab (1 Kings xxi. 27–29), made propitiation; but this is altogether inapplicable here, for the Judge, as in Isa. lviii. 5, looks at the sincerity of the heart. Thus much, however, the addition to *μετενόησαν*, *repented*, tells us that the penitent expression of guilt, true penance as such, is to be made prominent in connection with "change of mind," and consequently, Luther's translation may be justified. Let it be further observed with what absolute and sublime assurance the Lord speaks as Judge, and therefore as Searcher of hearts and as knowing all hidden things: the Father exhibits to him the coming judgment, and gives him at the same moment the glance of omniscience, so that he can speak of what would have taken place in any age, among any people, under any circumstances. This is not merely a common mode of speech, but must, like all the Lord's sayings, be precisely interpreted. It directs us to that *scientia media de futuro conditionato sive futuribili*, as the schoolmen have it, which is not, however, an invention of Jesuitical casuistry, but the only true reconciliation of the counsels of God with the freedom of man. The history which contains the visitations of God's anger against Tyre and Sidon, and the destruction of Sodom to this day, rests not upon any coherence of natural events simply, nor upon the unconditional decree of God, but upon the freedom of man; their judgments were drawn down upon them by their sin, and would not have fallen upon them, if the doomed had repented in time.

But now the Lord's words rise yet higher—They would have repented, *if* the greater means of grace had been afforded them! This is a deep saying, and of vast and far-reaching consequence; a *dictum probans* that cannot be too much pondered, against all that narrow and bigoted dogmatism which, swifter to judge than the merciful and righteous Lord himself, would rashly decide the eternal damnation of the heathen, not to say of all those multitudes of Christians, who, in their life-time, never had what might be called a clear testimony of the truth. To say that God is under no obligation to give the grace of life equally to all sinners, and that he was justified in punishing Sodom and Gomorrah in their iniquity, does not help the case; for God is *under obligation* to no sinner, and he would have been justified in punishing the whole world, instead of redeeming it—but yet he did redeem it. When the Redeemer himself, whose coming into the world is itself the great, decisive witness of all-merciful love, declares that the failure to repent, and therefore the want of salvation, was, in the case of many, the result of the lack of great grace—what is the irrefragable inference which must ensue? Is it merely that the half-permitted, half-presumptuous question is excited—Wherefore did not God give to them, or will he yet give to them repentance? No, it follows, according to the plain answer which he himself appended, that *it will be more tolerable* in the day of judgment for Tyre and Sidon, Sodom and Gomorrah, for heathen, Jews and Christians who have been hurried in their sins to eternity, but who, with fuller grace, might have repented, than for those who enjoyed upon earth the complete testimony of God's will, but rejected it against themselves. This word stretches far and deep. There is promised to Sodom (in Ezek. xvi. 53–55) a bringing again of their captivity and a return to their estate; but that indefinite Old Testament expression receives here its true meaning and explanation. The *day of judgment* can only be the last day of final doom;* as there will then, however, be no more room for preaching or conversion, but only the full revelation of what had been already decreed, it might seem to follow that an intermediate state of grace and corrective judgment must be presumed, between their judgments recorded in history and their final judgment, between the death of the sinners, and that damnation of unbelievers which will follow the finished preaching of the Gospel. Thus does the Lord speak words which might be thought to oppose equally the false dogmatics of condemnation, and those of general restoration: those carried away in their sins may yet find space of repentance, but those who rejected the full testimony of the Gospel will find no more salvation. There is a veil, however, thrown by our Lord over the whole subject of the dealings of God's judgment beyond time (Rom. xi. 33): he only uses the indefinite *ἀνεκτότερον*

* In the external judgment upon Israel, to which these words have been incorrectly limited, there is only a symbolical exhibition of what is here indicated. Otherwise the Lord must have spoken in the preterite instead of the future—It would then have been more tolerable for Sodom, than it will be for Galilee and Israel when their calamities come.

ἔσται, *it shall be more tolerable*, which might be applied simply to degrees of condemnation corresponding with degrees of salvation. He does not predict the damnation of any particular inhabitant of Chorazin, Bethsaida, or Capernaum, for he speaks only of those cities in the mass; no more does he determine the conversion and salvation of any individual inhabitant of Sodom and Gomorrah. For it does not by any means follow that they who believed not when the long-suffering of God waited for them in the flesh, would believe the preaching of the Gospel to the dead; so far as πάλαι ἂν μετενόησαν, *they would have repented long ago*, might be applied in general, there would seem to be some room left for hope in that mercy of God which never forgot mortal man.

Verses 25, 26. Olshausen's confident assumption that the formula ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ, *at that time*—occurring in a similar way in ch. xii. 1—indicates that what follows was uttered on *another* occasion, springs from his already mentioned idiosyncracy concerning Matthew's collections of our Lord's discourses, and is refuted both by the train of thought, and by the ἀποκριθείς, *answered*, which cannot be understood of anything but a strict connection. Every unbiassed reader must discern *here* something more than the mere indefinite beginning of a discourse, equivalent to the Hebrew ענה; nor is it merely, as it were, a third ἤρξατο, or *began* (after vers. 7, 20), indicating a new turn in its sentiment; but the internal *contrast* to the following with the preceding words leads us to its meaning. The Lord *answers* his own words, which had passed from lamentations to threatenings of judgment, by a quieting discourse, in which, submitting himself to the Father's righteous decrees, he returns back again to the language of gracious invitation. Regarding these new words as *addressed to the Father*, the *answer* will be understood in all its profound meaning. The Father had previously spoken to his Son by a secret inspiration which comforts his soul, and stills its holy perturbation; and the Son now responds to that secret voice by his ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, *I thank thee*—even so, Father, thy counsel is right, I will only thy righteous will and decree! Such an internal process in the soul of Jesus, when we conceive it aright, prepares the way at least for the sublime words of ver. 27; and on their repetition (Luke x. 21), the consolation seems to have been strengthened in his living remembrance, for we read ἠγαλλιάσατο τῷ πνεύματι, *he rejoiced in spirit*.

This is, so far as we know, the first public *invocation* of the Father before all the people,* and the only one which occurred before that final period, when Jesus twice (John xi. 41; xii. 28), thus spoke in the hearing of man, and the last instance in Gethsemane, and on the cross. It indicates an extraordinary emotion excited by a moment of sublime and critical solemnity. He calls him Father, but does not add *Lord*, in the absolute sense, which only became the Son under the veil of prophecy, and in the deep humiliation of his humanity *Lord of heaven and earth*—this is something more; it is generally the solemn invocation of prayer, and here particularly the appropriate reference is to that sovereign counsel which embraces, penetrates, directs all things that are. But what is that decree of the righteous Father, his concurrence with which the Son so solemnly declares, with his "*even so*" of glory and praise? That not all *can* be saved, and, therefore, indeed, *should* not be, that salvation is only given to the humble who receive it, but denied to the proud opposers. Did the Son find his solace in this, and shall we poor children reject it? Let us take good heed, that we do not likewise fall into the condemnation of the wise and prudent! Let us rather endeavor, so far as we may, to enter into the feeling of the heart of the God-man, which blends together and reconciles the sayings—More tolerable for Sodom than for thee, and—Come unto me, all ye that are weary! The giving or denying of salvation is not expressly mentioned, yet nothing less is meant by the *revealing* and the *hiding*, inasmuch as all must depend upon the knowledge of the counsel and economy of salvation. In the deep and mysterious ταῦτα, *these things*, which concisely includes the impressive contrasts of the preceding discourse, the faith and unbelief, the μακάριος, *blessed!* and οὐαί, *woe!* and the things concerning them, inconceivably much is said, but inconceivably more is unspoken. The *wise and prudent* (σοφοὶ καὶ σύνετοί, significantly twofold) are obviously those who are prudent after the flesh, the proud whose blind wisdom opposes the eternal wisdom of God (ver. 19; 1 Cor. i. 19–21, 27. According to *Hagada shel Pesach*, p. 5, the Jews said every year at the Passover, We all are wise, we all are understanding, we all have knowledge of the law; thus perversely appropriating Deut. iv. 6–8, since they were quite ignorant of the very essence of the law, knowing no more of the preaching of repentance, than of that which was its end and aim, the reception of grace in Christ. In the grandest and most general application of the words, the Jews must appear as the falsely wise, the heathen as the docile babes;* although the word penetrates much deeper, and found its first application in the distinction of the Scribes and the common people, the Jews and the *Galileans*; indeed, in our own day, it asserts its truth in ever new dis-

* Roos: These precious words are the first record of communion between the Son of God and his Father, which the Evangelists have given us.

* In the Clementines (*Hom.* viii. 6) it is quoted: ὅτι ἔκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις θηλάζουσιν, "that thou hast hid these things from wise elders, and revealed them to sucking babes"—in which Hilgenfield rightly regards the Jews as the wise elders, and opposed to them the Gentile Christians (comp. *Hom.* xviii. 15.)

tinctions between the falsely wise and the truly simple, so that *the revelation* may be *concealed* even from many a doctor thought to be orthodox. It is the Father's will to reveal his salvation to all, even as it is the Son's to give rest to all; but just as only the heavy-laden can find that rest, so can the wisdom and truth of God be revealed only to babes and simple ones.* To give this revelation to the wise, and to give this consolation to the satisfied, are alike impossible, for that would be to give to those who will not receive.† In the salvation of any man, that freedom which is permitted to him by his Creator, must exercise a deciding influence: and this is the inscrutable and unimpeachable counsel of the Father, which must ever be adored, even when through the opposition of a free agent, the revelation becomes a hiding, and in giving a withholding (Deut. xxxii. 4, 5). Thus will the righteousness of God be justified to the children of wisdom, even in its ἀποκρύπτειν, *hiding*. Νήπιοι, *babes*, are the פְּתָאִים of the Old Testament (Psa. xix. 8, cxvi. 6, cxix. 130; Prov. i. 4, etc.), who are free and accessible to instruction, who yield themselves up like little children to be taught and disciplined: and in this word the Lord has in view that great passage (Psa. viii. 3), which he afterwards so sublimely explained. He then rises from this little band of μικροί, *little ones*, who, however, under the training of God will become men and conquerers, to the supreme and only Father, and subsides from his holy indignation into the εὐδοκία, *it seemed good*, addressed to him (comp. Luke xii. 32). It is the same sacred will of the Father, which shows itself as good and gracious to the saved, and as righteous to those lost through their persistent guilt; and it is now sealed by the *Even so* of the Son, who would so willingly save them all. The ἐξομολογοῦμαι (incorrectly translated by Erasmus, *gratias ago*, I thank thee; as also of late by Ebrard—for that would have required εὐχαριστῶ, John xi. 41), expresses praise which springs from, and consists in acknowledgment and accordance: Bengel, therefore, says with as much depth as truth—*summa ἐξομολογήσεως filialis, ηα Pater!* This is the decisive *yea*, which protests against all the contradiction of worldly wisdom, and will be justified at the last day and through eternity; and it forms the transition to the following words concerning the Father and the Son.

Verse 27. Besides in this place, and in the parallel of Luke, we find in the first three Evangelists only once more "the Son" occurring absolutely, and that is in Mark xiii. 32. This utterance of our Lord is, as men say, entirely *Johannean;* and that it occurs in Matt. and Luke is sufficient to show the unison between these Gospels and the Gospel of John. We find an evidence of the genuineness of these words in their obvious correspondence, uttered as they were immediately after John's message, with the testimony which he had once given to his disciples concerning the Father and the Son (John iii. 35, 36); just as we found in Matt. ix. 15, a similar reference to John iii. 29. No exposition can exhaust, no dogmatic speculation can penetrate, the depths of this saying, which points to the deep things of the Godhead. We do better to spell it out in simplicity with the babes, and thus to yield up our souls to the mighty and effectual revelation of the Holy Spirit, who will teach us what is the confession of the Father and the Son. The first thing which such child-like reading emphasizes is the distinctive "*to me*:" seeking him in obedience to his subsequent exhortation—Come *unto me!* we shall find him, and in him, all that he may and will reveal unto his own. Then comes the παρεδόθη, *are delivered*, as inscrutable as it is absolute, which by no means applies only to the Son of Man in his humanity, but to the Eternal Son, who also as the Son hath received all things from the Father (John v. 26). Πάντα, *all things*, is just as comprehensive in its range as the previously ταῦτα, *these things*, to which it corresponds; but the Son cannot simply say, that all things are *revealed* unto him. He himself is the revealer, even as the Father is. It is not all *power* in heaven and earth (Matt. xxiii. 18), which is immediately contemplated here; but the full perception and knowledge of eternal truth, and the justification of the supreme wisdom of God's counsel. God is himself truth and wisdom, *he knoweth himself* in the trinity of his being, reciprocally as Father and Son in the unity of the Spirit. But the third Person is not here expressly mentioned, because he was not yet manifest, as the Son was in the Son of Man (ver. 19). What completeness does this give to the discourse of this chapter, compact and rounded as it every where is, when such a testimony to his divine and eternal dignity is set over against the deep humiliation of him who had come into the generation of that age! The Son hath all things to reveal and to administer, but as *given him* of the Father; thus, even while he is testifying of his own supreme dignity, he first gives honor to the Father, and then proceeds to cry: Come unto me, for only with me and in me, is every thing to be found!

The common translation "knoweth" does not fully correspond to the ἐπιγινώσκει, which signifies a perfect and living perception and knowledge: hence we have in Luke x., γινώσκει τίς ἐστιν, *knoweth who he is*, that is, what the names *Father* and *Son* would signify *ad intra.** *No man* knoweth that—a gracious

* "Because the babes, not perverted, are in reality more cultured than the wise and prudent of this world" (Petersen, *Lehre von der Kirche*, i. 135).

† Most assuredly, those who are wise in their own conceits, are here ironically referred to, so that we cannot say with Von Gerlach—The wise might better descend to the level of the babes, than these rise to the level of the wise. It is, alas, far otherwise, and that is not the Lord's meaning.

* Thus by a true interpretation we repel a cer-

and earnest warning for all the wise and prudent, who conceive themselves qualified to investigate what is in the nature of God, without the illumination of the Spirit of God. Well had it been if Christian dogmatics, both before and since Athanasius, had remembered this warning of the Son, and been content to speak of the mysteries of the Trinity in no other words than those which the Son reveals to the babes, and gives to the heavy-laden who come to him as their living and life-giving knowledge! It was first said, No man knoweth the Son but the Father. The intermediate idea, unexpressed, but which is necessarily deduced from these premises, is, that we must know *the Father*, in order to know the Son. It is further added—But the Father doth not reveal himself immediately, but in the Son. Thus it remains established, as it is testified in John xiv. 8, 9, vi. 46, i. 18, that the Son alone immediately knoweth the Father as such and in himself, all others know him mediately through the Son. The Son *revealeth* simply, as the ἀποκαλύψαι at the end (without our translators' addition—*him*) is designed to signify: He revealeth himself, and in himself the Father, and πάντα ταῦτα, *all these things*, of eternal wisdom in the plan of salvation, which have their issues in eternal salvation and condemnation.* This is the mystery of God, of which Col. ii. 2 speaks, be the true reading whichever it may; and this is the internal principle contained in Rev. x. 7, which is to be fulfilled in history. It might have run in conclusion, after the analogy of Scripture usage elsewhere, as Matt. xvi. 17; John vi. 45—And to whomsoever *the Father* will reveal; but this form of expression which was used in ver. 25, is now limited to its only possible meaning and application, just as the sentiment of ver. 46 immediately following ver. 45 in John vi. The Father only revealeth in the revelation of the Son. But whatever appearance of arbitrary, exclusive election in the will of God there might be in ᾧ ἐὰν βούλεται, *to whomsoever he will*, is emphatically removed by the words that immediately follow, in which the Son himself then present calls *all* to himself!

Verse 28. This sentence is as universal and unconditional as the preceding. But it must be attentively observed that the Lord does not continue to speak of revelation and knowledge: they who would know and *see*, must *come*, and receive the revelation in the living experience of the ἀνάπαυσις, *rest*; that only being the true learning of God's simple ones.* Only by living experience of God's grace can we know God, and this proceeds from faith to faith. What then is the way to faith in him who has come, in which the offence is overcome, and salvation is attained through him? In theory it is the casting away of all wisdom and prudence of self in order to a childlike concurrence with the Ναί ὁ Πατήρ, *Even so, Father*, which the Son utters for our example; but in practice, without which theory has no value, it is the obedience to the word of that same Son, the acceptance of that word which the Son of Man in meekness and humility utters to the children of men—Δεῦτε πρός με, *Come unto me.*

The whole of this comprehensive conclusion of the discourse (vers. 28–30), is an inexhaustible text which can never be preached out! *Who is it* that invites, beseeches, and calls? The eternal Son of the eternal Father, for us become a Son of man! *Whom* does he call? All, all who will know themselves to be what they are, weary and heavy-laden! What does he *promise* to them? Refreshment and rest for their souls! What does he *require* as the condition? Nothing, absolutely nothing but *coming*; and when they are come and have already received his consolation, only the abiding with him, *learning* of him!

In Ecclus. xxiv. 19, 20, the eternal Wisdom utters her own praise and invites men to herself, and the Lord here uses words which almost seem to be the echo of that passage in his own spirit, for he must often have read those words. The first Δεῦτε πρός με, *Come unto me*, is uttered with divine majesty, precisely as the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel cries (Isa. xlv. 22): פְּנוּ-אֵלַי וְהִוָּשְׁעוּ כָּל-אַפְסֵי אָרֶץ, *Turn unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth!* This single word in the mouth of one Son of Man, calling all others to himself that he may save them from all their need, is ample and sufficient testimony that he is more than man: this is the manner of a man who in his greatness is even the Lord God (2 Sam. vii. 19, 22; 1 Chron. xvii. 18). He only who could speak of himself as in ver. 27, could follow it with ver. 28.† O, how does the eternal

tain recent criticism, which asserts the aorist ἔγνω to be the true reading, as it was found in many ancient quotations of the fathers; imagining that the Evangelists saw themselves constrained to change the expression on account of its dangerous service to the *Gnostics* (who held that the God of Jesus was an altogether new and hitherto unknown God).

* If we were to supply αὐτὸν τὸν Πατέρα—which, indeed, seems at first to be right—we should overlook the design for which this αὐτόν is omitted; that is, in order that the end should round off into the style of the beginning, with a general idea. It is *revelation*, generally, that is concerned.

* As Roos has very beautifully said, "Our true notion of the divinity of the Son depends not upon any hard thought, or scholastic subtilty, but upon this—that the Son be in such sense the end of our coming, believing, desire and hope, that we never go beyond him for their satisfaction." In which connection of vers. 27 and 28, we may once more observe that the Son immediately reveals himself and only in himself the Father.

† Roos again: "Clearly to perceive and to feel this, we have only to imagine an apostle saying—Come unto me, etc. Would not such words in the mouth of an apostle be meaningless and blasphemous presumption? The same may be applied to all the sayings of our Lord, wherever he speaks of himself. We need not so anxiously and carefully go about to collect proofs of Christ's divinity."

mercy of God express itself in the tenderness and grace of the Saviour's human heart! How natural it is to regard him as looking round, and stretching out his arms and saying—Only come unto me, come, and *wait no longer for another;* I am he, let *me* not wait upon you! How would he, after this grief over those who were rushing into judgment and sorrow, take his own comfort in those whom he might solace, to whom he would all the more ardently extend all that salvation which the others had cast away or refused!

All men *are* actually weary, and heavy laden; laboring and dejected under the yoke of sin and vanity, of death and destruction; and so far the invitation is *to all.* This might be our first simple exposition, which would then make κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι, *that labor and are heavy laden*, only the same thing viewed under two aspects, *active* and *passive.* But with this it must also be observed, that he by no means excludes those who are miserable through physical and earthly external unhappiness, though he gives them no promises of help merely as such. We find no example of his having invited to himself the merely wretched in body; and we must interpret the words in the same sense as the poor and the mourners are understood in the Sermon on the Mount. Hence we have here, at the conclusion, the true interpretation of the miraculous works which, in ver. 6, were exhibited as *signs* of the Gospel preached to the poor. If the heavy-laden feel their burden as the burden of their spirits, then shall they find rest *unto their souls.* The contrast of the yoke and the burden (vers. 29, 30), tells us that the Lord lays his emphasis upon "heavy-laden," as the peculiar and fundamental idea. But what is the burden of the soul, which may be exchanged for his light burden? First of all, as it regards Israel, in whose midst this cry is heard, the Pharisaical yoke of the law (ch. xxiii. 4); then, further, also the law imposed of God (Acts xv. 10), with all its wearisome and hard observances of worship; then again as regards all men, it is sin, on account of which these laws are imposed by God or man, with all the disquietude of an evil conscience without atonement, and the service of things that perish and satisfy not; yea, all that oppresses and weighs down the soul in the utmost comprehensiveness of these words, from that restless, hot pursuit of sin, which finds no peace, as the most wicked children of the world well know, down to the gratuitous burden which even a Martha among the disciples of Jesus may impose upon herself. Thus *heavy-laden* in ten thousand ways are all men every where, and so the "all" of the invitation is an open contrast with the "no man" of ver. 27. But why then do not all come to him? This question leads us to observe that κοπιῶντες (*that labor*) is subject to a necessary *restriction* and connects itself with πεφορτισμένοι (*heavy-laden*), as τῷ πνεύματι (*in spirit*) with πτωχοί (*poor*). It means not here, according to its usual meaning elsewhere, those who labor simply, and strain their energies; for such vehement personal labor and exertion, so long as it is fruitlessly put forth, effectually hinders from coming to the only source of reinvigoration; but it means, according to the proper and original idea of the word, those who are *exhausted* and spent, who, pressed down by their burden, can bear it no longer. (Thus the καί is a *Vav exegeticum* for "*because*," as in John xi. 26.) Though he may call all, yet is his call heard only by those who feel their burden and would be freed from it: this is the mediating link between the offer and the acceptance of salvation. Where the law, and sin, and the world, and the flesh have so long burdened the Spirit, that the soul is brought to confess and mourn the burden, to despair of deliverance in its own strength; there is that spark of longing in the spirit to which grace can address itself, and which it comes down to meet. The Lord stands in the midst of humanity and utters his call: he who follows him approves himself thereby as one susceptible of salvation, and whose will is rightly disposed; all others, who have long heard his call in vain, will one day hear in earnest the awful—*Depart from me!* (ch. xxv. 41). But he does not now cry in another voice, Remain at your distance from me, all ye proud and satisfied ones, who are better pleased with the galling yoke than with my easy burden. No, he cries also to them, *Come ye too*, but come as the weary and the wretched! So will I *give you rest* also (compare ἀναπαύσω Isa. xxviii 12, in the Heb. and Sept., where עֲיֵף clearly corresponds to κοπιῶν; Isa. lvii. 15, Sept.; Jer. xxxi. 25 in the Heb.).

Verse 29. The *yoke* here does not involve the idea of subjection to authority; this would be actually opposed to the context, for the Lord explains himself immediately afterwards by *learn of me!* The expression was used proverbially among the Jews for the receiving of instruction, and discipline, as is plainly seen in Eccles. li. 33, 35, and also in passages like Jer. v. 5; Prov. i. 8, 9. The Jews speak of a עוֹל תּוֹרָה, "*yoke of the law*," and in the Mishna we find קבילו עליכו עול מלכותא קדישא, "take upon you the yoke of the holy kingdom." In the *Sohar* the yoke of the kingdom of heaven is spoken of, and elsewhere the Tephillim (prayer-fringes) are represented as the cords of the yoke, by which God binds Israel to himself. We find it said, "How beautiful is their neck, which beareth the yoke of my precepts; it sitteth upon them as the yoke upon the neck of the ox, which ploweth the field, and nourisheth both himself and his master." This proverb as a *Jewish* one, had indeed a legal origin and a legal savor clinging to it—but the Lord speaks catachrestically of his easy yoke, though not without intimating thereby that obeying as well as learning, was involved in coming to him: as a gracious teacher, whose heart is set on having disciples, the Lord just offers and recommends his yoke, his doctrine

and discipline; then proceeds a little farther, and leaving the first simple promise *κἀγὼ ἀναπαύσω, and I will give you rest*, gives all clearly to understand that this *ἀνάπαυσις*, or *rest*, is not in its fullest extent to be instantly secured, but that a continuous *learning* in his school is essential, to which a continuous and progressive *finding* will correspond. The former is the condition of the latter. They who seek their soul's rest out of him, are the most heavy-laden of all, for they find an ever-increasing burden of disquietude; they, however, who come to him, will most assuredly find what they perseveringly seek. He encourages the proud children of men—who, even after finding the true teacher, learn so unwillingly and so slowly—to progress in his instructions, by the assurance which he adds, that they shall ever find in him a *meek and lowly* Master. For I am *meek of heart*, although I spake words of such stern condemnation, vers. 20, 24; I judge, because all judgment hath been committed unto me of the Father, as the Son of Man, but condemn no man who only cometh and learneth of me. I am *lowly of heart*, notwithstanding that I have borne witness to myself as Son of the Father, vers. 25–27; I place myself among the foolish little ones, to share in every way their experience. Both meekness and humility (not merely the latter) are human attributes, which only the one Son of Man so possesses that he can fully claim them as his own, and unconditionally proclaim them. This is indicated by *τῇ καρδίᾳ, in heart*, which refers probably to both, and opens to us in the most engaging manner the full, voluntary condescension and love of his incarnate *Jesus-heart*. This is the *only instance* in which *καρδία* is spoken of in connection with Jesus.

Ye shall find rest unto your souls, is literally taken from Jer. vi. 16, and not after the incorrect rendering of the Septuagint. This promise, as it is finally given, comes *after* the testimony to his meekness and lowliness, in order to intimate to all who progress in the school of Christ, that nothing else is to be learned from him but the becoming, through his grace, by degrees *what he is* (Eph. iv. 2). For meekness and lowliness is itself the rest *of the soul*, even though the burden and disquietude may not be externally removed. Anger and pride create disquietude: he who finds not rest with the meek and lowly One, must be still oppressed by them; the failing is in him, and not in the yoke and burden of Christ.

Verse 30. Has he then also a *yoke* and a *burden?* Assuredly, for the heavy-laden can find no help without subjection to the grace and truth of God. The one yoke only gives place to the other: independent and gods we can never be (Rom. vi. 16–18). But the Lord only terms that which he opposes a *yoke*, in contradistinction to the other, just as Paul speaks of the *law* of faith. There it is a law, and yet no law; here it is a yoke, and yet no yoke. Hence the adjectives which are appended—*easy* (or pleasant, agreeable) and *light*—in a certain sense, revoke the word, in its strict meaning. The yoke is no burden imposed, but actually a means by which burdens may be rendered tolerable and easily borne. St. Bernard cries, "What can be lighter than a burden which takes our burdens away, and a yoke which bears up the bearer himself?" This is the gracious aspect of the words, as they regard that new nature which, learning from the love of Jesus to love both God and man, can say—His commandments are not grievous! But for the old Adam, which, in its stubbornness and pride, can never know rest, and as such is never to be revivified but to be put to death, the easy yoke and light burden is no other than—*the cross*, of which he had already spoken in ch. x. 38, 39. This is undoubtedly the undertone of meaning which they who learn of him will perceive in due time; it is contained in the thrice repeated ζυγός μου, and φορτίον μου—The yoke and the burden, which I myself bear as your Master and Forerunner! What fulness of meaning does this give to the words of the meek and lowly One, who so graciously submitted to the uttermost self-denial and the burden of the cross! Thus it is only, at first—Come unto me! and immediately on coming there is a first refreshment. Then comes the continued learning of him, and finding that only through him, through following and resembling him, the rest of the soul is gained. Finally, there is the persevering advancement under the yoke of his cross, in all the profound meaning of that word; with which is connected, however, the gracious encouragement that arms the Christian against all the opposition of fleshly impatience and refractoriness, the assurance that approves its truth in sure experience—*My* yoke is nevertheless, easy, *my* burden is nevertheless light.* And when that day comes, which shall make manifest those who preferred to bear the yoke of Satan, and the burden of sin, it will be found that the Lord's words were truth, and that his most burdened follower had an incomparably better allotment in the profound peace of the soul which he bestows, than all the slaves of lust with the disquietude of their guilty conscience. Dost thou not yet know this, dear reader, dost thou not say Yea and Amen to this from thine heart? Then take it now to thyself, and let the word of thy Redeemer pursue thee in all thy ways, until thou art constrained to yield up thy heart to its obedience: *Come unto me! Learn of me!*

---

* "It is not difficult to be a Christian. Only make the earnest attempt; take not up the Gospel, however, as a light thing, but upon both shoulders" (Braune).

THE DISCIPLES PLUCK CORN ON THE SABBATH—THE SON OF MAN LORD OF THE SABBATH.

(Matt. xii. 3–8; Mark ii. 25–28; Luke iv. 3–52.)

The chronology of this incident is altogether uncertain in Matthew, as it is not his object to give a consecutive narration of the events, but here in chap. xii. only to depict the *enmity of the Pharisees*, as shown on two Sabbaths, in order thus to prepare the way for the principal discourse directed against them from verse 25 onwards. Luke, however, gives a very exact determination of the time, inasmuch as he calls the Sabbath on which the ears of corn were plucked, δευτερόπρωτον, *second-first* ("second after the first"), a word unfortunately found no where else, and regarded as obscure even from the earliest antiquity, and which, indeed, it would be most convenient to omit, as is done in the Syriac, or to cancel as a false reading.* It is not our object to enter minutely into such collateral circumstances. Along with the majority of commentators, and last of all, Lübkert (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, 3. 664), we are inclined to prefer the opinion first established by Scaliger to all the other opinions of the learned who have exercised their ingenuity on the point,† according to which the first Sabbath after the second Easter-day is the one meant, σάββατον πρωτον ἀπὸ τῆς δευτέρας του Πάσχα, because from this day seven Sabbaths were reckoned to the Pentecost (Lev. xxiii. 10–16). This would also be the time that corresponds best with the plucking of the ears of corn. Yet we cannot herewith decidedly dismiss the really very plausible statement in Bengel's *Ordo temporum*. This, first of all, connects itself quite as simply with the most ancient interpretation of the Church fathers (Chrysostom and Theophyl.), respecting the coincidence of a Sabbath either immediately going before or coming after any new moon or feast day, which was generally called also a Sabbath and was observed as such (as the first Easter-day, Lev xxiii. 11; comp. Exod. xii. 17): he thinks, however, that it is specially the Sabbath *before* the new moon of the month Nisan, fourteen days before the Passover, that is here denoted (John vi. 4). The so-called Sabbath (feast-day) which fell upon the new moon itself, שבת וראש חדש, was called a σαβ. πρῶτον, or great Sabbath; on the other hand, the foregoing day (on which 1 Sam. xx. 18, ss., had been read) was called שבת מחר חדש δευτερόπρωτον, *i. e.* δεύτερος, equivalent to *secundarius* (as in δευτεροδεκάτη in Jerome, and δευτερόλεπτα in Tzezes). True, it may be objected to this, that the plucking of the ears of corn must have taken place *after* the waving of the sheaf of the first fruits, for, otherwise, the Pharisees would have found fault with it as contrary to Lev. xxiii. 14, rather than with the violation of the Sabbath in general; still, as Bengel himself remarks, a reply may be found to this in the answer of our Lord to the Pharisees; and the rest of the chronological arrangement as framed by Bengel, as well as the remarkable coincidence, that precisely on this Sabbath, 1 Sam. xx. 18, ss. (near to which is the passage here cited by Christ), had been read, will not allow us altogether to reject this view. Partly on account of this circumstance, partly because Lübkert (as also Wieseler) has not thought the great Bengel even worthy of being mentioned, we have deemed it right, by way of exception, to direct attention to his interpretation. Wieseler's latest hypothesis brings the year-cycle but too directly into the simple statement of Luke; by which, however, nothing is gained. At all events, the feast mentioned in John v. must be the Purim, which again, however, will not correspond with Bengel's chronology, and the whole subject remains involved in uncertainty; all the more so, as philologically it is impossible even to determine whether δευτερόπρωτον means a second following upon a first (as δευτερόλεπτα may be interpreted)—or a first of a subordinate rank. We willingly leave the enigma to the learned, although for us also it has in it something attractive.*

At the time when Jesus went about in all the cities and villages unweariedly teaching, and preaching, and healing (chap. ix. 35), it happened also on a certain Sabbath, that his disciples, urged by actual hunger, in walking through the corn fields, began to pluck a few

* As if some one had added δευτέρῳ to πρώτῳ as a gloss, and from this the monster had arisen—a groundless conjecture!

† Grotius and Pareau: The σάββατα which followed the great festivals were πρῶτα, or distinguished above the rest, or great (John xix. 31); here, therefore, the second of these three great ones, the Sabbath after Pentecost; which, however, seems too late a period. Capellus and Rhenferd: There were two πρῶτα at the beginning of the civil and ecclesiastical year. Wetstein: δευτερόπρωτον, הָרִאשׁוֹן שֶׁבַּשֵּׁנִי, the first Sabbath of the second month, on which, in the *section* (Lev. xxi.–xxv.), the shew bread also occurred. Hitzig: According to Lev. xxiii. 11, precisely the 15th of Nisan. Wieseler: The first of the seven first Sabbaths in the great week of years which forms the Sabbath-year.

* As a specimen of his time, Roos also could not resist the temptation to dispute the point with the renowned Bengel.

ears and to eat. Innocent conduct in general, expressly allowed by the law (Deut. xxiii. 25), in contradistinction to an act on which any charge of theft might be founded; it is still done, in order thus to see the gift of God in the harvest that is drawing near, and to taste beforehand a little of the bread which he causes to grow out of the earth. Here Matthew, who must have best known the fact, expressly observes that they had been hungry; which, in following their Master, for several hours might well have been the case. But the *Pharisees* (as after chap. ix. 11, Matthew concisely designates the then representatives of this class of men so hostile to Christ) were also in the neighborhood, also walking upon the Sabbath; for the ἰδόντες εἶπον, *when they saw it they said*, is here to be understood more directly than at chap. ix. 11, as is evident from the ἰδού, ποιοῦσιν, *behold, they do*, immediately following ἤρξαντο, *they began*, and afterwards from ver. 9. They went listening beside or behind Christ, and would gladly also have measured after him whether perhaps he would walk a step beyond the allowed Sabbath-journey. There is no Sabbath stillness in their souls, but they are full of evil purposes to go *their own* ways, to find *their own* desires, and to speak words out of such hearts (Isa. lviii. 13, Heb.). They have no notion how the disciples walk with Christ, either hearing God's word from the mouth, or silently offering praise in the great temple of creation. Scarcely have the disciples *begun* to pluck a few ears, when they come forward with their *Behold!* as if they had surprised them in a great sin. If Luke gives their words, as addressed to the disciples, Matthew certainly gives them more correctly as addressed to the Master: Do *thy disciples* break the Sabbath before thine eyes, and dost thou not rebuke them; that we, who are fortunately here, must needs interfere? Is this what they learn from thee? Behold, now, we *see* it! Οὐκ ἔξεστι, *is not lawful*, so in their foolish pride do they lay down their little statute which had been added to the law of God, and which in reality (according to Maimonides, *Hilchoth Sabb.*) forbade* the plucking of ears on the Sabbath as a kind of reaping. O how might Christ have replied to these malicious ones otherwise than he did, and in terms befitting their character, sharply rebuking them, and putting them to shame by his powerful censure! But he is now in a Sabbath tone of mind, to which that would not be suitable. He does not let himself be drawn into the petty school question as to what the מְלָאכָה, *work*, which was forbidden on the Sabbath, means, and whether the plucking of a few ears (or, the rubbing them also with the hands, as Luke adds), belongs to it, although, it only corresponded to the cutting and helping oneself to meat on the Sabbath (which belonged to the meal, see Exod. xii. 16). No, he kindly recompenses good for evil, overcomes their folly with a genuine Sabbath word of his own wisdom, and almost obtrudes upon them the unwished for salutatory doctrine in opposition to their whole Pharisaism, the great doctrine respecting the significance, limits, ground and purpose of every law relating immediately to outward acts, even in the case of that law having been given by God.

Verses 3, 4. Inasmuch as these Pharisees, with all their looking, had yet hastily overlooked the one circumstance which belonged to the *species facti*, Christ fulfills all righteousness, and mentions forthwith the fact that they were hungry, which had not been unperceived by him in the disciples, and which now on reflection he even feels in himself; for he says, at first indirectly, adducing the similar conduct of David, "when he and they who were with him hungered," in no other than a humble spirit, "I and they who are with me are also hungry." The τί ἐποίησε Δαυίδ, *what David did*, thus comes in direct opposition to the ποιοῦσιν, *do*, of the accusation as a suitable reply. Have you not *read* this? Often enough, indeed; but they have never read it aright, never understood it. In Luke οὐδὲ τοῦτο —nor this *also*—might point in general to their being much read in the Scriptures; but if, according to Bengel, 1 Sam. 20 had really been the portion read on this Sabbath, it might also be an injunction that they should call to their recollection a chapter further on in the history of David. In this case, it would be a delicate hint, how accurately Christ observed the arrangements respecting the reading of the Scriptures in the synagogue. Mark has, in addition to the citation, the difficult phrase ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθάρ, *in the days of Abiathar*, which can scarcely have been added by a later hand, and which deserves a word or two of explanation, inasmuch as it has likewise been magnified by those commentators who are ever on the alert for difficulties and mistakes on the part of the disciples of Christ. The priest named in 1 Sam., is called Ahimelech, son of Ahitub (chap. xxii. 11), but his son was Abiathar (chap. xxii. 20), and his father may also have been called Abiathar (which almost corresponds to the meaning of Ahitub), if it is the same that is spoken of in 2 Sam. viii. 17. Nay, he may have been called Ahimelech as well as Abiathar, see 1 Chron. xv. 11, comp. with xviii. 16, xxiv. 6. In short, as often happens, the names are used interchangably, and it is quite possible that both father and son may have had both names. The ἐπί denotes the time when the high priest flourished and held office (Luke iii. 2; iv. 27), and which of the two was priest or high priest, is also a question which cannot be determined. Consequently it is not at all necessary to suppose a change at any rate unimportant, of the name in Mark, but either the time of David and that of the high priest Abiathar (who soon succeeded his deceased father), belong in general to the same chronological epoch, or the Ahimelech who gave the shew-bread was himself also Abia-

* Comp. on this Sepp's *Leben Christi*, ii. 329 and 454.

thar. But enough on subordinate points, and now to the matter itself.

You will not think of finding fault by your *οὐκ ἔξεστι, it is not lawful*, with what King David did, he whom ye laud so much? That David, although he came at first alone (1 Sam. xxi. 1), yet desired the bread, at the same time, for the young men who were with him (Mark and Luke), and who had been "appointed to such and such a place," is evident in the history when attentively read (see there vers. 4, 5); the necessity of hunger is so naturally pre-supposed in the whole narrative that it is for this very reason not expressly named; finally, the going into the house of God, the tabernacle at Nob, follows from vers. 7 and 9. See how carefully Christ reads the narratives of the Scriptures, and how he has them every moment as it were present to his mind! R. D. Kimichi on 1 Sam. xxi. also expressly understands David's words: כִּי רְעֵבִים אֲנַחְנוּ, "for we are hungry;" and treats with great fulness of this remarkable incident, about the shew-bread, and also of its happening to be the *Sabbath* when the fresh supply was laid out, as well as about David's journey on the Sabbath. It is a Rabbinical rule which is also applied to this instance: Danger of life displaces the Sabbath (שׁספק פשׁות רוח השׁבת)—and the Talmud expressly enjoins that even on the great day of atonement, it is lawful, in the absence of pure meat, to give forbidden nourishment to a man overtaken with weakness or extreme hunger. Nor do we read further on in the Scripture, that the listening calumniator Doeg or the angry Saul afterwards made an accusation *of this*, that the bread which had been given was holy; and what David says (chap. xxi 5) contains an assertion and doctrine very clearly justifying what he had done.* Christ, therefore, by the *οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε, have ye not read*, completely refutes the Pharisees *e concessis:* Here was a stronger *οὐκ ἐξόν, was not lawful*, that of a *divine* command for the house and sanctuary of God, than your statute which you have brought against us—will you find fault now with the king and the priest?

Verse 5. *Or*, letting alone what these two once did from special warrant, and in an exceptional case, will you rather abide by the rule of the *law?* Well then, not merely does the sacred *history* relate exceptional instances of *necessity*, but the law itself ordains labor on the Sabbath as a *duty*. Thus Christ takes a step higher, from the particular instances with which the doctrine was connected to the development of the general doctrine: That the mere outward working or not working, without further reference and significance, can never have been the aim of the divine commandment respecting the Sabbath. For, as Scripture proves, there are exceptions to all external law, of whatever kind it be: in the first place, allowed exceptions of *necessity* (which general idea is expressed in Mark by the *χρείαν ἔσχε, he had need*); then, even commanded exceptions of *duty*. The first example has respect to the disciples having eaten (containing a reply at the same time to the charge which the Pharisees had perhaps forgotten to bring against them, of eating before the first fruits were waved), the second more especially to the *breaking of the Sabbath*. The first is taken from the life of the anointed king, the other is from the office and law of the *priests* (already named in the first); for he who now justifies himself is king and priest in the highest sense. The laying out of the shew-bread which has just been mentioned in the house of God, then the offering of the double sacrifice on the Sabbath (Num. xxviii. 9), to which belongs the kindling of the fire, otherwise forbidden in houses (Exod. xxxv. 3; Lev. vi. 12), and the whole temple service in general has to be performed by the priests in the temple on the Sabbath. This then would be a very grievous profanation (*βεβηλοῦν*, Exod. xxxi. 14, Sept.; 1 Macc. ii. 34), as Christ here expresses himself, with somewhat of irony, in order immediately to refute, it in the *ἀναίτιοί εἰσι, are blameless*. For this, also, there are Rabbinical sayings: In the sanctuary there is no Sabbath (אין שׁבת במקדשׁ); the killing of sacrifices displaces the Sabbath (דהתה שׁחטה את שׁבת). The internal truth, however, to which Christ here points, in a different spirit from the Rabbinical, is none other than that *to work the works of God* belongs to every place and time, and is rather the true priestly sanctification of the Sabbath and the sanctuary; for, as at another time, on a like charge being brought against him, he rises still higher: God himself works evermore on the great Sabbath after the creation of the world (John v. 17).

Verse 6. To all this Christ now adds a word pointing to the dignity of his own person (ch. xvii. 25, 26), in virtue of which he is *entirely*, and with the *highest* right of freedom, exempted from outward law, and thereby preparing the way for the conclusion of the address (verse 8). He expresses this, however, not by the direct form—*ἐγώ εἰμι, I am he*, but again, by the modest form of the third person—*Here* is one greater than the temple. The reading of the neuter *μεῖζον* (which Neander still prefers) would only say: Here something is reckoned greater, more important, namely, compassionate regard to the hungry, or however it may be stated;* but we cannot regard this as any thing else than a false correction, since the comparison with the temple instead of the temple service would in this case not be very suitable, while, on the other hand vers. 6 and 8 exactly correspond to each other, if Christ speaks of him-

* In which Melancthon (*Loci*, p. 137, ed. Aug.) finds the same thing already expressed as Paul says in Titus i. 15.

* According to De Wette, the Messianic work. Neander at least is for referring it to the "manifestation of Christ as a whole" (as *πλεῖον* Luke xi. 31, 32)—to which we afterwards also take objection.

self. As the Sabbath gives place to the temple, so Sabbath and temple give place to the greater, the Lord of the temple and Sabbath. He reminds the Pharisees of the enigmatic word (John ii. 19), with which they would certainly be familiar, as also of Mal. iii. 1; and thereby declares again in his own manner who he is—the Messiah, the true King David, the true High Priest, himself the archetype and Lord of the temple. His disciples, too, who have left house and goods for his service, that they might follow him, are collectively priests in the sanctuary, consecrated by him, just as David's companions in his lowly condition were by the already anointed king. This accessory idea unites the whole, and leads over to what follows.

Verse 7. Christ, prepared in the moment for a complete reply to the charge of the Pharisees, adduces the testimony of *history*, the *law*, and the *prophets* against them. If history and the law have already spoken of *particular cases of exception*, he now shows, secondly, how the prophetical Scripture opens up the *general* import, and the true spirit of the outward law. It is a passage already brought before the Pharisees in ch. ix. 13, but which he here again brings to their consideration, while he imparts to his address a severer form than hitherto, rebuking their ignorance, and therefore the sin committed *on their part:* If ye had understood this, ye would not have so uncharitably found fault with the innocent. On the import of the citation from Hosea we have already spoken at length in chap. ix., and we find here also (in opposition to almost all commentators), as connected with the main preceding sentiments, the compassion of God towards men, who willeth not that any one should hunger in order that a sacrificial Sabbath service may be rendered to him, a service in which he can have no pleasure when it goes against the love that springs from his love. The fundamental idea here expressed, is undoubtedly this, that the design of the *Sabbath*, as of the *sacrifice*, is not that men should do or bring something meritorious; but that God may show favor, and impart blessing to us. But there is here to be added the natural *inference* and *application* that the compassionate One who makes all his laws and ordinances only *for the sake of man*, will have them observed in no other spirit, in no way contrary to compassion. Somewhat similar, therefore, is ch. xxiii. 23. It follows, therefore, although it is *not merely* this that is intended to be literally said,* that in cases of collision, the royal law of love, from which alone all commandments take their rise, is superior to a Pharisaic outward adherence to the *letter* of *particular* commandments.* Thus the disciples, on this occasion, in their holy simplicity (as *blameless* as the priests in the temple) had no thought, when they plucked the ears of corn, about whether it was allowed or forbidden; their accusers, however, "by condemning the innocent," became themselves very guilty (verse 8). Christ concludes, *thirdly*, with a doctrine of far-reaching import, which indeed returns to the case of Sabbath-breaking now on hand, in order to draw a decisive inference with respect to it, but which, at the same time, enlarges, almost transfigures, what is special in it. He utters, in his overflowing wisdom, which he will not and cannot restrain, a sublime truth in addition to verse 6, and still more enigmatic, the meaning of which those Pharisees could not apprehend; therefore we, for whom it has been written, are to understand it. For the saying that "what a prophet speaks in the wind posterity reads,"† finds its highest application in Christ.

First of all, we must entirely set aside all those commentators who, misled by the intermediate sentence in Mark (of which we shall presently speak more particularly), are for understanding by ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, בֶּן־הָאָדָם, *Son of Man*, with the article in this stance, *man* in general.‡ This would be contrary to the sense in which the expression is every where used by Christ, who always designates by the "Son of Man" only himself, while, in addition to this, the designation κύριος τοῦ σαββάτου, *Lord of the Sabbath*, belongs to the same person who was just before said to be τοῦ ἱεροῦ μείζων, *greater than the temple*. But do we read in Mark an intermediate clause of a highly original character, which it is impossible to regard as spurious, and which speaks of ὁ ἄνθρωπος, *Man*, quite generally? How does this agree with our interpretation of the passage before us? Well enough; and neither are those right who, in the address which is *fully* recorded by Mark, understand Christ as speaking only of man, so that ver. 23 also must be interpreted according to that view; nor those, on the other hand, who understand it only of the person of the one "Son of Man;" the two opinions about which commentators differ harmonize when we go somewhat deeper. Why is Christ called the Son of Man, but because he represents humanity as a whole—because, as a second Adam, *he bears in himself and sets up a new humanity?* This is the key to the whole statement, according to which, in the first place, Mark ii. 27, as the words stand, contains a truth as sound as it is simple. So in the Talmud, R.

* As Von Gerlach, along with the great majority of commentators: That the entire "ritual law" is to be subservient to the supreme "law of love." So formal a distinction is in general foreign to the Old Testament, and least of all does it lie in the genuine sense and connection of the prophetic passage which Christ brings to bear on the subject.

* Which might also be applied with equal force to so-called moral duties.

† In Knapp's *Christoterpe* (1838), "*Funken vom Leuchter*" [sparks from the candlestick] (by J. Fr. v. Meyer)—would that in our time also these might fall into many hearts for their illumination.

‡ Kleuker emphatically refutes this, *Bibl. Sympathien*, p. 318.

Jonathan says literally: "The Sabbath is in your hands, not you in its hands, for it is said: 'The Sabbath is for you'" (Exod. xvi. 29; Ezek. xx. 12). It is, according to God's design, an ordinance and institution of mercy for the good of man, appointed, in the first instance, for rest and refreshment (Deut. v. 14; Exod. xxiii. 12), and then, further, for blessing and sanctification. This, too, is the real ground of that question, which Christ addressed to the Pharisees eight days afterwards, whether one should save life or destroy it on the Sabbath (Mark iii. 4). While the Pharisees, cleaving to their statutes, scarcely rose to the level of Moses' law, and knew not at all properly what or wherefore the Sabbath was, Christ here points them to the first and deepest ground and origin of it, opens up to them the fact that the rest of the Creator on the seventh day was a *typical* rest for man, and the blessing of the day a *boon* for man. True it is, on the other hand, that man, as also the whole world, has been created for God and for the promotion of his glory; but the glory of God does not demand an outward work-service in which man may bring a gift and offering to God, for God wills to bless, give, and gladden also by the Sabbath—so that to inflict pain upon a man, and, for example, to let him hunger on account of the eternal so-called Sabbath, runs directly counter to the internal nature of the Sabbath. But while Christ, who gives forth his doctrines, as Moses gave the laws in the wilderness, as they were called out by the various occasions of life, here specifies the Sabbath, he at the same time speaks by synecdoche of all law and its institution in general; his statement means, as we read also in 2 Macc. v. 19, of the temple which has just been named here: "God has not chosen the people on account of the place, but the place on account of the people." The import and order of his reasoning are therefore very evident, inasmuch as he rises from man in general and the ordinance hitherto in existence, which dates from the first ἐγένετο, *was made*, to himself, the Son of Man, who, moreover, introduces a new state of things to men. *First proposition:* Already in general under the Old Testament law, nay, from the creation downwards, the Sabbath, like any ordinance of God, was designed *for man;* for which as yet general doctrine, after *adducing the testimony* of history, the law and the prophets, he, in an *allusion* to the book of Maccabees, even goes beyond the canon pointing to the echoes of the prophetical Scriptures, and the foreshadowing of the New Testament doctrine found in the apochryphal writings. *Second proposition:* Therefore (Mark ὥστε), *I, as the Son of Man*, being already as man, in the state of things which has existed hitherto, no *servant* of the Sabbath according to your perverted ideas, and, moreover, being *greater than the temple* in the *new state of things* which begins with my coming, am much more abundantly *Lord* of the Sabbath.* Upon which the address closes again, with a most direct application to the case in hand.

That a complete reply may be given to the charge in ver. 2, *Behold, thy disciples do, etc.*, he now includes in this his prerogative and freedom—*Those who are with him.* The Son of Man, *i.e.*, the new man in Christ, the second Adam, in the new order of things, in which all preparatory institutions were fulfilled according to their original significance—not we as men, such as we are, are called lords of the Sabbath; for, although the Sabbath is made on our account, we are yet only so much the more for this reason bound and obliged to keep it—but Christ also the Lord of the Sabbath in the proper sense, *in so far* as in honor of him, the eternal Son of God, every Sabbath from the beginning has been celebrated, brings as the Son of Man to us, his brethren and members, that freedom and lordship through which, in the New Testament, every one is in Christ exalted above all imposed law as such, because he fulfills it not in the bondage of the letter, but in the liberty of the Spirit. In these words of Christ there certainly lies the germ of that apostolical doctrine which we find afterwards expressed in Rom. xiv. 4, 5, 17; Col. ii. 16, 17. Does it follow, therefore, that they declare a complete *abrogation* of the Sabbath as a day consecrated by God for man, above other days, and set apart for special blessing? By no means, and those who can find no Sabbath in the New Testament understand neither that apostolical doctrine nor the statement of our Lord in this passage. Not by doing away with the Sabbath, but by renovating and glorifying it, does he show himself to be the Lord of the Sabbath. We find here rather the most emphatic confirmation of the inviolably continuance of the σάββατον in the all-expressive ἐγένετο. Note: Moses has given you the Sabbath—but the Sabbath *has been* from the first, when all things came into being, when the world and *man* were created. As already in the reception of this commandment into the decalogue, which contains only what is original and permanent law for all men, not what was temporarily designed for Israel alone, so again does Christ, in the words διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, *for man*, set forth the universal validity of the Sabbath originating from the creation (not like the temple, only on account of the Israelitish people). So long as man lives on the earth he is to have a Sabbath of God; the necessity of his nature, and the ordinance of the Creator for meeting that necessity, always correspond to each other. But in this has Christ shown himself to be Lord of the Sabbath for his church, for the new humanity in him, that he has changed the day from the *end* of the old world week which passed away for ever with the still Sabbath of his grave, to the *beginning* with which an en-

* The whole discourse is pervaded by *personality*, that of man in general, of the *Son of Man* as representing humanity and raising it to a new elevation. This view closing at last with the κύριος corresponds very ill with the indefinite sentiment, Here is *something greater* than the temple! as Neander would explain it.

tirely new state of things commenced, and that he has made the day peculiarly his own, the *Lord's* day, and has united to the remembrance of the first creation, whose Sabbath was broken and rendered servile by sin, the praise of the new creation, effected by him who became a son of man for man's sake. Thus has he given to us the Sabbath anew, without literal commandment, as in the Old Testament, but by the free operation of the Spirit in the Church, so that even no defect of knowledge in this particular, no error of church doctrine has as yet been able to deprive the day of its Lord.* Thus do we, sanctifying the Sabbath in Christ, now look freely and joyfully forward to the future σαββατισμός (Heb. iv. 9), in which the rest of God in man from the redemption-work will unite with the first rest from the creation-work; on the other hand, before the appearing of Christ, the best Sabbath devotion could only point backward in humility and repentance, because of sin, to the lost peace of the Sabbaths of Adam in Paradise.

THE WITHERED HAND—IS IT LAWFUL TO DO GOOD OR TO DO EVIL ON THE SABBATH?

(Matt. xii. 11–13; Mark iii. 3–5; Luke vi. 8–10.)

From the frequency with which the *Sabbath* is spoken of in the Gospels, as it is here again, we may infer the importance of this subject: for, even in the narrow misconceptions of the Pharisaical Jews, there yet lies hid the truth, that the Sabbath which was given to them had something great and specially holy belonging to it. In all the discourses of Christ on the subject, directed against Pharisaism, we look in vain for an expression in which it is distinctly stated that at any period all days are to become alike; if the one which we have just considered contains no such statement, so neither does any other.

According to the account of Matthew, who is very careless as to the order of time, we might suppose that what follows here took place on the same day, did not Luke specify another, and, in all probability the next, Sabbath. Then, as always, Christ sanctifies the Sabbath by going to the synagogue, then also the Pharisees begin παρατηρεῖν, *to watch* him anew, and he again, according to Luke xiv. 13–16, instructs and confounds them in quite a similar way. If we had not in Luke ch. vi. (as also again in ch. xiii. 15 the same statement) the account corresponding to that of Matthew, how would the critics have spoken of a different report of evidently the same occurrence!

In the first account, also, we find this difference, that, according to Mark and Luke, Christ himself puts the question which Matthew lays into the mouth of his enemies. Luke observes, besides, that Jesus knew *their thoughts*, and anticipated the question of their hearts, by giving outward expression to it: ἐπερωτήσω ὑμᾶς, I will ask *you*, with which—probably more correctly, for then the account in Mark and Luke (the interrogative ἔξεστι without τί) becomes the same—is to be construed: ἐπερωτήσω ὑμᾶς τι, I will ask you *something*, as in Matt. xxi. 24, ἕνα λόγον. It is the same as in the case of the centurion's speaking (Matt. viii.); and Matthew represents as an expressed question, in the same manner as he does there, the διαλογισμούς or *thoughts* of those who watched *whether he would heal on the Sabbath*.†

Mark and Luke narrate exactly that Christ, at first acting with perfect frankness, and in order to put it to the proof whether hostile stubbornness will yield to sympathy with the unfortunate, called him forth: *Come forth and stand in the midst!* Now is the disputed case before their eyes, itself speaking and testifying to the unprejudiced; now goes forth the bold, irresistibly pressing question, to which the obdurate Pharisees had nothing to answer. He humbly sets them up as judges, while in the exalted dignity of simple, invincible truth, he puts their folly and wickedness to shame. Do you yourselves give forth your ἔξεστι, "*it is lawful*," on the case, so that I may act accordingly: Shall I now heal the man, or, because it is the Sabbath, shall I not? This, however, he expresses forcibly: Is it *permitted* or right *to do good* on the Sabbath, *or to do evil*. The answer is, of course, self-evident, and it is also so for the next part of the question, which comes nearer the case in hand: *To save a life* (ψυχήν quite indefinite, a living being), *or to destroy it?* Even yet the question represents the case in a generalized form, but it does represent it so far as *healing* is a σώσαι, a *saving and restoring of the life-power or health*, while, on the contrary, *not* healing when one has the power is an ἀπολέσαι, or *destroying*, as every omission of *well-doing* on any occasion presented to us is *evil-doing*. Thus does Christ, with simple decision, reduce all the

* We rather find that, under the pressure of necessity, the divine right of the new Sabbath is ever more fully demonstrated in theory; to promote which, church days, prize writings, societies, are useful, although not yet on a perfectly clear principle. I may be allowed to refer on this point to what I have said in my commentary on Isaiah, lvi. 2.

† Ἀπολέσαι in Luke is at all events the more correct explanation for ἀποκτεῖναι. Should the latter be genuine in Mark, it would not do to say that it does not belong to ψυχήν, but stands by itself in opposition to ψυχὴν σῶσαι.

complication belonging to the disputed questions as to what is or is not to be done on the Sabbath, to the highest clear law: Thou shalt not do evil, thou shalt not hurt thy neighbor even by the refusal of helping love. With sufficient irony Christ thus shuts up the disputers to the conviction, that doing good must be lawful also on the Sabbath, but that *doing evil*, that is, precisely their Pharisaical keeping of the Sabbath, is by no means so. Upon this follows what Matthew alone further narrates as Christ's discourse.

Verses 11, 12. In these verses he discloses the unfeeling nature of their evil thoughts, and shows that what men will not do from *love* is done from *self-interest;* for, although Christ speaks on the friendly supposition that a man will save the life of the poor sheep, and how much more render assistance to a man—yet, properly speaking, he pre-supposes the answer in the hearts of those whom he has put to shame: "Yes, we would do that in order not to suffer loss in our property!" Hence he gives emphasis to ὃς ἕξει πρόβατον ἕν, *that shall have one sheep.* Accidents of this kind with sheep, oxen, or asses, must at that time have been acknowledged exceptions; not till a later period do we find even this forbidden in the Talmud, perhaps, not without occasion from the words of Jesus. Whenever Pharisees forbid works of love towards our neighbor as unlawful, let them be put to shame by presenting an analogous case, in which their own profit or loss is at stake!—And now again with reproachful severity comes the benevolent conclusion from the Saviour-heart of the Son of Man: How much better is *a man* than a sheep! Thus speaks the love of God which compassionates all men, and will assist their distress in body and in soul. By how much the man is better, by so much the less is his health, the healing of a diseased limb, to be placed in comparison with the saving of a perishing animal. Consequently it is indeed *lawful* to do good on the Sabbath—whereupon the words in Matthew point back to what goes before in Mark and Luke. We are certainly not, however, to confine the application of this to bodily benefits, and the saving of life; for how much better is the *soul* of man than the body. Works of soul-healing, soul-saving, alone reach the man properly so-called; hence all the present operations of home missions, which have the object of drawing men out of the pit of perdition are, in the truest sense, a Sabbath work.

Verse 13. Who has any thing to say against my doing good now to this man? Thus does Christ look around, again asking, and—O the gentleness and kindness!—would have still waited to answer any word that might be addressed to him. But he knew, at the same time, that they would be silent with the mouth, and yet would hate him more bitterly in their obdurate hearts because of the truth; hence (according to Mark), the holy anger which he manifests at the same time that he humbly puts the question—anger, which is the same thing with grief at sin. They are silent. Upon this he did not touch the sick man, did not even stretch out his hand, that he might certainly do no external work on the Sabbath, but spake the words (as all the three Evangelists agree): *Stretch forth thine hand!* That is, as much as to say: Thou *canst* do this, thou *art* freed from thy malady (Luke xiii. 12). And behold, he could do it; it became, in the act of stretching it out, whole as the other (1 Kings xiii. 6). The miraculous cure, which we might expect to be performed after the hand was stretched out, *was already done* in "the speediest and most spiritual manner"—as Lange expresses it.

BEELZEBUB—CHRIST DEFENDS HIMSELF AGAINST THE CHARGE OF BEING IN FELLOSHIP WITH SATAN.

(Matt. xii. 25–45; Mark iii. 23–29; Luke xi. 17–36.)

It is a question, and one which must find its answer in a harmony of the Gospels, whether the occurrence here related by Matthew, as connected with what immediately precedes, belongs to the later period, which Luke seems to assign to it, since the identity of all the particular parts of the discourse, which are as strongly marked as they are closely connected, is too great in this case to admit the supposition of a repetition.* But whether the sequence of the particulars, as given by Luke (who not only first introduces at ch. xii. 10, the account given by Matthew vers. 31, 32, and omits that of Matthew vers. 33–37, because he had already given something of this in ch. vi.; but also connects the parable which, in Matthew forms the conclusion with the beginning, and gives a different conclusion), whether this arrangement in which he deviates from Matthew be the *more correct*, we very much doubt; for, in the connection of the longer discourses, Matthew is generally the more exact.[?] Christ has healed a demoniac whom the devil made blind and deaf, which circumstance, as giving occa-

* Alford says very strongly in opposition to Greswell, who maintains such a twofold occurrence of the same discourse, that upon such principles it would be quite as easy to prove that there took place four different crucifixions and resurrections.

sion to the discourse,* Mark does not at all mention, while Luke mentions only the dumbness. *Κωφός* signifies deaf as well as dumb, (comp. Matt. xi. 5). This striking double cure draws from the astonished people the bold and open question: Is not this indeed the Messiah? Who will now contradict it any longer? The Pharisees feel themselves challenged by the question to come forward, and, according to Mark, these are Pharisees who had come down from Jerusalem, and think it necessary to show their superiority to others in learning. The fact stands clear before their eyes; the powerful conclusion, however, which the simple popular understanding draws from it, must, on no account, be held good. Thus it is as if the cast-out devil had just entered into them, to make them blind with a more wicked blindness, and from being a dumb devil had, for a change, become one speaking blasphemously. Here, probably, these Pharisees say for the first time what, according to Matthew ix. 34, on a similar (later) occurrence was impudently repeated, by them outright. They maintain it, however, at once openly, emphatically, quickly replying with their contemptuous *οὗτος*, *this man*, to the wondering *οὗτος* of the people; nay, they give forth as masters in a learned faculty a most strongly affirmative judgment: This man doth not cast out devils *but* by Beelzebub; *εἰ μή*, it is no otherwise, *we know it!*† That is more than the *δαιμόνιον ἔχει*, *he hath a devil* (ch. xi. 18; John vii. 20, viii. 48, x. 20). He has not merely a devil, but Satan himself, the prince of the devils (Mark *βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει*); he is the most wicked of *conjurors*. They not only think this blasphemous thought, but speak it, or rather they thrust it forward without even themselves truly thinking it; finally, they do this as the leaders of this people! and, with this clenching word as by a master-stroke, the whole subject of the source of his miracles is to be for ever set at rest, the power of God in them set aside, the people, who were disposed to believe, rather led to cherish the deepest contempt for Christ, horror towards the ally of Satan! Here it was necessary for Christ to *speak*, and truly he speaks as the Lord. But he *speaks* only, he does no new miracles either to prove his dignity in an overpowering manner (see afterwards vers. 38, 39), or even to rebuke the wicked blasphemers, and to make them dumb. All those qualities that we have hitherto admired in his discourses and answers are found united here: the gentleness and humility which no personal offence, not even the most wicked reviling, can provoke; the uniformly lofty, calm temper which returns not reviling for reviling, but can rise from the most patient testifying for the truth to the rebuke of insolent unbelief; the holy judicial anger in harmony with love, which teaches and persuades in circumstances in which every other would have thought it unsuitable and useless; the immovable certainty and clearness of his position in relation to the sin of man and the kingdom of the devil; the fulness of wisdom which, on every occasion, at once reaches forth from its deep treasures, surveys the present, the past, and the future, lets us see into the Scripture, reveals the secrets of hearts, the judgments of history even to the last judgment, and then, again, in the most familiar and persuasive address by parable and proverb, declares the truth with an all-subduing, penetrating power; finally, his majestic and unique personality, which must attest itself in every thing, which never can nor will deny itself. Let any one study thoroughly this one discourse, and say whether any other but the Son of God in the flesh could so speak, whether any one among men could either consciously or unconsciously fabricate any thing like this!

It is again really *one discourse* which Matthew gives us; the interrupting challenge addressed to him (ver. 38), is replied to by Christ, only by continuing to express his thoughts. *He defends himself against the charge of confederacy with Satan*, by adducing first of all most conclusive proof against such a charge (on to ver. 36); from this he rises higher, and rebukes those who insolently set aside what he thus proved, and this is the main idea of what is said to ver. 45. Here also he at first *warns* against the highest, the unpardonable sin, which the Pharisees at that time were in a fair way to commit; then he *threatens* more decidedly the entire *perdition* which will assuredly follow it. The former embraces vers. 31–37, and already, at the conclusion, points to the *judgment*, when the repeated defying challenge by which he was interrupted gave him occasion, now prophesying of total unbelief, to carry it out to the highest and last sign.

He does *not at once* rebuke them thus: How unreasonable are your words? how must they, wise as you are, proceed from bad hearts, from wicked lying against the truth! He does not begin with the deserved rebuke which they had afterwards to take before the whole people (ver. 34); but from a calm elevation, as if it were a friendly discussion upon a subject not at all affecting his own person, he *begins* with a few plain and undeniably stated *general* positions. These contain the *first ground* of his defence: *Granted*, according to your own words, that *Satan's kingdom* exists; it cannot surely make war upon and overthrow itself—a very general propositition about every kingdom, city, house, true in the great, the lesser, and the least (ver 25)—and an application to Satan's kingdom as *deductio ad absurdum* (ver.

* Who perhaps might confound it with Matthew ix. 33, 34.

† *Beelzebub* (God of flies), a mocking euphemism (from 2 Kings 1, 2) for *Beelzebul*, *i. e.*, lord of the dwelling; not, however, of the possessed as being inhabited by demons, as some have thought, but ruler of the abyss, prince of hades [rather of the ærial space, Eph. ii. 2].

26). Then comes the *second reason* from the other side, which more nearly touches the disputed case, and in which he declares what they conceal, affirms what they knowingly deny: Rather does the *kingdom of God* attest itself by my casting out devils. Here also, with the utmost humility, he first of all classes *himself* with common examples (ver. 27), in order from the general proposition—*Where Satan yields, there God works*, to make the higher application—*The kingdom of God is come* (ver. 28), the conqueror of Satan, the serpent-treader (the Messiah, ver. 23), is virtually present in my person (ver. 29); to which is added (ver. 30), finally, as a transition to the now well-founded rebuke, the proverbial saying sharply distinguishing the two opposing kingdoms, his and Satan's associates.

Christ sees the thoughts of the heart behind the words which were spoken in his presence, a circumstance which the Evangelists regularly repeat from time to time, in order to indicate the entire internal suitableness of his answers. Yet, notwithstanding, he himself also teaches and proves, even when he sees that spiteful wickedness which will not be instructed. How much more ought we, who know not the heart, to follow his example in this respect; how ought we rather to suppose ignorance to be helped on the part of those who are hostile, than blasphemy, and not withhold the salutary doctrine! He who, in the wilderness, gave even to Satan the answer which he would and could never receive, in order to render what was due to him, does the same here, and would have spoken thus even though the wickedness of all who heard him had been already incorrigible. But this was certainly not yet the case; perhaps in the worst originators of the blasphemy there was still a hidden germ of obedience to the truth, more probably, at least, in the better or less bad among those who *joined in what was said*, as such are wont to do; finally Christ certainly could not be silent for the sake of the poor deluded people, among whom the worst error, if boldly spoken, will find access. Besides, we are not to suppose that between the truth and the worst denial of it there is no common ground for explanation and defence; there is, and remains, so long as we speak to men, even for the highest truths of the humanly attested kingdom of God, the *common understanding of men* to which the Son of Man here appeals. For where the testimony of the Spirit of God is not listened to, there is always unreason (Mark vii. 22).

Verses 25, 26. Taking up the words of the blasphemers themselves regarding the ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων, *prince of the devils*, Christ at once says, *e concessis:* On the existence of a *kingdom* of Satan and the *unity* of it in the one head, we are agreed! O the specious unreason of the vulgar rationalism, which could and can speak here of accommodation! With the highest earnestness of truth, even in those places where he maintains it against the most contumacious denial, Christ rather confirms the true idea which his opponents express, even to the most complete inferences which they do not now perceive: the fundamental idea of a *kingdom* is its self-inclosed, firmly compacted *unity;* by how much it fails in this, by so much it is no kingdom in the strictest sense of the term. A prince who puts down and casts out his own servants and subjects, is no prince. While Christ, descending from the great to the small, shows upon the principles of reason and experience that every community is and must be dissolved by being in opposition to it, he takes it for granted indeed that such a thing *does take place* in *human* societies;* so much the weightier is his assertion that there is no such thing as this in Satan's kingdom. The mention of the *house* also, the family, as the smallest society which cannot subsist without unity, is here so natural that there is no necessity to find an occasion for it in the fact that Christ at that moment was teaching in a house (ver. 47; ch. xiii. 1; Mark iii. 20). It is possible, however, that his afterwards carrying out the analogy of the "house" (ver. 29) instead of the kingdom, was occasioned by this circumstance. In Luke xi. 17, (where the middle member πόλις, *city*, is wanting), Luther translates wrongfully, "And *one* house falls upon another in such a kingdom;" it must evidently be construed as the Syriac has it—Where there is an οἶκος ἐπὶ, οἶκον, *i.e.*, a house striving against *itself*, divided against itself, *falls*, is destroyed. (The family is designated metaphorically by the house in which it dwells.) This view alone agrees with Matthew, and corresponds to the main idea that runs throughout the passage. Οὐ σταθήσεται, *shall not stand*, is equivalent to Mark's οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι, *cannot stand;* in which the passive form† is to be particularly noticed: the prince or head of a family will not be able to maintain or preserve his kingdom or house (Luke xi. 21), if he himself in his place of power encourages division and strife. Then it is directly said, and will soon be manifest, that it *hath an end*, as Mark says, in addition. Would that it were so with Satan's kingdom! But Christ, by a valid conclusion derived from the undeniably acknowledged existence of this kingdom, denies the absurd hypothesis of his opponents, that *Satan casteth out Satan*—as he purposely with emphasis says that Satan attacks *himself* in those who are his, his own sovereign power in his servants and subordinate devils; for then he would, indeed, be at variance with himself; prince and kingdom would not be one perfect unity, as Christ who knew the fact, maintains that they are, and therefore under the name Satan comprehends the closely and firmly united whole.

Here, already we have a hint which helps us to the understanding of the words which

---

* Grotius cities Cicero de Amicitia: Quae domus tam stabilis, quae tam firma civitas est, quae non odiis atque dissidiis funditus possit everti?

† Ammonius: σταθῆναι μέν ἐστι τὸ ὑφ' ἑτέρου στῆναι δέ, τὸ κατ' ἰδίαν ῥώμην καὶ προαίρεσιν.

follow in vers. 31, 32, namely, that *human* wickedness is distinguished from *Satanic* by this, that in the former, because there is also still error in it, and not an absolute evil will, there is division against itself. The kingdom of human sin here upon earth is, as such, in reality a divided falling Babel, in which one sinner is against another, and so the power is broken. But in the *background* of this confused scene, the will, plan, kingdom, and power of Satan stand firm and united: the proof in fact, of such another kingdom being behind all the sin of man, discordant in other respects, lies in the fearful, otherwise inexplicable harmony which appears in this Babel-confusion, whenever it goes against the kingdom of God in Christ. Then must those who in other respects hate and are hostile to each other, become friends and allies, for Satan uses them as his arms and household stuff to accomplish by their means what he will, and well he knows what he will. He will certainly do no hurt, on his part, to even the lowest devil in the host of hell, for the evil counsel and will in the head and in all his spirits is one and the same, which cannot contradict and conflict with itself. It may, indeed, appear in the particular instances, when we look at the human side, as if one devil does cast out another; in reality, however, it is no *expulsion*, but the one devil gives place to the other deliberately and willingly, at the word of command. Beelzebub, or any superior devil, never does from caprice or whim what the powerful ones of the earth so often do, who remove their servants from place to place, in accordance with or against merit,* but it is, throughout, the connected plan of one will, one power, in this kingdom. In the single word: There exists a *kingdom* of Satan—much, every thing indeed, is said. Christ, indeed, here implies (though in the whole of Scripture this is hardly ever stated), that Satan is a *king*, notwithstanding he is an already condemned and overthrown usurper (he receives this name elsewhere only in Rev. ix. 11, where the writer speaks metaphorically with a half play upon Prov. xxx. 27, and in Job xviii. 14); yet what is to be understood here is the not to be despised kingly power in this kingdom (hence Jude 9, according to which Satan also belongs to the "dignities," the kings by God's *grace or righteousness*), and there are even *thrones* of Satan set up in particular places (Rev. ii. 13).

Verse 27. Christ meekly and humbly, without the least personal pride that would have shrunk from it, or personal anger that would have been provoked by it, takes into his mouth all the contempt and blasphemy directed against himself, even the most horrible part of it, that which charges him, the Holy One of God, with being an ally of Satan. He speaks in order to refute it, as if he were bound to defend himself against it, and thus assumes the monstrous hypothesis: *If I cast out devils* by Beelzebub—in this form, willingly accepting the concession, that he actually cast out devils, and thereby, first of all, condescends to place himself on a level with every other Jewish exorcist, in order to claim for himself at least what they concede to *their children*; the casting out of devils is in every case done only from a good, a divine power. It is a humble, conceded analogy of the same kind as John x. 34–36. Nay, he even shows a *kindly* feeling in this, pointing to something good in the Pharisees by bringing into notice their acts which were wrought in God. You so thoroughly despise me, that you cast me out to Beelzebub; I willingly give credit to the Pharisees for what they perform in faith in the name of God. For nothing is said here of those who cast out devils in the name of *Jesus* (Mark ix. 38), as, in this case, the conclusion from them to himself, which forms the principal idea of the inference, would be lost; because the Pharisees would by no means in such cases allow any authority to the name of Jesus. That Christ means his own disciples and apostles (chap. x. 8), among whom, moreover, there could scarcely be a disciple of the Pharisees, can be the opinion of only those commentators who read altogether without reflection, or of the timorous ones who, according to their somewhat narrow theory, cannot allow that there was any casting out of devils in Israel besides that which was done by Christ (among whom Chrysostom leads the way). The *ὑμῶν*, *your*, stands in direct opposition to him and all his, and the *υἱοί*, *children*, denotes also not Jews in general (Jewish exorcists, Acts xix. 13, your fellow-countrymen; this would be *ἀδελφοί*), but nothing else than *disciples* of the Pharisees, Acts xxiii. 6.*

If their casting out of devils had been a mere delusion and superstition, then indeed Christ with all his humility, could not for the sake of truth have placed his own on a level with it, could not have appealed to it as a fact of their conviction, as he does in the *ἐκβάλλουσι*, *cast out*, of his question, in which he grants that it was a real casting out, quite as true as *his own* *ἐκβάλλω*.† We leave un-

* Kleuker, "A Human Essay upon the Son of God and Man."

* Even if the discipleship had not much significance in other respects, still the Pharisees certainly appropriated those exorcists to themselves and their party, appealing thereto against the Sadducees. Accordingly Von Gerlach's question is very much out of place, "How can we know that these were disciples of the *Pharisees?*" The Sadducees admitted the existence of no spirits whatever! Nor is it *arts learned* in the schools of the Pharisees, whereby devils were actually cast out, that are here spoken of—but the believing work of orthodox Jews, which, however, was of rare occurrence, so as not in any way to hinder the astonishment at the totally different power of Jesus.

† Unaccountably wrong and yielding to a preconceived opinion is Menken, who understands Christ to refer to the most worthless jugglers and to say, "Such hateful and impure conduct do ye allow to pass without question and call it divine?

decided in what relation this may have stood to the τρόποις ἐξορκώσεων or *methods of exorcism* which, according to Josephus (*Antiq.* viii, 21, 5), Solomon is said to have bequeathed to the Jews, the practice of which was at that time also still common; but, if Justin Martyr (*adv. Tryph.* p. 311) appeals against the Jews to the fact that devils yielded to the name of the "God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," as they did to no name of king, prophet, and patriarch—if Irenaeus, and likewise Origen, acknowledged the still continuing exorcisms of the Jews in the name of God (see the passages in Grotius), we may see with what reason, and with what sense, Christ might ask: ἐν τίνι, by whom, and by whose power, do your disciples cast out devils? Certainly not by Beelzebub, a supposition which he had just refuted as impossible.

Verse 28. At first he condescendingly places his acts side by side in general with those of these disciples, but now, as was right, he sets the ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω, *I cast out*, far above any such acts performed by them. Here, first of all, express mention is made of that kingdom which is not merely opposed to the kingdom of Satan but which overcomes it, notwithstanding all its power and unity, namely, the *kingdom of God*, of the eternally stronger One who everlastingly upholds the kingdom. It is mentioned here in a stricter sense, in so far as it was future for Israel and now visibly come on the earth in their midst. In general, wherever devils are made to yield, there is the kingdom and Spirit, or powerful energy of God; but *the* kingdom of God which comes in Christ, is something different from what was already among the disciples of the the Pharisees, *the* Spirit of God by which *he* casts out means something more than what is conceded in regard to them in the ἐν τίνι. Luke says: *By the finger of God*, an expression which Christ in his more detailed discourse probably used along with the other, and which very appropriately points to the history in Exod. viii. 19, where the magicians themselves were constrained to acknowledge by this expression the difference between magic and the miracles of God (comp. also Psa. viii. 4; Exod. xxxi. 18), whence it came to be a proverbial form of expression that God's *finger* works mightily. What in Isaiah (after Moses) is called the redeeming *arm* of the Lord, appears here as, so to speak, the but slightly touching finger. Strong emphasis must be laid on the ἐγώ, *I*, in this verse, in order to feel the full force of Christ's inference: "I with all that belongs to me and that goes forth from me, I with my holy walk and witness for truth —can signs wrought in support of Beelzebub help *me*, as I stand before you, my whole teaching and working which are to you well known? Truly, then, he would be, in the strongest possible sense, *against himself*, and assisting his most decided enemy. Not, therefore, the isolated acts of casting out devils or miraculous acts as such, but all taken together as attestations, which cannot but come from God, of him who reveals and declares by his whole being the kingdom of God, prove it beyond contradiction: His word is true, the kingdom *is come!* Ἔφθασεν, *has come upon*, as has been observed before, expresses more than ἤγγικεν, *has come nigh* (chap. iv. 17). It has come upon you (2 Cor. x. 14), unexpectedly broken in upon you,* already present and attested, since I am here and work. What follows then, further? That in me, he who was to come is come, the Serpent-bruiser, according to the first and oldest promise, the Conqueror and stronger One, whom the prophets announce under these names—wherewith the discourse passes on to what follows.

Verse 29. Satan is the *strong* one, but the *stronger* than he, ὁ ἰσχυρότερος, overcomes him. This name is expressed in Luke, and reminds us, at the same time, of the Baptist's word (Luke iii. 16; Matt. iii. 11); for, even in these passages, it is not merely ἰσχυρότερός μου, "stronger than *I*," but there is in the expression a general name by which Christ was distinguished: He who in every comparison is in himself the stronger, superior to all with him and against him, who is and remains the unconditionally strong and mighty One. Perhaps, as has already been observed, Christ expresses himself in the parable with immediate reference to the *house* in which he is speaking, but, at all events, he speaks from the prophetical writings, as he almost always does when he announces himself as he who was to come. Not merely does he look back to Gen. iii. 15, but still more definitely does this testimony contain an evident allusion to the subsequent prophecy of Isaiah. When the Lord himself comes after the voice in the wilderness has prepared the way for him, he comes as a *strong One* (בְּחָזָק, not quite accurately rendered in the Sept. by μετὰ ἰσχύος), and his arm rules, conquers for him (Isa. xl. 10). This is the general import in which the words of the Baptist and of Christ agree.

The passage Isa. liii. 12 comes nearer still to the words of Christ: He shall have the *strong ones* for a prey, bear them off as spoil אֶת-עֲצוּמִים certainly the Accus., and again not accurately rendered in the Sept. by ἰσχυρῶν

These rather are the marks of what is evil and devilish! But I cast out without profit, out of love, without means and formulas; this pure divine work is forsooth from Beelzebub, and that which really proceeds from him is divine!" Such an interpretation is refuted by a right reading of the text. Sepp, indeed brings it forward anew (ii. 362), in his own manner, always hunting after something peculiar and abusing the text itself. Neander, too, cannot reconcile himself to the thing, and calls the plan and concession upon which the whole discourse is built, a supposition κατ' ἄνθρωπον—which is retracted afterwards at v. 30.

* Which lies in the ἐφ' ὑμᾶς (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 16), hence Wesley in his New Testament quite correctly, "Unawares, before you expected; so the word implies." See also Dan. vii. 22, in the Sept.

μεριεῖ σκῦλα); where the common superficial interpretation falsely places the great one among other רַבִּים, and represents him as sharing the booty with other strong ones and heroes.* Finally, in that most profound passage, Isa. xlix. 24, 25, exactly answering to the words of Christ, we find taken out from this indefinite number the one, the *strong one*, whom the Messiah overcomes and spoils. It stands at the beginning, in the first chapter of the third principal part of all Isaiah's prophecies, where, with the greatest clearness akin to the New Testament, the great redemption is represented as a spiritual one, and the preparation of Israel as an implanting into the suffering and glory of the true servant Israel. Here, we find, as a concluding assurance at the end of the chapter, the *question* just as Christ here puts it: Can the prey be taken also from the *strong one* (גִּבּוֹר, Sept. strangely γίγας), and the prisoners of the rightful one (צַדִּיק, he, who although a robber, has yet a right of property in them) be delivered? To this is given in answer, the prophetic assurance: Yes, even the prisoners shall be taken from the strong one, and the prey of the usurper (עָרִיץ) shall be set free, be delivered; for I myself will contend with thine adversary (יְרִיבֵךְ, sing.), and *redeem* thy children! It is necessary to look at this passage (which Christ has evidently in view), so thoroughly confused in the Sept., and carefully to observe, that here a person is mysteriously spoken of who is called both עָרִיץ and צַדִּיק, *oppressor* and *righteous*, because he now has in his power, partly by force, partly according to justice, the prisoners whom he has secured as prey, and, for this reason, a process is here spoken of which is to be successfully carried out against this יָרִיב, accuser, Satan.† The close connection between Christ's words, and those of the prophecy, is expresssed most exactly in Luke xi. 21, 22, not merely by way of giving more coloring to the parable; if Matthew gives more correctly the connection of the address as a whole, Luke, on the other hand, has in this particular instance given the original expression. As Paul in Col. ii. 15 refers especially to Isa. liii. 12, so here, Christ refers to it and chap. xlix. 24, 25 together. It appears, at first sight, as if he would only give forth a general parable again concerning a strong one, and a stronger one who must overcome him, and this aspect of his words has been retained by Matthew, in his πῶς δύναται τις, "how can one." But even Matthew, by the article before ἰσχυρός, *stronger*, hints at the proper special sense of the parable, which then in Luke comes fully into view. The *house* or the αὐλή of the strong one here spoken of, is the world, whose prince he is called and is, while his σκευη, or *goods*, Hebr. כֵּלִים, in a comprehensive sense are *men*, whom he not merely possesses as house furniture, but even uses as his tools and instruments, his weapons the same, therefore, as the σκῦλα in Luke. These, the robber himself, has already taken by plunder (for the word corresponds, also according to the Sept. to the מַלְקוֹחַ and שָׁלָל in both passages of Isaiah), and now they are to be, as much by right as by force, again taken from him. They are his possession and his property (ὑπάρχοντα), and with them he is armed (καθωπλισμένος). With these he is proud in his confidence (ἐπεποίθει), for, without men as the vessels of his iniquity, he could not reign and work evil upon the earth, but would be the poor naked devil, alone in his dark and long since finished empire of hell. But he shall not keep his αὐλή and παντοπλία as his anti-paradise, he shall not hold his goods in the false *peace* of his servants, for the stronger One, the conqueror, overcomes him, mightily destroying this peace, so that it may become the peace of God, and the strong ones taken from the strong one, he now allots for *his own* service, as *his* well-earned spoil, as his prey of victory and honor in the world (the διαδιδῶσιν in Luke again parallel to the יְחֻלַּק in Isa. liii. 12). Let any one refute if he can this profound connection of the prophetic word, as also of this discourse of Christ, which takes it up, with the most fundamental principles of the Bible, in order to reduce this lofty statement, significant even in the minutest detail, to a general, indefinite parable; let us rather learn here, how the mysteries of the kingdom of God lie every where in the background of these parables. Let us further mark what is also said: The stronger one comes to save only us men, but to drive out and to judge devils for our salvation.

Finally, what is to be understood by the expression, *except he first bind him*, which Matthew and Mark put into Christ's mouth, certainly as a word of peculiar importance? It is the same as ἐπελθὼν νικήσῃ, *come upon him, and overcome him*, in Luke. This, again, was evidently spoken for Jewish Scribes, since, according to their doctrine, it was expected of the Messiah that he would *bind Satan* —a true expectation, to which a passage at the end of the Scriptures (Rev. xx. 2) corresponds. The binding is effected by vanquishing, through which his right, and therewith

* So also Sack unfortunately, because the present exegesis of the Old Testament imposes on the best. The רַבִּים are the same as in the foregoing verse, only differently understood. (Comp. on account of the ב, Job. xxxix. 17) [The author has so far outrun "the present exegesis" of this passage in Isa. (or rather gone back to the most ancient one), that few interpreters, after Hengstenberg, will probably follow him in it.—Am. Ed.]

† Here, then, also we have the true explanation of what the imprisonment (Isa. lxi. 1) properly is. Observe, besides, that of *this* tyrant and robber such a thing as saving, converting, gaining cannot be spoken, but solely the disarming, binding overcoming.

his power, is taken from the צַדִּיק (righteous). But what is to be understood by the πρῶτον, *first*, upon which alone the καὶ τότε, *and then*, can follow, the binding of the strong man himself by conflict with *him*, ere his house, the world, can be taken as a prey from him, and his σκεύη, σκῦλα, *men*, wrested from him?* Christ means this, we must say, in two senses, the one of which already shadows forth and contains the other. First of all, indeed, the act denoted by the πρῶτον must already have been done, inasmuch as Christ shows himself to be the stronger one, by his already casting out devils: this is true, for he came into the world into Satan's house, as he who in himself was from eternity the stronger, so that the departure of devils at his word and name, from such as were possessed, was a thing of course (Luke x. 18). But then this casting out of Satan from those who were bodily possessed, is still by no means the real overthrow of his work of sin, the real redemption of those who have been under his power (Acts x. 38), but a prophetic figure and pledge of that which was yet to be done. Consequently Christ here predicts, at once, the great conflict and victory of his death, and his descent into hell (see afterwards ver. 40), the πρῶτον or first of which had already taken place: so that his word, in its deepest and most completely fulfilled sense, is the great text of the Passover discourses (see John xiv. 30, xii. 31, 32; Heb. ii. 14, 15; Eph. iv. 8–10). Thus has Christ bound the strong one and overcome him, not properly in this his earthly house, but beyond it (as indeed the words affirm, the πρῶτον expressly distinguishing from the εἰσελθεῖν) in his own most proper domain and province: from that time forth is his house spoiled, and Christ now does this ever more and more by his instruments, by the same whom he has rescued from Satan. Christ, too, will gain for himself an army for this conflict and victory which has been decided from all eternity, but which is to be carried out gradually in time until the end of the world; he will gather together vessels for his use and service to build and adorn his house. This is the last point to which the words of Christ, presenting something new from whatever side they are considered, conduct; this is the deeper reason why Christ began thus indefinitely: Can *any one* overcome the strong one? (Mark says *no one* can.) In *his own* strength and might Christ will say, "No one can do this but I, the stronger one;" *with me*, in my name, from this time forth all my followers, all who decide for me shall be able to do it.

Verse 30. Here is another sentence from the holy lips of Christ which, in order to perceive its depth and fulness, might be presented ever anew to most believers with a "Go and learn what this meaneth." It is a proverb in use among men, applied to cases and circumstances in which there is no neutrality allowed between the strictest either-or, in which every one is to show himself, and must show himself, as *for* or *against*. It is difficult to see how a Chrysostom and Euthymius should have understood by him who is not with Christ, and is therefore against him, the devil—what a strange statement would this make! Yet many, even to the most recent time, are of opinion at Christ here still speaks of the complete unity of Satan's kingdom; this, however, only gives the point of connection which lies behind, and what Christ will say is: In the contest between these *two kingdoms* which embraces every thing, and out of which nothing is or is done on the earth, your proverb thoroughly holds good in reference to me, the determined adversary of the adversary, and to those who are mine; we, too, must be firmly united and not at variance among ourselves.* In order, however, not to misunderstand the emphatic *with me*, we must take a look forward to the parallel saying (afterwards to be interpreted)—"He who is not against you, is for you" (Mark ix. 40; Luke ix. 50). In this case, the disciples hastily and short-sightedly added their *we* to the *I* of Christ which alone decides: He follows (thee) not with *us*, he follows not *us!* This *outwardly* visible fellowship, founded on the fact of following Christ, must not be the ground of *our* judgment, as if he were not with Christ who casts out devils in his name; humility and love should rather reckon every one a friend who does not declare himself an enemy. *Quilibet praesumitur bonus, donec probetur malus* ("every body is to be presumed good, till proved bad"), this principle in law, so capable of abuse, is yet true here. He who is not with *you*, is against you, that is as much as to say against *me*—*this* Christ will affirm of no visible church of his believing followers whatever, he has not even granted it to the apostles. He cannot, and will not, thus unite himself with his followers in an *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* ("no salvation outside the church") falling under men's judgment, by saying: He who is not with *us*, is against us—he rather in that passage places the *you* in opposition to himself, as it was right that he should. But so soon as he, in whose person and fellowship the great alternative presents itself, appears, then, on the other hand, he cannot say, "He who is *not*

* Almost to the same effect Roos speaks of the *binding* of Satan to himself, that he can no longer use the powers of his angelic nature with such full authority, or such entire might, and the *disarming* him or seizing of something else upon which he relies, with which he covers himself. Yet, to the *latter* should not be reckoned the right over men (Isa. xlix.), which is no mere "right of war."

* Neander (following Schleiermacher and others) finds that Christ in this saying also repels the Jewish exorcist as those not with Christ, and who therefore cast out devils. How can one thus, by the very ingenuity of the expositor, hide from himself the great simple truth! Bengel gave at least a different turn to this view, and read in ver. 30 *e contrario*: "Your disciples are, and gather with me"—which, however, does not in truth belong to this place, and would not be so expressed.

against me, is for me." Precisely in opposition to this mischievous error, which would suppose an impossibility, is the statement which Christ here makes.*

The false Gamaliel-prudence thinks that it will save itself: If only we are not found fighting against God—and leaves the kingdom and work of God to take its course, without helping it by profession or by action, and thereby coming to the knowledge that it is from God. Let the indolent and undecided only not mock, only not persecute, that is thought to count in the meanwhile for something. But this is the middle party of whom Christ knows nothing, and of whom he makes no account, but condemns them and casts them over to his enemies. When Christ spoke on this occasion, as generally when he stood testifying of the kingdom of God in Israel, there were before him his *disciples* and his *enemies*, between them the class consisting of the *seemingly* neutral, outwardly undecided: many whom he had healed, who were ashamed to speak against him, although their hearts were not yet for him; many impressed with his preaching, who yet could not get loose from themselves and their position in the world; many stupidly indifferent spectators of his works and listeners to his words. Yet this middle party was not at that time very numerous, and the more powerfully the βιάζεσθαι or "violence" of the kingdom of God pressed upon them and penetrated within them, it would become always less; it, even then, became ever more and more a matter of necessity to decide for or against this Jesus of Nazareth, whether he were from God or from the devil, whether he were Christ or a deceiver. In the later periods of the church, on the other hand, the class of people who think themselves, and appear to others to be *not against* him, has become great, and indeed the greatest; it is properly for this state of things in his kingdom that Christ speaks this prophetic sentence of rejection as king and judge.

The "with me," then, means the true *inward* fellowship of the heart, of the will, and therefore also of the life, in confessing Christ and working for him, not the belonging to any party formed by outward consent and discipleship. It pre-supposes, certainly, that *he has appeared* with his testimony by the Spirit of God; in every country and among every people on the earth, this strict separation and decision begins whenever he comes and appears. It is his royal right to bring it. True, the more there is of what is divinely good in a man, the more of heavenly truth in opposition to the error and sin of the world, so much the more will the same be approximately true also of him, that he urges all who come into contact with him to decide; still, no sinful man can presume to say: In me, in my person, the decision is made for judgment, either for or against! *This* He only can say who is altogether truth and love itself, in the divine royal right of the only begotten Son; he who now says to all "Follow me!" and declares at the same time: Those who have not listened and obeyed, I will not know at that day! Wherefore not? He tells us in his word: he who is not with me, who does not decide for me and yield himself up to me, who does not become mine in the obedience of faith, although he imagines himself and appears to be "not against me"—I know and say it, *he is nevertheless against me!* How so, then? Already inasmuch as, previous to this yielding up of himself to Christ, every sinful man is *by nature* against him, as being against God (Rom. viii. 7). The enmity of the heart is therefore still there; if it were really overcome, then must the heart be with me. Neutrality here is no neutrality, but a remaining on the side of the enemy; indolence here is no mere indolence, but opposition; the merely not believing and not obeying is *still* resistance and rejection. This, however, is not all; there is more than this. To be *against Christ* is not merely to be in opposition to God as we all are by nature (which can and is to be atoned for, forgiven, taken away)—but it is wilfully to maintain and to aggravate such resistance, it is to resist the truth of God in its last and clearest revelation, the love of God in its highest manifestation, the power of God in the Holy Ghost which would win us and restore us. And truly that is a fearful degree of guilt, enough for the judgment! He who has perceived and experienced so much that he does not join himself to the open enemies of Christ, and yet is not won and overcome *for* him, has often all the greater resistance to him in his heart; so that, as regards the furtherance or hindrance of Christ's cause by the outward life, it is a question whether the neutrals are not the worst enemies in the great contest. But with all this it is to be well observed that it is only he, the Judge, who says this, only he knows it who knows the heart. We who judge of the internal state of a man only by the external marks, in which we may be deceived, who must abide by the other saying in Mark ix. 40 and not judge before the time, dare not say personally upon conscience of any one whatsoever, *Thou* art against Christ, because so far as *we* see thou art not with him! He alone speaks thus far: *He who* is not with me—and applies it to the conscience of the individual: Thou also art meant here, I know it of thee, and thou canst and shalt know it when I disclose it to thy heart. This saying, severe as it is, yet leaves room enough for charity in *our* judgments, as Braune has justly observed (but giving a one-sided prominence to this), "The most different *views* respecting the dignity of Christ do not exclude any from him, if only there be left to him the dignity of one sent from God; and the feeblest pointings *to him* are not to be called a scattering."

* What Elwert and Ullmann have recently said on the relation of the two proverbial sayings, we purpose to consider more particularly in connection with Mark ix. 40, in the second edition.

The *first clause* of the saying is decisive and incisive, inasmuch as it touches the *principle of the heart* in which must be either the *with* or the *against;* but the *being* with him or against him, although first and foremost it means this internal principle of the life, is yet so expressed as to embrace the outward *manifestation* and *expression* in the whole conduct and character. For, indeed, as is the tree so is the fruit, as is the treasure of the heart so are the words of the mouth and the whole conduct. Now this—as being, so to speak, the test and proof of the striking assertion—the *second clause* brings forward into the full light of the entire truth which is here intended to be spoken. Christ does not first *require* this: He who is and would be with me, must gather also with me! He pre-supposes this as self-evident in the perfectly parallel expressions: Every one ὢν μετ' αὐτοῦ, *that is with him*, is also a συναγων, *one gathering;* every one μὴ συνάγων (because inwardly κατ' αὐτοῦ is also outwardly) a σκορπίζων, *one scattering.*

In the expression *gathereth*, Christ connects what he says slightly with the foregoing figure in verse 29, as also with the ground-idea of the whole discourse, namely, that there is a *unity* of the kingdom of God as opposed to the unity of Satan's kingdom; still, the expression is so general as to include also other figures, and, indeed, is itself quite independent. *What*, then, will he have to be gathered? Not treasures for the pomp and splendor of a Romish church-throne, not even property for founding and establishing an evangelical state-church, not names on the roll of those who own his name; but *souls* are to be gathered, as vessels of honor to be used by the Master of the house, which before were the house furniture of the evil one; fruits are to be gathered for the eternal garner, seed which itself again bears fruit; sheep are to be brought to the shepherd, which the wolf scatters not again. They are, first of all, brought *to him*, led to him, gathered around him (Matt. xxiii. 37), but, at the same time and in addition to this, they are *brought together* into unity and concord, into the strong fellowship of conflict and victory formed by his united flock and church. What a work, what a commission for the members and laborers of the kingdom, this *gathering together in one the children of God who are scattered abroad!* (John xi. 52). For this every subject must labor and work, for this every one who is in heart with the King will of himself work. To this *gathering* belongs also all preparatory work of any kind of παιδαγωγία εἰς Χριστόν (bringing as a "schoolmaster" to Christ) manifoldly exercised in the midst of our earthly calling, with a true eye to the one end; then, the bringing to Christ properly so called, the strengthening and upholding of those already brought to him, the removing of the stones and making a plain path for his followers, the uniting and bringing into connection all that is separated and isolated, in short the entire building up of the house which is to grow together in love, the entire sowing, and watering, and tending for the great harvest.

Christ in these words designates his kingdom as one that is indeed come in him, but the building up of which is to be progressively carried out by his followers. Satan's kingdom *subsists* already on the earth in every human heart, in so far as it is against God and Christ: Christ has, indeed, first bound the strong one, but the subsequent spoiling of his house has since been going on from people to people and from soul to soul, by the labor of those who enter upon Christ's service (John iv. 38). Shall we now, in reference to *activity* in the fellowship and service of Christ, shrink from the same strict alternative which recognizes only gatherers or *dispersers?* May we at least here think, that the undecided and indolent, though he may still in heart be entirely or partially against Christ, is yet not so in his acting, does not outwardly hinder or injure the cause so long as he conducts himself in this neutral way? *Neutrality is impossible*, says Christ, impossible as regards the internal state of the man, and therefore, also, as regards the actions which proceed thence; both are one. A man who is in heart altogether with Christ cannot but gather for him every where and in every thing, even without knowing and willing it; his light illumines, his anointing gives forth its savor, he bears rightfully the title of the old Roman emperor: "always extender of the kingdom"—at least as much as in him lies. No one is so much a hermit upon earth, even though he lives as a hermit, that his life is not related to others in the connection of influence; Christ, however, will have no hermits, but laborers, and in whomsoever his Spirit is, he brings them to work for his kingdom in all the work of the calling which each one has. The same, therefore, holds good on the other hand: he who does not take the field with me against Satan, is not merely himself as yet under his yoke, but serves also in his kingdom; he who does not take his place and arms for the lawful king against the usurper, is reckoned by the latter as upon his roll, that roll which he holds up before the people to let them see how great it is. The unfruitful tree stands as an offence in the way, and cumbers the ground (Luke xiii. 7). The greater the honesty and apparent absence of hostility from without, so much the more dangerous the offence, so much the more is every suppression of the name of Christ, when he should be acknowledged and praised, equal to a denial of him, so much the more efficacious also in the merely not working. In like manner, where there is an outward position in life to which the eyes of others are directed, where, in a word, there is an office to lead and to teach the people, such as these Pharisees had, this saying applies in its highest truth: He who gathers *not* with me *scatters abroad.* He scatters only *more and more* what is already separated from God, and is another spoke in the wheel for the kingdom of the wicked one, that kingdom which is also not

yet fulfilled among men, but which ceaselessly moves towards this end wherever the Spirit and power of God does not interpose. He *scatters himself* in his indolent standing still, which, indeed, is not standing still, for he goes ever further from the kingdom of God, while he imagines himself to be only standing before or at the door, without yielding himself up as an instrument and workman in the house; as on the other hand, he who gathers in his diligence and zeal, at the same time, unites whatever in his own soul may yet be out of Christ into a firmer unity of faith and life proceeding from Christ. For *this* sense, also, lies beneath the general saying which comprehends all fulness of truth.

Finally, for we are not yet done, emphasis is to be laid in the second clause on: He who *gathers*, but *not with me*, whose gathering is itself a dispersing! Nay, this is really the extreme point of the paradoxical antithesis. No one *can* truly (not merely in vain or mistakenly) gather *to him* without gathering *with him;* hence it is not said merely: He who does not gather to me. To bring souls to Christ in one's own strength and reason, with a selfish object—how can that be possible? Thus far, certainly, the προφάσει, "in pretence," in Phil. i. 18, does not extend. As there is a passive, so there is also an active, *false friendship* with Christ. Some ask: Am I then against thee, merely because I am not for thee? Others again: Am I not with thee? see my zealous labors for thy kingdom? But Christ looks into the heart, and says: No, thou art, nevertheless, not with me, thy labor is in my sight only injury and destruction. O how many famous and proud laborers in the building up of the church and kingdom are included in this sentence! They gather, indeed, but not with him, not in his mind and spirit, consequently, also, not *to him* and *for him*—if not to draw disciples *to themselves* (Acts xx. 30), making merchandise of dear-bought souls (2 Peter ii. 3), yet for a form, party, church or sect. These, in great things and in small, act upon the maxim: Every one is to follow Christ *with us*. Where this is not done they repel and disperse, and those, too, whom they have gathered to themselves, they have thereby turned away from Christ. To create such confusion, so that Babel may seem to be again revived in Zion, is Satan's greatest art and pleasure; then he mocks, when that which has no place in his empire, namely, that Satan cast out Satan, is yet done in the kingdom of God, when the subjects dissever the kingdom, and Christians cast out Christ.

Thus the *first* clause of the saying strikes terror into the open enemies of Christ by the already pronounced judicial sentence: You are *against me!* in which lies, indeed, the entire condemnation of enmity to God. But it also lays open the heart of the externally neutral hypocrites, to whom the same judicial sentence belongs. The *second* clause, while it first of all shows to these hypocrites their inward state from their outward character, at the same time lays open to the real disciples of Christ all their remaining indolence, indecision, and perversity, and constantly shames even them into being entirely, both outwardly and inwardly, *with Christ.* He who is not yet entirely with me, is in so far still against me; that in you, and belonging to you, which does not yet gather with me, disperses! We must, indeed, shrink with fear from this sentence of truth, did there not immediately follow the gracious assurance that there is forgiveness for all sins, except the one which is committed only when a man has become wholly like Satan.

This comforting assurance follows somewhat remarkably and significantly here, where, after having adduced proof in detail as to the entire opposition between the kingdom of Satan and the kingdom of God, an opposition that reaches to the heart and life, the will and conduct of every individual, Christ declares the *punishment* of those sinners who wilfully mistake this. The first part of this rebuke is a *warning* against the unpardonable sin, in contradistinction to which, with the most gracious gentleness, the forgiveness of all others is declared. This sin, which already showed itself typically in the *blasphemy against God* uttered by the Pharisees, and therefore derives its name from this, Christ marks out (as in warnings is very natural) as the fearful end of the way upon which they then were, and as, in some measure, coinciding with their present sin; hence, in vers. 34–37, the address runs as if they had already committed it, while yet, in vers. 31, 32, it is only indefinitely set before them by way of warning. The intermediate sentence, which unites these two, is in verse 33: Will not such fruit at last grow upon such a corrupt tree, if it does not now let itself be engrafted into the good tree? We might also divide the passage in another way, and say: Christ shows the *unpardonable sin*, first, in its peculiar *greatness* in itself (more generally ver. 31, more emphatically repeated, ver. 32); then, in the *source* or principle whence (by increasing persistency in evil) it must at length result (if the corrupt tree will not know the good, so as itself to become good, ver. 33—the figure properly applied in the address of vers. 34, 35); finally, in its *consequences*, the inevitable condemnation according to the general law (in ver. 36), and according to the more general fundamental law (in ver. 37), for judging the internal state by the outward *expression.*

Verses 31, 32. The Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, "*Wherefore* I say unto you," which Matthew puts instead of the Ἀμήν, "Verily," of Mark, has its own proper sense; *therefore*—because, according to what has just been said, the opposition between Satan's kingdom and God's, between fellowship with me, and fellowship with the wicked one, is so clearly an attested fact; *therefore*, I say further to you gainsayers and calumniators: It is a very serious and dangerous thing! Many a one may be *against me*, may speak or act against me, even for a whole life time, and yet for-

giveness stand open to him; but there is, even in this world, a wilful contradiction and resistance which forfeits all grace for ever—therefore, I have reason to say to *you, beware!*

That, in the divine judgment, while internal sin as such is condemned, yet it is also apprehended and judged in its *expression*, and also that *words*, as the most decided evidence of the principle of the heart, are before actions—this fundamental idea, essential to the understanding of the whole passage, is announced in the first words; all *sin*—this is the most general, truly proper name, to which belongs also what was before excepted. Lest we should associate with this word first of all (as, alas! men are wont to do in *their* superficial use of words), so-called common, simple sins, Christ immediately intensifies the expression, and puts between these common sins and the unpardonable sin, *blasphemy*—not as an isolated, casually dropped word, but as the fruit of an evil heart. In Mark it is expressly said: *αἱ βλασφημίαι, ὅσας ἂν βλασφημήσωσιν, blasphemies whereinto soever they may blaspheme*, and Luther rightly adds: Wherewith they blaspheme *God;* for, although *βλασφημεῖν* occurs elsewhere in a wider sense, here it is certainly this sin in so far as it is committed against God, and can be forgiven only by God, consequently, blasphemy against God is meant, even where it expresses itself as calumny against a man (Erasmus here, *convitium*). *Ἀφεθήσεται*, by no means merely, *Can* be forgiven; for from this *can* the actual forgiveness follows of itself, according to the great and richly provided grace of God. Still less, as some think, who unsuitably render the words, trying to blunt sharpness of the expression, are they to be taken in a comparative sense: For all other sins, forgiveness is, comparatively speaking, possible; but absolutely, as it stands: *They shall be forgiven.* So much the more directly and strikingly does it stand in opposition to the entirely unconditional *οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται* (shall not be forgiven) in respect to the *βλασφημία τοῦ Πνεύματος, blasphemy of the Spirit*, or (as Mark more concisely expresses it *βλασφημεῖν εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα*), the *εἰπεῖν λόγον κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Ἁγίου, speaking a word against the Holy Ghost.* What is this? It is still more definitely limited by its being opposed to speaking against the Son of Man, inasmuch as for this latter sin also there is forgiveness. Many find here a gradation according to the rank of the three persons in the Godhead; but, in the first place, the first general *βλασφημία* certainly does not refer to God the Father in particular (for which supposition there is not the slightest ground), and then, in the second, the *Son* is expressly set forth, not in his divine nature, but as the Son of Man, liable, in his state of humiliation, to be unknown and calumniated. The aggravation of the sin, in respect of its guilt (Mark *ἔνοχός ἐστιν*), as is implied in the antithesis between the Son of Man and the Holy Spirit, is determined not by rank of the *object* against whom the sin is committed (according to which the Father would very improperly stand lowest in the Trinity), but by the increased clearness of the revelation of God, in proportion to which, of course, sin must be committed always with more of *consciousness* and *will*.* All sin and blasphemy is against God, consequently also against the Son, and in like manner, against the Spirit of God, through whom the revelation of truth, the rebuking and drawing of the sinner is accomplished The phrase, *sin* again the Holy Ghost is, in so far, an improper designation, at least very liable to be misunderstood, and in which a departure is made from the word of Christ. In proportion as a man resists God and is disobedient, from the degree of general unbelief (Acts vii. 51) on to the last grieving of the Spirit in the saints (Eph. iv. 30), in the same ratio he sins also against the Holy Spirit. All this is forgiven, says Christ. Nay, he speaks still kindly: He who speaks (and acts) against me, against my person as the Son of Man, although already accredited as the Son of God, and come from God—whosoever calumniates me, this I judge not! Thus far is the grace of the New Testament dispensation opened up here in opposition to the typical Old Testament, in which even the simple blaspheming against the name of God had no atonement provided for it, and was punished by the sinner's being cut off from the people.† Saul spoke and acted against the Son of Man (1 Tim. i. 13), even after the Spirit had vindicated his claims to be the Son of God; the Jews crucified him after the resurrection of Lazarus, and yet he said of them: Father, forgive them, *for they know not what they do.* The mockers on the day of Pentecost knew not what that was, until the words of Peter entered into their ears. Ananias lied to the Holy Spirit; but whether he also blasphemed him, we do not know. All this is not yet properly the sin which Christ here means. But it may be questioned whether Caiaphas (Matt. xxvi. 64, 65), did not blaspheme the witnessing Spirit, when he called the confession of Christ a blasphemy; for the "Thou sayest it," intimates that he himself well knew what he yet wilfully asks.

We observe, that "*against the Holy Ghost*," means against the most direct and conclusive testimony, by which the person who, nevertheless, contradicts and resists is yet *entirely convinced*, consequently, sins with the most complete knowledge and wi l; and this is the

* Thus, Origen already refuted the error that might seem to find support in this passage, as if in it the Holy Ghost were placed above the Logos. Not because the Holy Ghost stands higher, is the sin heavier, but because he who has received the Holy Ghost stands higher in the Christian life.

† "What clearness, majesty, and freedom on the part of the Saviour, thus, in the midst of this warm controversy and conflict to distinguish so sharply between different enemies, so that according to what is here said, all the enemies of Christianity, in every age, must be distinguished" (Brauno).

idea most essentially belonging to the unpardonable sin, which might certainly be committed also before the day of Pentecost, for, otherwise, Christ had not spoken of it here to the Pharisees. It was possible so to calumniate Christ in his state of humiliation as that it should be blasphemy against the Spirit, brought perfectly to the consciousness by the truth of his doctrine and the dignity of his person; it is possible still so to blaspheme Christ in his state of exaltation, as that it is seen by God to proceed from the ignorance of unbelief (1 Tim. i. 13) against the Son of Man, against this Jesus of Nazareth (Acts xxvi. 9), and therefore is forgiven.

Christ certainly speaks here of an individual act, nay, rather of an individual word, for in such expression all sin completes and attests for judgment; but the individual expression is, of course, so significant only as the fruit of the tree, and an emanation from the depths of the heart (vers. 33, 34). As Grashof simply and strikingly observes, it is the same here as with the *Raca* and *Fool* (chap. v. 22). Consequently, the expression pre-supposes an *internal state* developed up to this point, in which lies the *sin* properly so-called, which is always something belonging to a state, never an isolated speaking or acting as such.* Where are we to look for the sin to which, in opposition to all others, Christ unconditionally denies forgiveness? How has the want of understanding, even in those who are otherwise most intelligent, confused his clear words! How humbling to find such a man as Wesley, for example, saying that he finds "nothing more clear in the Bible" than that this sin is neither more nor less than what these people here did: "the ascribing those miracles to the power of the devil, which Christ wrought by the power of the Holy Ghost." Menken, also, is of opinion, that this blasphemy was only possible at that time, when Christ was present in visible personality, and performed acts through the power of the Spirit of God—but we cannot so lightly pass over the depths of this dreadful word. It is, rather, pretty clear from the *warning* words λέγω ὑμῖν, *I say unto you*, that those Pharisees were only on the way towards this highest degree of guilt;† and although this should remain doubtful, yet, at all events, the same must be possible now, much more even than then. Or, shall we say, that the convincing manifestation of the Spirit of God, in word and in power, is less now, than it was then in Christ upon earth? Does there not lie in the antithesis between the Son of Man and the Holy Ghost, a real reference to the days of the Holy Ghost, *after* the days of the Son of Man? The more powerfully and convincingly the Comforter, who is come, reproves the world by and without the word, of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, the greater the works which the apostles do after Christ (John xiv. 12), *i.e.*, the more comprehensive and convincing the *works of Christ*, as wrought by his followers in the history of the Church and the world, appear, so much the more impossible now, than before, must it become from century to century, for any one who wilfully rejects the testimony of the Spirit, to retain the plea of ignorance in such conduct, upon the ground of which it might be forgiven. The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost has been here and there committed since Christ appeared, but it is to be pre-eminently the sin of the last time, the consummation of anti-christianity. It is the substance of that to which the *type* of blasphemy against God (under the Old Testament dispensation) remotely corresponds.

Christ speaks, certainly, not *de peccato hominis cavendo, quamquam in hominem non cadente* (of a sin to be avoided by man, though not occurring in man), for his clear and true word has in it no mere empty bugbear, knows nothing of contradiction with itself, as this title of a once famous and well-meant writing would in vain reconcile the *homini cavendum* with the *in hominem non cadens*. What Lange, again maintains (*Leben Jesu*, iii. 126) is not true, namely, that a man cannot blaspheme the Holy Ghost with perfect knowledge of his doing so. "If man can truly *love* God and what is good, then must he also be able to *hate* God and what is good"—says Grashof in answer to this, and the apostle of love testifies that *there is a sin unto death* (John v. 16). So much, however, is certainly true in that well-meant opinion, that the highest sin, the pure, or rather the altogether impure *hatred* of the good and holy Spirit of God, which expresses itself in conscious blasphemy against him, is no longer the sin of man in the ordinary sense, but of *Satan*. If it has gone thus far with a man, he is then no longer merely under Satan's power and delusion, but has himself become a freely acting and conscious Satan. This is as truly possibly and real, as that there can be no restraint of a compelling grace to prevent the continued sin of man, so that it must be the end of the downward course, the same actual abyss into which Satan fell in his first complete fall. It is not, therefore (as Gurlitt thinks), contemptuous *indifference* to all that is good and holy which is here spoken of—of which Julius Müller truly says that it is impossible—but *positive hatred*. This transition of unbelief "from the merely tolerable character of indolence and cowardice to that of the most hateful falsehood," Nitzsch also designates as at least a *conceivable* height of resistance (*System*, § 142).

* "For this sin is not a *merely* outward act, as if, by the secret magic of certain words which do not emanate from the depths of the heart, one could commit the worst sin and consign himself immediately to eternal perdition." So Jul. Müller, On *the Doctrine of Sin*, vol. ii., p. 476 (Clark's *Foreign Theological Library*), who in general quite agrees with our interpretation.

† Mark iii. 30 by no means says, that Christ imputed this sin to them, but only explains the name which he gives it from the occasion that certainly foreshadowed it.

From this we may hope it will be understood, why Christ can do nothing else than denounce against the Satanic sin, Satan's everlasting condemnation without forgiveness. His words indicate this relation between *all sin and blasphemy* and this *blasphemy* peculiar in its kind, by the striking expression τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, *to men*, to which Mark gives still greater prominence, so that all other sins belong τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *to the sons of men*, while the blasphemer of the Spirit (the singular ὃς δ' ἄν) appears as a man fallen from the human state, a monster. The expression *neither in this world nor in the world to come*, cannot mean here the Rabbinical עוֹלָם הַזֶּה and הַבָּא (*this age* and *the age that has come*), as the time before and after the appearance of Christ; for, in this case, there could have been no αἰῶν μέλλων, *future age*, when Christ spake; still less can ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος (*this age*) mean, as in the writings of the apostles, the evil world without God and Christ, for in it there is in general no forgiveness. It means the time before and after the death of man.* It is in so far, certainly, a proverbial expression for *now and never*, Mark οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα;† but when *Christ* speaks proverbs they become truth in his mouth, he never speaks *animo commoto* (as Kuinöl thought), so that his words are not to be taken in their exact sense. The jejune sense (with which Alford also satisfies himself) goes completely against the letter, namely, that if a sin is forgiven or retained *here*, it is, therewith also, forgiven or retained in the world to come. This is precisely what we deny. Of the utmost importance, when the words are taken exactly as they ought to be, is the demontrable inference *ex vi oppositi* that other sins are forgiven also *in the world to come*. "*Neque enim de quibusdam* veracitar *diceretur, quod non eis remittatur neque in hoc saeculo neque futuro*, nisi essent quibus, etsi non in isto, tamen remittetur in futuro" (Augustine, *de civ.* lib. 21, c. 24). Nay, Christ has already maintained much more than the mere possibility of forgiveness for some sins even in the world to come, when he declared that all sin, except this one, *shall really be forgiven*, at all events in the world to come.‡ And there is good ground for this, indeed it cannot be otherwise; for, as there can be no standing still either in good or in evil, but must be a development onwards to the full degree of ripeness for the eternal fire or for eternal life, so also, in the other world, it goes on till the last judgment in the same way as here upon earth: all sin which belongs to a man at death developes itself either to the blasphemy against the Spirit, to the Satanic sin, which alone casts down to eternal fellowship with Satan,* or it is through means of not yet ceasing grace, taken away and *forgiven*.† But, let it be well observed, it is *forgiven* also in the world to come, by no means, expiated, discharged, purged away by fire or forced away. All salting with fire (Mark ix. 49), and all purifying pain, can only awaken in the freely acting creature the penitent faith which lays hold on grace—in that world not otherwise than in this.

The sum of what has been said is this: The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which at last remains only for the judgment, is the consummated absolute sin of the devil, to which man also may arrive; and this Christ denotes, according to Mark, by a peculiar word adapted to the peculiar nature of the sin, a word which perfectly corresponds to the fundamental idea of his discourse: ἔνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτίας or ἁμαρτήματος (for which κρίσεως is certainly only a gloss), he is guilty of an *eternal sin*. Here we look with horror into the abyss of guilt, for which only the abyss of condemnation remains. We cannot, therefore, see our way, with Meyer and all those who believe in a final restoration, to add to the words: "As long as it continues"—with which, strangely enough, just as before with the *cavendum* and *non cadens*, what he goes on to say stands in contradiction: "Because it pre-supposes an entire hardening and an incurable wickedness." We regard the unpardonable sin—the eternal sin of which Christ here speaks, and of which he was led to speak, from a special occasion, so that he characterizes it according to one of its forms, here definitely foreshadowed—not merely in this or that one of its manifold expressions, but in its deepest ground, which Christ here at the same time lays open. It is the rejection and—on account of this its inherent eternal nature as a sin—the eternally unpardonable rejection of the perfectly known, immediate, testimony of the Spirit, with which the Holy Ghost has proffered truth and grace, developed in a human being, till it brings him to be of the same nature with Satan. It is committed when the man, with entire conviction, knows what, in complete wickedness, he does; for thus did Christ on the cross, mark the limits of forgiveness and atonement. It is distinguished from every other pardonable sin of

* If as Julius Müller thinks: "αἰὼν μέλλων is the period of the manifest, consequently of the perfectly realized, Messianic kingdom, which is not set up till after the resurrection and the judgment of the world"—where then remains the *continuity* of the time embraced by neither-nor?

† As in *Sepher chasidim*, num. 234, one Jew says to another: I shall not forgive this, neither in this world nor in the world to come. This may be added to what is here adduced by Grotius.

‡ König (*Die Lehre von Christi Höllenfahrt*), p. 238.

* Precisely to the same effect Julius Müller: "Rather must the sinful development, if it be not reversed by the redemption, every where complete itself in the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost."

† By no means merely in the sense in which Von Gerlach weakens and trifles with the words: "He who through great anxiety of mind has not experienced the comfort here, may *there* first attain to the *enjoyment* of forgiveness"—as if this alone were meant by "forgiven!"

man by this, that in it there is not even a minimum of Satanic *deceit* practiced upon the understanding (Gen. iii. 13), or *compulsion* of any nature, or by any creature, upon the will, but sheer evil is willed, spoken, and done instead of the known and rejected good, the lie, as such, instead of the blasphemed truth. That it should be forgiven is impossible, not on God's account, but on account of the creature, who has put himself under such a ban, that he henceforth remains incapable of repentance and faith in divine grace.

When Christ here designates the sin against the Holy Ghost as that which is *alone* unpardonable, while yet the Scripture speaks of sins unto death, for which no repentance, no grace, and no sacrifice can be of any avail, it follows, beyond contradiction, that all such passages are to be understood merely of different forms of development and expression, but, at bottom, as speaking of one and the same sin. In this light 1 John v. 16; 2 Tim. iii. 8; Jude 4, 12, 13; Heb. x. 26–31, vi. 4–8, are to be viewed; while, from the last cited passage, it may be seen, that the fall into such an abyss, even of those who have been regenerated, is possible and real. But that not merely those who have fallen back may commit the unpardonable sin (as some have thought), is very evident again from 2 Tim. iii. 8.

Verses 33–35. With how much propriety for the explanation of what goes before, this tracing back of the outward expressions to its internal ground now follows, we have already seen, and have little to add by way of interpretation; all the less that Christ, evidently repeating, recurs to his Sermon on the Mount,* as, in what he says about trees, and in the expression, "generation of vipers," he goes still further back to the Baptist's first repentance sermon, with which these people had again to begin. From the last outbreak of diabolic sin, he turns warningly back to its first source in the heart of man! *Ποιήσατε, do* ("bring forth"), seems at first to be a Latinism, inasmuch as the tone of address now anew takes the form of a logical demonstration, as at ver. 25: *Imagine, suppose*, or *put the case*—still there lies beneath the surface of this, as the German "setzet" well renders it, the proper sense of the word, derived from the *planting* of a tree; for, as the parellel accusatives show, the expression is strikingly brought up on purpose from the *ποιεῖν καρπόν* to the tree. If you will *bring forth* fruit, then first bring forth the tree for this! To *suppose* the tree to be good will not do. Against the false interpretation according to which Christ would merely say: *Suppose* the case—Julius Müller has also objected, that in this sense, the confirmation *ἐκ γὰρ—γινώσκεται*, (*for from—is known*), would not be at all suitable. The same learned writer (not always acutely exegetical) denotes here the *two* main ideas of the text quite correctly: As from the quality of the tree the quality of the fruit follows of itself, so the good and evil actions of man follow from the good or evil state of his heart; but this state is itself again conditioned by the *fundamental determinations of the will*, *ποιήσατε τὸ δένδρον κτλ.*, (*Von der Sünde*, ii. 79, 80). This is well said; for the *ποιήσατε* which, first of all, *ironically* expresses the impotency of nature, immediately takes the force of an earnest challenge. For, in order to do and speak what is good, the tree, the fountain, must become different. The *λαλεῖν, speaking*, proceeds only from the *εἶναι, being;* in the heart is the fountain whence the words of the mouth flow, and their being good or evil is manifest from the state of the heart, to him who knows the heart, just as *vice versa* the words betray the heart to the judgment of men, and in spite of all hypocrisy expose to conviction also before the tribunal of God. For the fountain *cannot but* overflow according to its nature and kind (James iii. 11). The expression *ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύματος λαλεῖν, speaking out of the abundance*, is from Eccles. ii. 15, Sept. What is denoted by *περίσσευμα, abundance*, is further called *Θησαυρός, treasure*—the innermost storehouse of life in the heart of man, open only to the eye of God, where those influences which determine the personal state and character form themselves, in order thence to flow forth again in the expressions of the life (Beck). It is not good or bad words and works, that make a good or bad man, but *vice versa.** "If the heart be worthless, then the virtue also is worthless." Christ's sharp word of rebuke here comes as a good word from his holy truth in love, while the finest hypocritical speeches, smooth as butter, are only so much the worse on account of the venomous source whence they proceed. The man forms himself *freely* between the kingdom of God and Satan; the strong one is not so strong that the *bad* man who is bound in his service, nay, developing to his likeness, should yet not be bad in a criminal surrender of himself; nor is the *stronger One* so strong as to make the bad man good by force. *The* good man and *the* bad: these are not by nature two different kinds of men, but we *are* indeed all bad (chap. vii. 11; Mark vii. 21; 22), and *the good man* here, as opposed to such in the highest degree, is Christ,

* Into which Luke (ch. vi. 45), as we there saw, has inserted this passage. We hold, at all events, that the present occurrence does not belong to the period *before* the Sermon on the Mount.

* Compare the saying of Aristotle, which Neander cites in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für christl. Wissenschaft* (1850, p. 1o2). [The passage to which Neander refers is in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book ii. ch. 4: "Actions are called just and temperate, when just and temperate men perform them; but just and temperate men are not those who do these actions, but who do them in such a way, that is, as the just and temperate do them. But the most of mankind do not act thus, but betake themselves to mere words, and think that they are then philosophers, and that thus they will become good." And he compares them to the sick, who consult a physician, and do not follow his prescriptions.—Am. Ed.]

who now even speaks good words to them, and then all who, as renewed men, participate in his grace before and after his coming in the flesh. Christ, as the γινώσκεται, *is known*, at the beginning indicates, will here, in connection at the same time with all that proceeds, say and ask: "If *my* fruits, works and words are *good*, works of love and words of truth, am I myself, then from God or a friend of Beelzebub?" For the most evil man is he that speaks evil against the good man who bears witness of himself by his goodness. The worst tree *plants* itself, inasmuch as it will not know the good tree, from which healing is to come to it, will not let itself be planted into it—therefore is it known at last by the worst fruit.

Verses 36, 37. What the tongue speaks is very significant; for the small member not only does great things, but it is also nearer the heart than the hand is. Men may, with wilful folly, say: A word or two spoken which meant nothing, what is there in this? I have surely in this done nothing bad! The history of the world and of man's life every where refutes such folly, and says loudly: Words are acts, which work most deeply and lastingly, even in the spiritual sphere in which works alone are taken into account; and this not merely the words of the leaders and representatives of the people—to whom certainly it chiefly applies—but in general; nor is it merely discourses which at the time seem great and powerful, but the smallest word which, after it has escaped the tongue, thou canst never recall, is a seed which grows and bears good or evil fruits, such as can never be computed. God, however, judges sin not according to its effects, but according to the motive and intentions. Here thou sayest again falsely against the truth; I only speak so and so, the heart means nothing bad! Yes, in those rare instances in which this is true, the words will not be charged against the heart; but in by far the most cases, indeed in general, the word is the proper expression of the heart, showing its real character more surely even than the act. Where the *gehenna* burns in the heart, there hypocritical works are of no avail, the course of the natural life which cannot be restrained, catches fire upon the tongue, and the whole body, however outwardly clean and pure, is tainted by the evil words (James iii. 6). Let one only hear what even those who are most honored *speak* within their four walls, or even in public! There are words of anger, of scandal, of pride, envenomed words against their neighbor, words of rebellion against God, that weigh heavier in the balance than many deeds, nay, lay open at one view, the whole treasure of evil into the heart, from which alone they could proceed. Hence, also, there is in the first and second tables of the decalogue, not to mention that all its commandments point in the same direction, a command expressly for the mouth. Immediately after the command against idolatry and the worship of images, comes the one against taking the name of God in vain, and immediately before that against the covetousness of the heart, is the one against falseness of speech, which always is and ought to be, an evidence of the former. This reaches far and deep. Did Christ, first of all, speak of *blasphemies* as the worst words which are the expression of the worst sin, and then, coming downwards, designate as "evil" in general that which the mouth brings forth from the heart—he now descends still farther to the πᾶν ῥῆμα ἀργόν, *every idle word* (placed before in an absolute form for emphasis), which implies still less than the apostle's πᾶς λόγος σαπρός, κενοὶ λόγοι (Ephes. iv. 29; v. 6). Where there is no good fruit of truth and love unto edification, there this very unprofitableness and emptiness is itself an evil fruit; before God's judgment, however, not even the smallest word which a man has ever spoken is forgotten! Ἀποδώσουσι λόγον περὶ παντὸς λόγου, "they shall give account for every *word*." How dumb shall they then be, and have not a word to answer for a thousand, if the *justifying* good words, proceeding from the spirit of grace and prayer, do not weigh heavier in the balance of the Judge!* It will, we hope, be seen, with what perfect justice Christ here, instead of the principle of judgment which most commonly occurs in the Old and New Testament: "To every man according to his *works*"—lays down the more appropriate one, which we find in ver. 27. Even in human judicial processes, this is a proverbial rule, as Eliphaz expresses it in the book of Job, where the discourse was precisely concerning *unprofitable* words (Job. xv. 2, 6). By the *tongue* we write for ourselves the most decisive protocol of our future trial before the tribunal of the highest Justice, and all that was in us, all that we have done, or as good as done, speaks then loudly in our words as a silencing confession, as our own testimony.

What Luke (ch. xi. 16), introduced right before, along with the calumny: *By Beelzebub*, etc., as the occasion of Christ's address—was according to Matthew only now objected to him, in reply to what he had said. So much, however, we would learn from Luke, did we not perceive this also in Matthew from the thing itself, that those who demanded a sign were *different* persons from the blasphemers. They are not quite so bad as to reject all his signs as the decided work of the devil, but all that he had given hitherto, were not sufficient to prove that they were from God; they want to see another which goes still farther than these, *to see a sign*. As Luke rightly adds, and

* A writer in Tholuck's *Anzeiger* (1848, p. 311) has taken great offence at the expression "justifying words," and sees in it a want of "unity and exactness of *dogmatical* interpretation." As if this heresy against the exact terminology of dogmatics were not here only Christ's own expression!

as in Matt. xvi. 1; John vi. 30, 31, the demand is repeated as a sign *from heaven*. Now, these words of wilful unbelief are not much better than the foregoing, and therefore Christ does not change his strain on account of them, but only makes them the occasion of carrying out the warning, which he had brought to the threshold of the judgment, to a complete prophetic *threatening* of the *doom* that was ready to break over the unbelieving generation. What the challengers meant by the "sign from heaven," we will leave to be explained at ch. xvi., and here, first of all, interpret the answer, which he there repeats to them with closer reference to the signs of the times then already present. He uttered this in the presence of all the people (Matt. verse 46; Luke τῶν ὄχλων ἐπαθροιζομένων, which only indicates a being together or a gathering together, not precisely a thronging towards him), and he includes the Pharisees in the whole race which was like them, and was expressing itself by them. He *predicts* Israel's destruction and judgment, which will break out, if this people, as a whole, persist in their unbelief, even after the last sign that is yet to be afforded them, and if they reject the testimony of the Spirit when the risen Son of Man is justified, and once more preaches to them repentance unto the forgiveness of sins by the apostles in his name. He announces this last and most perfect sign taken from the hell that had been vanquished, a sign which had all the value of one from above, and which indeed became such on the day of Pentecost (vers. 39, 40). Then, he announces the unbelief of the people under that preaching of the apostles, as in the present—the unbelief of Israel in their Messiah, which is condemned by the faith of the heathen who listened to a Jonah, and who even sought out a Solomon (vers. 41, 42). Consequently (vers. 43–45), the final and complete destruction, if after a previous casting out of Satan, his power shall again take possession of this people, and in a worse form.

Verses 39, 40. Israel is not merely an *evil* generation (which Luke alone has, as are also all heathen, but, as Matthew in both places significantly adds, an *adulterous*, which alludes to the special covenant of God with this people, which they had broken. Γενεὰ μοιχαλίς cannot denote here merely, or in the first place, a generation begotten by adultery, and is therefore wrongly compared with John viii. 41, but one which commits adultery; idolatrous in heart, with all their Pharisaical ornament on the outside, just as, in former times, in open idolatry (Hos. i. 2, ii. 2, 5). But already in this allusion to the adulterous children of the adulterous wife, as also in the γενεά, *generation* (which corresponds to the γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, verse 34), there certainly lies, at the same time, a reference to the sins of the fathers out of which the children are begotten in order to fill up its measure, and hence, also, an explanation of the final destruction, by the fearfully continuous progress of evil from generation to generation. The seed of adulterers is itself adulterous in the twofold sense of which we read in Isa. lvii. 3, and Wisd. iii. 16. iv. 6. They demanded signs of which they already had enough, from the desert onwards, where they tempted God, and put him to the test whether he would do this and that according to their lust; and just in the same way do they now act towards Christ. But, although the long-suffering of Christ continued to perform miracles until his hands were bound in Gethsemane, still, no signs of such a kind *were given in answer to their request*, but that last one which he had already at the beginning announced to them (John ii. 19) in answer to a like challenge, *the sign of the prophet Jonas;* and this, too, was to be in vain for them! For they who believed not Moses and the prophets, could not believe on Christ, even though he were to rise from the dead.

The explanation which *Luke* gives, verse 30, of the sign of Jonas, does not by any means contradict the one here given by *Christ*,* but is only an abridged an indefinite statement of what Matthew gives in detail in vers. 40 and 41; as well the similitude of the resurrection as the call to repentance. We could, indeed, scarcely understand the more obscure account of Luke without the assistance of Matthew, but we ought, therefore, with grateful docility, to receive what the Spirit has caused to be written for us, and not wilfully darken what is clear. The history of the Old Testament presents no more striking example of a wonderful preservation from certain death than that of the prophet Jonah; nay, it is singular in its kind, inasmuch as the prophet, although as it were shut up in death and buried, yet came forth again to life: therefore is this history recorded as a similitude and type of the resurrection of Christ, as, in the sphere of the type, a resurrection of one really dead was not yet possible. The expressions in the book of Jonah intimate plainly enough to him who reads aright, that the spirit of prophecy, even then, wrote them with reference to Christ. The prayer of Jonah (ch. ii.) was really uttered in the belly (Heb. מְמֵּעַי) of the fish (κήτος an indefinite expression in the Septuagint for דָּג גָּדוֹל, *great fish*); for the deliverance follows in verse 11, and to take this in the pluperfect, and understand at the beginning: *Out of* the belly, *i. e.*, after he had been saved, and was out of it, would be too far-

* Which, according to Schleiermacher, is again "only a false interpretation of the reporter's own, which he has mixed up with the words of Christ," namely, on the supposition of its being a reminiscence already weakened and confused! Neander, unhappily, almost to the same effect says, that verse 40 is an entirely unsuitable, later addition, the sign of Jonas only representing the "manifestation of the Son of Man as a whole" in contradistinction to every single sign or miracle. That the resurrection was a sign only for believers, is against the whole Acts of the Apostles (from ch. ii. 32, 33 onwards), against Rom. i. 4, and all the apostolic preaching.

fetched. The whole prayer in his distress is certainly, at the same time, a thanksgiving, a confident expectation of help, with which the prophet, even from the bowels of the fish, sends up his cry to God's heaven and the light of life; but this is his *faith*, which was the speedy result of his finding that he miraculously remained alive within the fish, and that he could pray for help. The Spirit, in his record of the prayer (for in such histories, still more than in other places, the difference between the written and acted history holds good, so that we do not expect to find the bare actual occurrence literally in the word), views, in perfect accordance with the system that pervades all Scripture, the depths of the sea (בְּלֵב יַמִּים, ver. 4), as being the same with the abyss of the realm of the dead, where the floods of destruction, the waters of Belial drown; the belly of the monster is the belly of hell (בֶּטֶן שְׁאוֹל, verse 3). Thus from the prophetical text are derived the expressions of Christ in this place, with which he places the type there already indicated, completely in the light of fulfillment: the κοιλία, *belly*, corresponds, as to the מְעֵי הַדָּג, "*bowels of the fish*," so also at the same time to the בֶּטֶן שְׁאוֹל, "*belly of hell*," and the καρδία τῆς γῆς, *heart of the earth*, points back at once to the בְּלֵב יַמִּים, "*midst of the seas*," and to the הָאָרֶץ בְּרִיחֶיהָ בַּעֲדִי, "*the earth with her bars was about me*." If Christ meant to denote by these expressions nothing more than death and the grave, inasmuch as the body lay in the earth, then, not only would the heart, the centre of the earth, be too strong an expression for his sepulchre in the rock, besides its being not true that the Son of Man was himself so long in the earth—but what is chiefly to be objected to this is, that the word of fulfillment would thus remain behind the word of prophecy. No, he means—let a theology or dogmatism, which shuts its eyes to these things, say what it will to the contrary—his actual abode in the Sheol, the realm of the dead, beneath, and in the heart of, the earth,* or, to speak in dogmatic phraseology, the descent into hell, of which Eph. iv. 9 testifies. What the type could only shadow forth outwardly was, in its mysterious and essential significance, fulfilled in him who thus entered into the strong man's house to bind him there, who proved himself to be victorious over him in the highest power of the quickening Spirit of God, even when the leviathan appeared to have swallowed him up, and when it was said over the earth, The prophet is devoured, it is all over with him. "But thou hast brought forth my life from destruction, O Lord my God" (Jonah ii. 7).

Three days and three nights—not longer, and then will the Son of Man come forth to life, as it happened with Jonah.* Then, just as Jonah preached to the Ninevites, a new preaching will begin, in which the risen Saviour will be a sign for repentance unto this generation, as Jonah, saved from the fish, was to the Ninevites. Then will he, who even now (a greater than Jonas is here!) displays himself to your eyes and ears as the true sign, the bread from heaven (John vi. 51), be, by the highest possible miracle which seals all that went before, offered to you as the bread of life; then will follow upon this sign *from beneath*, wrought upon the *Son of Man* by the power of God, the Pentecostal sign from *heaven*—for Daniel's vision of the glorification of the Son of Man begins from that time to be fulfilled (as Christ, Matt. xxvi. 64, in the depth of ignominy, announces by a "*from this time forth*"). All this, Christ sees and signifies in his words: those who heard him plainly understood so much, at least, as they afterwards came to show, namely, that he would *rise again after three days;* therefore they set a watch upon the grave *until the third* day† (Matt. xxvii. 63, 64).

Verses 41, 42. But the sign of Jonah, too, will be in vain! Christ speaks here, in continuation of the prophecy, by no means merely of the unbelief in his person then manifesting itself, as one might be led wrongly to suppose from the καὶ ἰδού, ὧδε, *and behold, here.* He only goes out from the present, taking it also into his view as he does by saying: Now already in my words and works, which prove that the kingdom of God is come more than Jonah or Solomon did (ver. 28; chap. xi. 12–15, 21–23). But he especially speaks of the last preaching of the Spirit after his resurrection, for he compares with it the preaching of

* Since microcosmically the heart of man actually corresponds with the innermost part of the earth, for which compare James iii. 6, and Prov. xxvii. 19, 20 (and if possible our interpretations of both passages).

* Although it is not without significance that, precisely on the third day, corruption in general begins to appear, we are yet certainly not at liberty with Hofmann (*Weissagung u. Erfüllung*, ii. 262) to make that alone the ground of Christ's words, which expressly refer to Jonas. Comp. also 1 Cor. xv. 4.

† The refutation of the trifling and presumptuous after-reckoning of the three days and nights belongs only to a note. In the *Talm. Hieros.* it is expressly said: "Day and night make together a space of time (עוֹנָה), and the part of such is as the whole." The Jews reckoned νυχθήμερα (2 Cor. xi. 25), and said, so many *days and nights* (Gen. vii. 11; Exod. xxiv. 18). (Compare Esth. iv. 16 with v. 1; 1 Sam. xxx. 12, 13; 2 Chron. x. 5–12; 1 Kings xx. 29.) Consequently, if Christ died at the end of the first day, and arose at the breaking of the third, there are three day-night periods, and he says here nothing else than in the other passages: "In three days, on the third day." According to König (*Höllenfahrt*, p. 197), Damascenus Studita has ingeniously reckoned, that Christ was thirty-three hours in hades as he was thirty-three years on the earth. This might really almost harmonize—better, at least, than the very summary combination of Oetinger, who speaks of forty hours in the grave answering to the forty days after the resurrection.

Jonah *after* his deliverance. As the Ninevites did not see the sign of the prophet with their eyes, but believed and repented upon his *preaching* (εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα, see Winer's *Gramm.*, p. 338), so, and not otherwise, was the risen Son of Man, whom they no longer saw with their eyes, a sign to the Jews in the preaching of his Spirit by the apostles. That, moreover, the people of Nineveh may have known something of Jonah, from their expedition to Israel under Pul (2 Kings xv. 19, 20), and may have seen the fulfillment of his prophecy (2 Kings xiv. 25), at all events have heard from his own lips the wonderful history of his deliverance from the depths of hell—all this, although not declared in the narrative (Jon. iii.), may yet be pre-supposed as probable, from the great success which attended his preaching; it is intimated to some extent (ver. 5), in the words: *Then they believed in God*—which may indicate in general, it is true, the ground of all repentance (to which Christ here also points), but may mean, at the same time, the miracle of divine power before narrated. Be that as it may, the comparison which Christ here makes implies, that the sign of Jonas was not in vain for the Ninevites, but this generation will not, in like manner, receive unto repentance the preaching concerning the resurrection of the Son of Man, although powerfully attested by the Holy Spirit.*

Greater than Jonas! greater than Solomon! If such a comparison of the Lord from heaven, who is over all, with children of the earth, of the incomparable One with those who are altogether as nothing before him, and who in reality derive all that they have only from him, is, on the one hand, an expression of condescension and love, asking in sadness, Am I less than those, that you despise me so?—on the other, the propriety of the comparison is based on the divine consecration, which exalted Jonah and Solomon into types of Christ. When Christ, in his own history or in that of his kingdom, points to histories in the Old Testament with a *like as* (ch. xxiv. 37; John iii. 14), there, in every case, is a resemblance not arbitrary and only then superadded, but one already prepared in the type. As the typical explanation, *Like as Jonas was in the fish's belly,*† preceded the affirmation, *A greater than Jonas is here!*—so does the following comparison with Solomon pre-suppose an entirely "*like as*," *i.e.*, in like manner, a typical reference to Christ of the person, power, wisdom, and glory of Solomon, of all that characterizes him as Solomon. If it was fit for Solomon to be placed in comparison with all the children of the east, with Egyptians, and with all heathen poets (1 Kings iv. 30, 31), so it is fit for Christ himself only to say: *A greater* than Solomon. Only in the sphere of sacred history, at least in types that but faintly shadow him forth, does he find his like, *i.e.*, such as are worthy even of being mentioned side by side with him, with the words, Here is one greater! We find even in the Old Testament, in Nathan's prophecy, and in the Psalms founded upon it, how Solomon's reign of peace, his building the temple, his splendor, his marriage, point prophetically to the future; here, in addition to these, it is especially his *wisdom* that is spoken of, as Matt. xiii. 16 points back to 1 Kings x. 8. The queen of the South is not so much placed in antithesis as a woman to the Ninevites, (ἄνδρες Νινευῖται, which indeed is only אַנְשֵׁי נִינְוֵה), but, by way of climax, as one who came even from the ends of the earth, from the far coast of the foreign country that bounds the known world,* to seek out the anointed of the Lord who was so much renowned, while Jonas came to the Ninevites in their own country.

We may certainly, however, apply the words of Christ in the widest sense, and, taking into view all the renowned names of wise, and all the wonderful destinies of remarkable men, all the missions and preachings confirmed by signs of whatever kind, say: Here is a greater than any Jonas-miracle! Here is a greater than any Solomon of his nation and time! For the history of him who, by the suffering of death, was crowned with glory and honor, is the miracle of all miracles in the world's history for every one who asks a sign; the words of the Word are wisdom itself for all who inquire after wisdom and earnestly seek it. What then shall we say of the unbelieving generation of fools in Christendom, who esteem the fables of the heathen and the histories of the world's heroes more remarkable than the cross and the victory of Christ? who run after this or that ancient or modern "hero," or "classic," or "genius," and say: Here is one almost as great—or, again, Here is one really as great, or finally, Here is one greater than Christ! As the excellent Dannhauer on the text exclaims, in reference to his own time: "Carthusians and Flagellants shall *stand up in the judgment* against the philosophers of this day, and condemn them." What Christ said in chap. x. 15, and xi. 22–24, he here again says more strongly, from another point of view: As the Gentiles who, till then, remained impenitent, have a more tolerable judgment than Israel, so at least shall those who have repented, who sought, even from afar, the truth of God which appeared in the midst of Israel, *condemn* Israel by their example—in that great judgment in which all of every country and time shall appear together, and all the guilty, besides the protocol which they themselves have written, shall be confronted with all witnesses for their

* At all events Christ least of all intends to say what Lange strangely understands him as saying, viz., that the Messiah is come even as Jonas came—a stranger, a poor, unknown, nameless man, attesting himself *solely* by the power of his inner life! For he plainly speaks of something *future.*

† With which ὥσπερ ἦν — οὕτως ἔσται, moreover, the veritable reality of all that is recorded of the prophet, as corresponding to the real history of Christ, is maintained and proved.

* As already Homer called the Æthiopians "the farthest out among men."

conviction, whose conduct cries out with reference to them: Might you not also have done so, and even much more? The last sign of the Messiah, then, will not be that Israel shall judge the heathen, and rain fire and brimstone upon the Romans, but that the believing heathen world shall condemn Israel (chap. viii. 11, 12; xxi. 43; Rom. ii. 27). The Nineveh of this Jonah will be Rome, whose power bows before the sign of the cross, and Greece will seek and find in this Solomon the true wisdom. But as for this evil and adulterous generation—its *latter end* will be terrible and worse than any former destruction and judgment, as is now shown in verse 43 to verse 45. And why so? "Because thou hast not known the day of thy visitation!" (Luke xix. 44).

This transitional idea, which is only presupposed in Matthew's epitomized collection of Christ's discourses, is given in Luke xi. 33, 36, as having been also spoken by Christ; for these words in Luke stand plainly in close connection with what goes before, and are there, where several transpositions occur, to be introduced between vers. 23 and 24. They are again a repetition from the Sermon on the Mount (as at verse 33), and need no further interpretation here. We have only to observe the connection here, according to which, what is meant to be said is: The light of my preaching shines even now clearly enough, and after the sign of Jonas will be set still more clearly on the candlestick, although, the blindness whose light has become darkness, sees it not. *Εἰς κρυπτήν, in a secret place*, may be the Hebrew idiom for the neuter, or may mean really a crypt, a concealed passage or vault;* the sense remains the same. The *ἀστραπή, bright shining*, verse 36, is equivalent to *φέγγος, light*, before, purposely, however, expressed more strongly, in order to mark that the light does not struggle through with difficulty, but, victorious over the darkness, instantaneously illumines every thing. These words, spoken in a spirit of mingled sadness and kindness, and only hypothetically, of a complete illumination by the light† of God, now only conceived as an ideal, contrast all the more fearfully with the dark closing picture in Matthew, to which we must now turn.

Verses 43—45. The words are a *parable*, in which Christ (an evident proof of the unity of these discourses), turns back at the end to the beginning of his address; he takes the casting out of the devil from an individual demoniac as an illustration, in so far as he announces an aggravated return of the evil one. It thereby becomes worse with this man than it was before, and so will it be also with this generation! It is the same generation, of course, that was spoken of from verse 39 onwards, although besides (which shows the truth of the interpretation that refers the words only to it), the beginners in the faith (verse 23), may also take warning from such a threatening prophecy. Thou hast Beelzebub! said the masters in Israel to him. He has patiently refuted them, kindly warned them, sharply rebuked them; now, at the conclusion of his address, announcing the end of the people, he has come so far as to retort upon them: This evil generation is *the great demoniac*, in regard to whom all previous casting out will at last appear to have been vain. As before, at verse 29, mankind as a whole was represented as Satan's *house* and household, so now it is especially Israel, viewed collectively as his abode, and as having fallen anew by their own guilt. We will just examine the details of the parable, that we may then see more clearly its application.

The unclean spirit which dwells in the demoniac, as is supposed by way of parable, is still to be understood as one of the many subordinate demons, and not the prince of them himself (who, in Mark iii. 30, has the same general title). He is in reality *gone out* of the man, which pre-supposes an expulsion by the power of God.* Christ—we might say, with special design—accumulates in a few words strong and massive features, taken from the natural history of the devil, as it lay open before him, so that in all future time it might not be thought that he spoke only according to Jewish superstition, and that he drew the figure for representing world-historical realities from unreal representations, springing from human delusion! Indeed (as the excellent Stein on Luke here also admits), he glorifies his *wisdom* precisely in this, that he was able to graft the loftiest truths upon erroneous popular conceptions. The expelled spirit wanders about through *dry places*, districts without water, and therefore without human houses or inhabitants. Such waste places are the devils' dwelling place, when they are not in and among men; as we find not only in passages of the apocrypha, as Tob. viii. 3; Bar. iv. 35, but even in Rev. xviii. 2 (according to prophetic representations, Isa. xiii. 21, 22, xxxiv. 14), and as is here with full earnestness confirmed by Christ. The ejected devils abide willingly at least upon the earth, as they are still at liberty to do, and have a certain pleasure in all that is waste and desolate upon it, in ruined paradises and overthrown glory. Then impelled by inward pain he *seeks rest*, *i. e.*, first of all, a temporary place of abode and settlement, in which Christ (to whose mind passages of Scripture are always immediately present, inasmuch as all his

* In this case to be written *κρύπτην*. Euthymius: *ἀπόκρυφον οἰκίαν*.

† On the sense of which, we have already expressed ourselves at Matt. vi. 22.

* It is by no means *mere* appearance that is here spoken of, as if the malady were overcome, as if by the healing of the demoniac damage were done also to the "principle of evil itself" in the man (as Neander understands it). Every casting out of the devil is an actual step towards improvement, and even in the application afterwards to the generation of this time, this holds perfectly true.

thoughts and knowledge as a man take their rise from the Holy Scriptures) has again evidently Isa. xxxiv. 14 in his eye.* But when the word of the prophecy, less distinctly expressing the meaning which lies under the figure, speaks of the finding of rest (מָצְאָה מָנוֹחַ, Sept. also ἀνάπαυσιν), Christ here, as it were, justifies and confirms the word, inasmuch as he goes on to say: And findeth it *not*. For how can a devil find rest, which the creature can find only in God? He has lost it for ever, he seeks it in vain, in all waste places, which otherwise please him; he seeks it especially in vain where God the Lord of creation will have his rest, and where, therefore, the devil also, if he can force an entrance, finds himself relatively most comfortable—namely, in man. Therefore, the desire soon returns upon him to look after his own more peculiar *house*. He declares his intention, ἐπιστρέψω, *I will return*, which he cannot long leave unexecuted, for he is always willing to return if only he can. As, in verse 29, it was Satan's *house*, as a whole, that was spoken of, in which individual men are the household furniture, so now the same expression is, with equal truth, applied internally to the individual; every man in a devil's power is his house. He impudently speaks of the house as *his own* from the first—he still knows all the secret passages in it, as in a stronghold which he had left, and speaks, like a true devil, as if he had only *gone out* of his own free will, not confessing that he was forced out. And when he thus comes, how does he find it in the case here supposed? *Swept and garnished*, as both Evangelists have it. But would not this be contrary to the nature of the unclean spirit, who likes to dwell only in the filth of sin? Alas! *this* garnishing, which is here meant, is to him filthy enough to be agreeable; for it is the outward garnishing of hypocrisy, it is a sweeping with the besom of Pharisaism which makes worse what was already evil (in proof of which compare Luke xi. 39, 40). In Matthew there is still the term σχολάζοντα, *at leisure*, ("empty"), affording a certain explanation of the other two words before which it stands, and which designedly includes at once the figure and its explanation; in the figure, *empty*, open for free access, in the explanation *idle*, left unguarded through indolence, security, hypocritical conceit, and thus in the best way prepared and adorned for the devil.† This is a discovery going beyond his expectation, and in which he will have his pleasure and labor not alone. Then, he goes away once more (not concerned lest such a house should meanwhile be lost to him), and takes as a reinforcement seven other devils who are *worse* than himself. This does not mean worse in respect of wickedness (*nequiores, sceleratiores*), for in this, indeed, there is no difference possible between devil and devil, but worse in their power to destroy, and in their consequent obstinacy (ch. xvii. 21). *Stronger* ones are meant, but, because from them greater evil (*i. e.* in the explanation, worse sin) follows for the poor man, Christ speaks of *worse* ones. The seven dwell there instead of the one, are no more driven out, and the relapse of him who was once healed is worse than the first illness.

Who is this man? Christ explains his parable unasked. Such will be the last end of this evil generation! Consequently, the end of the story here narrated will be realized in the then existing last generation of Israel, which fills up the measure of guilt, and draws down judgment upon itself. We know now how it happened. But inasmuch as Christ has put the ἔσχατα, *last*, in opposition to the πρώτοις, *first*, and begun the parable with the actual casting out of the one, first devil, we observe, at the same time, that he takes into one view the collective history of this entire people, from the fathers downward. What was their first devil? It was rude heathenish idolatry. This God truly cast out by the Babylonian exile; which certainly was in itself something good, it was a result obtained for the time. But soon again in indolent security they adorned the house which was mistakenly supposed to have been cleansed for all coming time. And, the more their pride recoiled from idols, with so much the more corruption and inward idolatry must they commit sacrilege in the true sanctuary (Rom. ii 22); in Pharisaism there grew up a γενεὰ μοιχαλίς, *adulterous generation*, which went a whoring after idols worse than the former. The seven devils were not merely on their way, they were already come when Christ spoke; still he speaks prophetically (ἔσται), because he has in view the last *manifestation* of this state, the outbreak of the destruction which awaited the people in judgment. Nor is it to be overlooked, what Von Meyer in his striking note here says, that as another application of this many-sided parable, the ineffectual casting out which is followed only by a worse relapse, means, at the same time, the coming in of the kingdom of Christ (ver. 28). The manifold good, both in the sphere of knowledge and of will, which was actually called forth by the labors of Christ for a time, might once more have effected a thorough cleansing of the people, but this also was in vain. In the period between the ascension of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem, especially towards the end of it, this nation shows itself, one might say, as if possessed by seven thousand

* Moreover, a perplexing proof for those who too hastily throw many things among the Jewish fables, that by the צִיִּים and אִיִּים שָׂעִיר, and לִילִית, hellish spirits are actually indicated, though not the Rabbinical *Lilith*.

† Braune, here falsely understanding it in the good sense of preparedness for receiving the Holy Ghost, entirely mistakes the *irony* of the expression (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1847, ii. 390). It is truly not the beginning of regeneration that is here spoken of, in which Satan might yet again find room for working, but it is the offence of the hypocrite in false security.

devils. It is judged, destroyed, blinded; its judgment is the great type of history for the last judgment of the whole world, and in its present blindness it must, even as the people of God, without knowing or willing it, serve at least as a warning and prophetic parable to the world.

For we find that the same holds good of Christendom, of those who are outwardly called taken collectively. The apostolical age is followed by the setting up of the golden calf in the Romish Church; even idolatry properly so called breaks out on every side. The return from the exile corresponds in part to the Reformation; nor have we far to look for the Pharisaism of Lutheranism. At present, indeed, every thing is more complicated, more spiritual, and on a scale of more complete development, still the ground-features remain the same, although Pharisees and Sadducees, on this side and on that, in many ways change places in and outside of the still remaining faith of the letter. Enough, that "in the midst of all the culture that exists," with all the sweeping and garnishing of the house by art, science, illumination, industry, and speculation, there is already something worse at the bottom than a mere Laodicean *σχολάζειν*, or vacancy. How one who has been cleansed only with the besom of an outward reformation, who is only outwardly civilized, is not safe from coarse excesses, as a savage, outwardly broken in, may yet easily fall back into wildness, and the nature which was washed only on the outside revenge itself all the more violently and filthily—the first revolution in the land of civilization has begun practically to show; and as an additional impending proof of the theory, Germany, also more spiritual in its sins, as the kernel of Christian nations, begins in like manner to develop itself.* What will it be when the *ἔσχατα*, or end comes, the last unbelief of completed antichristianity, the Man of Sin!

Finally, this grandly prophetic parable finds always its true application also in the individual, with whom the same may and must take place, if, after a first cure and conversion he becomes *σχολάζων* for the returning devil. Every relapse brings a worse state (John v. 14); but the complete relapse of the regenerated person (which the relapse of Israel and of Christendom *shadow forth* as a whole, just as they are really *exemplified* in many an individual, and of which Christ here speaks generally according to the innermost kernel of the word), such a relapse makes the destruction irreparable, it makes the person ripe for judgment, and is another, nay, the most fearful expression of that unparadonable sin spoken of above. Hence the apostle in 2 Peter ii. 20–22 plainly refers to this parable of Christ. *Οὕτως ἔσται, so shall it be*—the Saviour, as judge, has declared respecting his whole nation, and it has been fulfilled before the eyes of the world. A still more awful *οὕτως ἔσται* remains literally as the *ἔσχατον*, or in this, and the future world, respecting the *evil generation*, most properly so called, of the lost, whose destruction and judgment are prophetically attested by all the fearfully ending catastrophes of the men and generations of the Old and New Testament people of God in the world's history, as parables which already, more or less, carry their truth in themselves.

CHRIST'S MOTHER AND BRETHREN.

(Matt. xii. 48–50; Mark iii. 33–35; Luke viii. 21.)

Again, a contrast similar to chap. xi. 23–28. Often as the future Judge must cast down to hell by his word of truth, his Saviour's heart can yet never forget that he is come into the world not to judge, but to save. A gracious word coming immediately after the fearful denunciation against the seed of Abraham, which had become a generation of vipers; an expression of the deepest, tenderest feeling of love, which was still in his heart even when he spoke words of anger, and which was called forth by an intimation that was made to him; a word also for us, which is more to be *felt* than understood.

He had brought his address to the people towards its close; would he have been silent then, or what more would he have said? He is interrupted by the intimation, that his mother and brethren had already been standing a long time before the house, inquiring after him, endeavoring to come to him in order to say something to him. We should never have thought of conjecturing what this was, did we not read it with astonishment in Mark (whose account we must regard as parallel, in opposition to Ebrard's harmony which is not always correct). Surrounded by the throng of people, he had found neither time nor space for eating, and carried along by holy zeal, he had spoken without rest—the Evangelists giving only the substance of what he had said. His kinsfolk† become apprehensive about him, especially the unbelieving brothers, who prob-

* This was in the year 1844—what will the reader now say to it?

† For this must at all events be the meaning of *οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ*, Mark ver. 21, because ver. 31 again takes up the discourse with *οὖν*. Mark iv 10, *οἱ περὶ αὐτόν* is something quite different.

ably had not yet desisted from going about with the humble first-born, as they were wont to do in Nazareth, who, again at a later period (John vii. 3), are represented as giving him advice, and who here, most naturally, from the human point of view, are for exercising their right as brothers, and even their *mother* stands, on this occasion at least, passively on their side. They will stop him, *seize him* (κρατῆσαι αὐτόν), for they think and say: ὅτι ἐξέστη, *he is beside himself.* Let us interpret this as gently as we may, it remains a strong word:* He does too much, forgets all moderation (2 Cor. v. 13), exerts himself beyond his power, and beyond what is proper; certainly equivalent to *He is beside himself*, out of his senses, knows not what he is doing, so that we have to interfere! Mark brings it expressly in connection with the words of the Scribes: He has Beelzebub! in order to show us at one glance all that happened from *friends* and *foes* to Christ, who remains ever the same, and whom neither devilish blasphemy, nor the false love of men, was able to move. Perhaps he will even indicate that the friends of Christ heard the fearful word, and, at least, in a milder sense, applied it to him. But it is altogether contrary to the text (Mark ver. 22) to suppose, that the *Pharisees* also (on account of the many *paradoxes* which Christ uttered) had merely meant to say, and to spread abroad that he was out of his senses, crack-brained, not quite wise. "Possessed of a devil," and "out of his senses" are two very different things.† Christ was certainly in an unusual frame of awakened zeal, but he was quite *himself*, he was fulfilling his work and office, viz: to speak the *word of God* to all who would, and should hear him, and so to speak as it was needful for them, for instruction, warning, and judgment. (What is recorded in Luke xi. 27, 28, also took place meanwhile.) His zeal had just carried him to the point of opening up a look into the fearful depths of destruction, from which he would willingly save those who are yet willing to hear and believe, when his mother and brethren according to the flesh, came in his way, and as his spirit in the ἔκστασις—which yet in reality was no ἔκστασις—well perceives, with a carnal request. What else can he feel and think, and therefore say, than what we read in Matt. and Mark. Away, perverse generation! Away, mother and brethren! I speak as long as I can for those who have ears to hear; for this am I sent, and I know that I do not speak in vain: here are those who hear me—these are my brethren, my sisters, and mother!

Thus faithfully speaks and acts the true High Priest himself, according to the word of Moses (Deut. xxxiii. 9, 10), which he wishes to be realized in his followers; and thus does he set before us the brightest example how we should conduct ourselves in reference to those *family importunities* which would often so dangerously depress the spirit. Raised above all concern about its seeming disregard of filial duty and brotherly love, as if, in his prophetical and Messianic dignity, he was even ashamed of his humble relations (for only malice could thus interpret his words), he now repeats, evidently more strongly, what he had already said at Cana, inasmuch as the improper interference was here repeated in a stronger form. But the first sharply repelling word is immediately followed by one of unspeakable kindness, in which the mother and brothers are again embraced, according to which also the brothers, as soon as they believe on him, and become disciples of their brother, are then truly his brothers. Thus to shame them, and draw them to himself, belongs to the aim of his zeal, which is always lovingly wise, and considerate even in its most rapid expressions.* He extends the gracious hand of blessing and protection over his disciples, just as if some one would take them from him; he turns a kind look of love towards all who sat around him (others, therefore, besides the apostles or his outwardly decided followers, but not those also who were now standing in a hostile attitude towards him, all, in short, whose quiet sitting around the master indicated that they were μαθηταί, who would learn and hear), and affectionately exclaims—*Behold my mother and my brethren!*

This is a precious word from the heart of the First-born. It means first of all simply: *I love them as* much as my mother and brethren (in which, at the same time, the natural affection of a son and brother, which was seemingly disowned becomes again apparent), nay, more than those who are such after the flesh, inasmuch as *they are* such in a truer sense. There lies in this certainly, as coming from the Son of Man still dwelling on earth, *something* of that *humility* which Timothy needed to be recommended to practice (1 Tim. v. 2), so that he should be able to say of the aged women: Behold I speak to them as to mothers! But it has a deeper meaning, and expresses the actual spiritual relationship, above all of a carnal kind, for which Christ would prepare, and to which he would elevate his people, which he already sees in the weak beginners, and makes them brethren, inasmuch as he calls them so (Heb. ii. 11, 12). But are we to take in this sense not merely

* Schleirmacher thought that this addition by Mark must always seem strange even when understood in the mildest possible sense—and therefore assigned it a place among those "accumulations and exaggerations which are so frequent in Mark."

† But to speak of *ecstacy* in Christ, as Sepp foolishly does, is folly; he was removed above ecstacy, though not above strong emotion.

* He answers *in the first place*, indeed, the person who had addressed him, and perhaps gladly so, in order thereby at length to put a stop to his severe discourse—but not *this person alone.* Such sayings were retained and repeated to every one whom they concerned, here certainly in a short time to the kinsfolk of Christ—and this Christ knew when he spoke the words.

brothers and sisters, but also *mother*, as it stands at the beginning, and again with the highest emphasis at the end of the address? By all means. Zinzendorf's naive circumlocution: "I reflect that I was a child, their race is my mother"—belongs here quite to the surface. Whoever receives him, has in heart conceived and borne him, is himself a Mary, as also Mary only thereby became and continues to be his mother (Luke xi. 28). The congregation of all the brethren (see also Psa. xxii. 22), is collectively the true Mary,* a presentiment of which profound truth forms the concealed ground of the shocking Mariolatry of that church which exalts itself above Christ.

But a dear friend whom I will not here name, has very far forgot himself when, in a sermon he makes Christ say: They are to me as *father and mother!* This he could not say. Where in the Scripture, after Luke ii. 49, does Christ speak of any other father or mother than the one whom he here also names, his Father in heaven? The mystery of his miraculous conception is in all his words plainly attested, even although there had been no account of it, no dogma concerning it. Brother, sister, and *mother:* these words express the compass and limits of the relationship of the Son of God and Man with the human race.* This relationship has already been laid open to the whole race by his birth in the flesh, already involved in the grace afforded to all; but it is only truly completed in every one *who does the will of God* (Mark), the will of his Father in heaven. This means in its completion, the utmost demands of the law laid down in Matt. vii. 21; in its beginning, however, so as kindly to draw to higher attainments, not more than is expressed in John vi. 40. Those who *hear* God's word in faith are to *do* it, and shall do it (Luke viii. 21); the hearing and learning receives and already has in itself all the grace necessary for keeping it (Luke xi. 28). With a kindness that hastens to meet its object, Christ already adjudging and appropriating, *promises* every thing to the good *beginning*, which, alas, is so often not a going onward to the end (Rom. viii. 29). On the other side—for this, as always, is the other side of the judging word of grace—he who does *not* hear and do, Christ knows him not, even though after the flesh he were born of his mother, nay, were his mother herself!

* As already in Isa. vii. 14, the Old Testament Church, David's house and Zion, the Virgin whose faith at last conceives him in Mary. See Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. 222: and compare Micah iv. 10, v. 2.

* By the way, this *connection* of the brothers and sisters with the mother in the mouth of Christ, frequently in the Gospel history, is at the same time the *decisive* proof that the "brethren" were actually children of his mother (Psa. lxix. 9). Yet not the sole proof. The sainted Von Meyer, unconvinced indeed with many to the last, asked me, "Why is it not said, the mother of Christ and *her children, sons,*" and how could relations be otherwise named in the original languages than "*brethren?*" But the answer is easy. Christ remains the centre of all relation and designation. *His* mother, *His* brethren. Relations must, at least in Luke and John, be called ἀνεψιοί or such like. See my introduction to the epistle of Jude.

THE SEVEN PARABLES.

(MATT. XIII.)

The Evangelist opens up to us here, just as in the Sermon on the Mount, a scene in the teaching and preaching of Christ evidently complete in itself, and quite remarkable in its kind. On the same day on which what is narrated in the preceding chapter took place, Christ goes out of the house (chap. xii. 46), and sets himself by the sea-side, probably to seek rest and refreshment. But the ὄχλοι πολλοί, *great multitudes*, gather around him anew, and in order to escape from this new throng he enters into the ship (usually kept in readiness for him by Peter or others), and because the people remain standing on the shore, he immediately, without resting, begins again to speak to them. So *much* has he to say to the world and to judge of it (John viii. 26), and from his exhaustless treasure to bring forth things new and old (afterwards, ver. 52). He has just been speaking *parables*, and in *parables* he begins anew to teach, in calmly instructive *parables*, such as correspond to his frame of mind at that time, seeking rest in vain, whereby, at the same time, he composes his own soul to the *survey* of his whole office and kingdom, after the sharply judging prophecies in chap. xii.

Already does the plural ἐν παραβολαῖς, *in parables*, lead us to expect more than *one* parable as spoken at that time. When, after certain intermediate words, narrated by Matthew, addressed to his disciples, (showing why he spoke to the people in *parables*), and after the explanation of the first parable, we read (ver. 24), that he addressed *another* parable to them—this certainly means that it was on the same day (ver. 3). Consequently vers. 31 and 33 are connected in the same way with ver. 3; and ver. 34, therefore coincides again with vers. 3 and 10, ταῦτα πάντα ἐλάλησεν, *all these things spake he.* If now, ver. 36, Christ having

returned to the house, explains the second parable to the disciples, and the Evangelist, without any mark of separation, connects with these words a three times repeated *πάλιν ὁμοία, again—is like* (just as before at ver. 18, he connects the first explanation with the first question concerning his reason in general for speaking in parables), if next occurs a question whether they had understood *all these things* (again, as at ver. 34), and finally, ver. 53 (just as at chap. vii. 28) closes the whole with: *ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν τὰς παραβολὰς ταύτας*, "when he had finished *these parables*"—it is impossible with all this before us, otherwise to read and to understand the writer, than that Christ, on one and the same day, on which many other things had occurred, consequently in pretty quick succession, spoke the *seven* parables, the first four outside on the sea to the people, the last three in the house to the disciples. With this agrees Mark iv. (see especially ver. 2)—although all the parables are not there given, while another is narrated which Matthew has not, showing that Christ indeed spoke *many things* on that day, from which Matthew selects the seven *parables* that contained the real plan and order of his teaching at that time. With this Luke viii. likewise agrees, although there only the first parable is recorded. Luke xiii. 18–21 might indeed be an insertion, without regard to time, of what was said on that day, but it may quite as well indicate a repetition of that parable at another time. At all events, there is not the slightest reason for going against the decisive words of *Matthew*, of which, in order not to break the *Scripture*, we cannot possible make up our minds to say, in spite of their savoring so much of the letter, that "not much value is to be attached to them." If harmonies cannot reconcile other passages with this, we must still *go out* from the firm data given in Matthew, verses 3, 10, 24, 31, 33, 34, 36, 51, 53, and judge of other passages according to these.*

The scene in Matthew is also complete in itself, in so far as the surrounding objects furnish the material of the parables. Christ, looking from the ship, saw before him the fields and lands—these are naturally taken to represent the people standing upon them. *Seed*—this continues to be the ground-material, variously applied, of the first four parables, for as, on the one hand, the *leaven* stands closely related to the farther history of the ripened fruit, so, on the other hand, it represents in itself the penetrating, renovating power of the wonderful seed. Another quite similar application takes place in the first of the three esoteric parables of ver. 44 (which, in general, go deeper than the others), since just as the seed was viewed as a leaven, so it may also be viewed as a *treasure* committed to the earth and concealed in it. Now, however, the spiritualized idea becomes quite detached from this range of figures so manifoldly applied; when the transition is made from the *treasure* in general to the precious *pearl*, we can hardly fail (seeing that pearls are fished from the *sea*, and at that time, especially from the Arabian Gulf), to note that Christ in this parable returns to the place from which he speaks, as in the concluding parable of the net, it is made to connect in the closest manner with the ship of his fishers of men.* Thus, between the shore and the sea (vers. 1, 2), the circle of figures is formed, in which, as we shall soon see in the interpretation, each succeeding parable connects itself with the foregoing as a further development of it.†

As, notwithstanding all the profoundness of meaning which belongs to the figurative language taken from the operations of God in nature to represent the kingdom of God, the single parable can yet never present every side of the subject with perfect fitness, but must leave out of view other sides of it which do not enter into the *tertium comparationis*, so it was most consistent with the wisdom of Christ to deliver his instructions here by means of several parables *supplementing each other*, thus to awaken and exercise the understanding for parables, and to place the many-sidedness of the truth in opposition to the one-sided misunderstanding of it. But this is not all. By turning the significance of the figures from one side of the subject to another, his words have a *prophetic* import as he advances into the signified "mysteries of the kingdom of heaven," and this remarkable cycle of parables has in it an organic progress internally developing itself in the same way as the Sermon on the Mount in its kind. Here, as there, if we first of all attend to the final points, we have the first establishment and the final separation of the church of Christ, the beginning of preaching and the last judgment in the first and last parables; between these the line of connection will have to be drawn—we conjecture it and find it too. But it is not (and Bengel is here at fault) the reference to consecutive periods in the history of the Church, that forms the principal thread on which we are to lay hold; for Christ will here, in the first instance, not *prophesy* but *teach*. The prophecy must, from

* It belongs not to our work to refute the confusion in Ebrard's note, p. 371. This arises first of all, from his understanding Mark ver. 33, as a *parenthetical* (?) remark, and then also from his reading Matt. vers. 53 and 54, in an unwarrantably strict connection.

* As already in my *Andeutungen für gläubiges Schriftverständniss* ("Hints for the believing Understanding of the Scripture," I. Collection, p. 46 ss.), I expressed myself in almost the same terms on the connection and sequence of the seven parables; in which also are additional remarks on the designed and instructive change of figures according to which seed and field, birds, leaven, appear with different interpretations.

† Which transitions might be still more plainly effected through the medium of subordinate parables, one of which Mark gives; this, indeed, *may* have been the only one of this kind; who knows of any other like it?

the nature of the case, appear as a result in the back-ground, in so far as the history of the Church is nothing else than the doctrine of the Church gradually developing itself—its own manifestation. We understand, therefore, the order of the thought on a survey of these parables (which, indeed, only the interpretation of the particulars can make quite clear), to be what will be presently stated, and we are not afraid of being charged by those that really understand the case with any artificial refinement.

The objection, moreover, urged for example also by Neander, that so many parables following each other could only have the effect of distracting the minds of the hearers by an over-fulness of matter, and was therefore not in accordance with Christ's method of teaching,* appears to us to have little weight, especially when we consider that all the seven parables were not spoken to the people, and that intervals of time for reflection are marked.

The four parables to the people, and the three that follow, addressed to the disciples, are one, and yet different. The first speaks more exoterically of the outward form and development of the kingdom as a whole; their fundamental twofold idea is, in its unity, *sowing and harvest.* This divides itself again into two propositions, to which the two connected larger parables and the two smaller correspond; the seed of the word brings forth fruit only in a few, yet such seed will develop itself to a full harvest. The first parable about the different kinds of ground expresses the first proposition as a now existing fact; the first thing is, that the whole field is sown, and the springing of this seed is the beginning of the Church. The representation—which goes out from the preaching that had just been addressed to the people, according to which the parable, as it were, describes and explains itself—is still to be understood quite outwardly: *So it happens*—the ground of this not yet being given. Not merely the complete unfruitfulness, but also the seeming growth of the seed for a longer or a shorter time, so that it becomes manifest only at a later stage that there is to be no harvest, consequently the *uncertain mixture* of the seed before the eyes of men, is already indicated. This will now awaken and draw out the question, *Whence* comes this condition of the land, and *to what* will this state and course of things lead? The twofold answer is given in the second parable, which thereby also makes an advance, in respect of time, to the approaching, continuing, and increasing mixture in the Church. The continuance of the kingdom, after the Son of Man has sowed the seed, is certainly therein presupposed. But as the question, Whence are the tares? pointing back, includes in itself, at the same time, a previous one, viz., Whence is it that all the land is not good?—so, too, does the answer, The enemy has done this! conceal within itself, at the same time, a reference to the first and foremost sowing of tares in God's field. This parable, likewise, already points forward to the separation necessarily coincident with the harvest, and denotes therefore the *reason* and *aim* of what the first parable had laid down merely as a fact.

From the conclusion results quite naturally the second principal glance at the *full harvest* to which, notwithstanding, the corn is to be developed. As before, the individual person was represented first as the ground, then as the seed itself, so now, by a new turn of the figure, the entire kingdom, the entire company of the children of the kingdom, is compared to the single seed-corn. The small seed-corn grows or *develops itself* (verse 32 takes up verse 30, according to the ground-idea of the preceding parable in Mark), by virtue of the life-power inherent in it as *seed.* This wonderful seed, however, is at the same time like leaven (bearing within it from the first the nature of the last product), which leavens the ground itself, changes it to corn and fruit according to its kind; it *penetrates* that into which it is put, or *spreads itself out* by virtue of the *quickening power* inherent in it. Mustard seed and leaven then represent the development and spread of the Church upon earth, which no mixture can hinder. Here, it will be observed, an advance is made toward the deeper *internal* truth, thus preparing the way for the three *esoteric* parables, although, in the first place, the reference is still mainly to the external history, as will be found. Each parable belongs to every time; but the first may be referred chiefly to the time of Christ and the apostles (the sowing), the second to the period after the departure of the apostles (when the tares, properly speaking, appear), the third finds a preliminary fulfillment under Constantine, the fourth, in the leavening of the popular life through the influence of the Catholic Church. Thus we have presented here a general survey of the history of the kingdom, as we might truly say (according to Eph. iii. 18), in the *breadth* of the seed scattering itself over the field of the world (fore-shadowed, at least, by the preaching of the apostles), in the *length* of the time of growing till the end of the harvest, in the *height* of imperial power which represents itself (at least outwardly already as heavenly) in the edifice of the Church overshadowing all kingdoms and nations, finally, in the *depth* to which every thing susceptible is penetrated by the new, leavening, and salting life.

But precisely in this depth is implied the truth which belongs to the esoteric doctrine for the disciples, that it is not properly in the Chuch at large as such that the kingdom of heaven forms and completes itself, but in *each individual.* The outward history of the Church, as a whole, is itself again only a type and parable setting forth this truth, as was already hinted at, vers. 32, 33. This is the characteristic distinction of the last three parables

* So, too, Schneckenburger thinks: but we should have to take from Jesus the promise of being a wise teacher, if he had thus *overburdened* the people at once.

whose ground-idea, with special reference to the individual righteous ones who are at a future time to be separated from the rest, is now rather the necessity of *renunciation* and *trial;* this is the true seed for the true harvest in the heart of man. This points at the same time, to a still later period in the history of the Church, when, after the outward spread *over*, and internal mingling *with* kingdoms and peoples, the self-denying struggle and victory of the Church, which is to be proved to be true, is more properly called forth; it points to the second principal period, the character of which is this spiritual development from within, as, in the first, it was the unfolding of the Christian principle. Again, the kingdom of heaven is like—that is as much as to say: Farther on—the nearer it approaches to the harvest and the separation—it will be like. The *treasure* in the field, and the *pearl* are again closely related, and yet different, just as the mustard-seed and the leaven. Both speak of the *renunciation* of every thing else for the one thing (necessary from the first, but, in this future state of things, evermore necessary). The treasure in the field represents it as a thing *hid*, no longer known to the possessor of the field, which, however, by virtue of newly-revealed grace, may be found even by those *who do not seek it;* the pearl, on the other hand, represents it as a thing *precious* beyond every thing else, which is entirely overlooked, and is obtained only by those who *come to know it, and who seek it aright.* In the first parable, therefore, the treasure stands first as a thing present, and then comes the man who *finds it;* the other begins with the merchant who *seeks* pearls. If the Reformation may be taken to denote the turning point of the two periods in the history of the Church before named, then the most striking application would be, that the treasure hid in the field was then found anew, the treasure of the *word*, and, therewith, of the *true Church*, which has its life from and in the word, as Luther found the Bible in the cloister, and in addition to this the mystic theology. In the period of the final falling away, however, which is now near at hand, if we are not already living in it, it will concern true seekers, such at least as are dissatisfied with all the false tinsel wares of the market, and inferior goods, to find out the one true possession that lies ever hid and unknown among all sorts of merchandize, and then—giving up all for it—to buy it.

Finally, the last parable speaks of the separation and *trial* at the end, as was already pre-intimated in the second; it forms, however, at the same time a complete conclusion to the series of parables, and points back again to the beginning. If all the previous figures which followed each other (seed, leaven, treasure, pearl) were not yet developed from each other, we have here at last the transition, for which the way was already prepared by the pearl, from the parables of the shore and the land to the parable of the *sea*. The *sowing*, from which the whole series started, appears here as a catching. Thus the net is again, in the first place, *the preached word*, just as the seed,* but it is the word in so far as it founds a *Church* (the sowing makes a field to be the ground of the sower)—in so far as it unites individuals in a fellowship founded on the word and its effects, although it should be a merely outward fellowship, of which no account is taken at the last. Consequently it is the outward mixed Church itself, for the contents of which the separation draws near. If Christ began with himself as the first true sower, he here comprehends his apostles within his view, in whom he sees all his future fishers of men, and workmen in his kingdom, whose net will bring together fish of every kind until the *angels* make the separation.

Let any one now say whether, in this cursory survey, we have arbitrarily put all this into the seven parables, or whether it proceeds from the Evangelist having of himself brought together and arranged them with a view to this, or whether, which is the only thing that remains conceivable for us, Christ himself did originally speak, at one time, and in this profound connection, *all these things, these parables.*

WHEREFORE IN PARABLES?

(Matt. xiii. 11–17; Mark 11, 12, 21–25; Luke viii. 10, 16–18.)

These statements of Christ to his disciples about his speaking in parables, we think it right to place together, ere we proceed to the uninterrupted exposition of the parables themselves. The question of the disciples (verse 10) plainly shows, that his addressing the people thus publicly and at greater length, without any proper explanation, in nothing but finished parables (ver. 34), was something new and strange to them. The *beginning* of this mode of address denotes, further, a later development of his relations to the people, as, according to Mark xii. 1, at a still later period Christ began to speak also to the Scribes and Pharisees almost solely by parables. The right understanding of what Christ here says to his disciples will show the impossibility of supposing that this significant beginning of the enigmatic mode of address, which was designed as a judgment upon hardened hearers, belongs to an earlier period before the Sermon on the Mount.† "Why speakest thou unto them in

* For in all parables, as Roos observes, Christ ever tells us to look back from the great thing set before us to the *beginning* of it (which, in like manner, goes on re-producing itself, through all times).

† As the excellent and well-meaning Ebrard, after a criticism too hastily completed, carries back to so early a period his otherwise well connected "*Syndesma* G.," which also contains the parables, solely on account of the "calling of Matthew,"

parables?" The *plural* form further implies, that Matthew here inserts proleptically what properly took place after several parables had been spoken, therefore after vers. 24–30. Yet *not after* he had returned to the house (verse 36); for Mark informs us after ver. 2, ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλά, *many things in parables*, had gone before, then at ver. 10, that this esoteric intermediate address took place during a pause, when the people, satisfied for the time with a διδαχῇ, or *teaching*, which they had desired, withdrew, and left him again for awhile *alone* or at rest. (This ἐγένετο καταμόνας of Mark, with which Luke ix. 18 is to be compared, is by no means the same as the ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν of Matthew, for we find in Mark afterwards a twice repeated καὶ ἔλεγεν, vers. 26–30, to which ver. 33 belongs.) This, however, we may yet learn chiefly from Mark, that the μαθηταί who put the question were *not merely the twelve*, but, along with them οἱ περὶ αὐτόν, others, followers who stood near to hear him and were inquiring after salvation; this remark we shall find to be necessary in order not to misunderstand the opposition between the two classes of individuals of whom he speaks. "*Why* speakest thou to the people there without as we have not been accustomed to hear thee, addressing to them no plain word, but speaking of ground, rock, and thorns, and such like things, of which we can see well enough that they are *parables*, but nothing further? The people cannot surely understand them, since we as yet understand them quite as little!" To so welcome a question addressed to him in so friendly a spirit Christ willingly replies, and it might be said that the answer which he gives, only develops, properly speaking, the sense of that call which he had just addressed to the people: *He that hath ears to hear let him hear!* (ver. 9), as vers. 16 and 17 show. The leading idea is: Because *they* (*i.e.*, the greater number at least) have no longer hearing ears and understanding hearts to receive the plain and open word, therefore I hide it from them, *if haply they might thus be stirred up to give heed to it;* consequently, to awaken as much as possible every ear that yet hears, and as a deserved judgment on all who are thus dismissed!* Christ must certainly, for a considerable time, have spoken in such a directly instructive manner, enlivened indeed with מְשָׁלִים, or *parables*, but still for the most part plainly as we find in the Sermon on the Mount, before he could pronounce such a judicial sentence as we find here upon the unsusceptible multitude, and could turn to parables because of their deaf ears.

Verse 11. *The mysteries of the kingdom of heaven* (for which only Mark less precisely has —The mystery)—fit title and most general explanation of *all* the parables of Christ, and especially of those now before us. The kingdom of heaven is itself a mystery for the natural earthly understanding, and, like earthly kingdoms, it has its *state secrets* which cannot, and ought not, be cast before every one. When, on a frank and friendly approach being made, no feeling of loyalty shows itself, but rather a threatening of rebellion (and such on the whole had evidently now come to be the state of the people since the preaching of the Baptist, and such addresses of Christ as we find in the Sermon on the Mount), then it is wise and reasonable to draw a vail, which, however, is willingly removed whenever any faithful one wishes to join himself more nearly to the King. Here belongs the citation of Matt. ver. 35, the word of *the Lord* by the *prophet* Asaph (2 Chron. xxix. 30) in the 78th Psalm. It is altogether wrong, as even Matthew shows by his *formula citandi*, to say that Asaph himself in that place speaks in his own person; the עַמִּי and תּוֹרָתִי, *my people and my law*, alike strongly testify against this; comp. ver. 5, and in the other Psalms of Asaph, l. 7, lxxxi. 9, 12, 14. God himself, by the prophet, explains the events which belonged to the history of his people as an unwritten תּוֹרָה, or *law*, and their נִפְלָאוֹת, or *wonderful acts* as *parables* and *enigmas*. Matthew, then, with the deepest insight will here show that Christ now spoke to the people not otherwise than he had done from the beginning, that the language of God the king of Israel remained the same even after this manifestation in the flesh.† The κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, *things hidden from the foundation of the world* (חִידוֹת מִנֵּי קֶדֶם), are the secrets of his eternal counsel, already express-

which *must*, he says, have taken place *before* the Sermon on the Mount. Here there is one internal reason against another, nay more than one against this single reason, and (as has been said at Matt. ix. 9), we can much more easily imagine another sense for that conclusive call, "Follow me!" than comprehend how Christ, in the severe address given in chap. xiii., could, even at the beginning, declare that the people were deaf, and then, notwithstanding, could address to them the Sermon on the Mount. A new proof, that without the most thorough exegesis of the discourses of Christ, the *harmony* must ever be liable to errors. Could then the enmity and impudence of the Pharisees have already been developed even to the extent of charging Christ with being in league with Beelzebub, before the Sermon on the Mount, or rather, could this latter have been spoken at so late a period, certainly in contradiction to its entire nature and significance? Alford, too, says quite rightly: The natural succession of things is against those who, as Ebrard, would place all this before the Sermon on the Mount.

* Both are meant in and with each other. Roos well says. This condescension to which the Saviour was, as it were, constrained to stoop, was mingled with his holy anger. Again Von Gerlach: "A parable is like the pillar of cloud and fire, which turned the dark side to the Egyptians, the bright side to the people of the covenant; it is like a shell which keeps the precious kernel as well *for* the diligent as *from* the indolent."

†This more at large in my "Seventy selected Psalms," i. p. 104, and following.

ed by the Creator in the sign-language of nature and the creature; while these divine utterances in parables constitute in Israel a new circle of figures, touching more closely on sin and redemption. Here in the first seven principal parables they are drawn *chiefly* from *nature*, in which the figures are already given as expressions of the hidden truth (not arbitrarily used for this purpose); in his later parables (as already here at the same time) he draws them more and more from Israel's prophetic circle of types, when he opens his mouth as well to reveal as to hide, in figures of inexhaustible meaning, the depths of the plan of his kingdom. The heavenly sowing on earthly ground, the outgoing of all efficacy from the word, the conflict of the eternal will of love with the creature freedom, the thorns of the lost paradise beside and among the new seed, the power and the cunning of the enemy, the patience of the householder till the harvest, on account of which in the long intervening period the evil also can and must grow and ripen, the great proceeding from the small, the secret nature of the transforming power, the seeking and finding on the part of the man, the long mixture previous to the speedy separation at last, the beginning and end, not merely of the Church of Christ, but the end of the world, in which what was not there from the beginning is judged—are not these purely *mysteries* of the kingdom of heaven? And does not Christ declare them by figures in which God, from the creation onwards, has spoken to our ears, in a way as loud as it is secret.

To you it is *given* to *know*, to understand them, inasmuch as you understand my parables. Therefore truly *given* from above, revealed (chap. xi 25; xvi. 17)—but why only to *you?* Because you bring to these mysteries open ears and inquiring hearts. *To them* it is not given, and never can be given, because this is wanting in them (Luke, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς; Mark has the most striking expression, which we willingly take from him as having been spoken by Christ—τοῖς ἔξω). Who are *those without?* (This recurs again in passages such as 1 Cor. v. 12, and more and more sharply defined on to Rev. xxii. 15.) First of all, in reference to the company whom Christ was addressing, they are opposed to the οἱ περὶ αὐτόν who were remaining round about him in the ship, or near him addressing questions to him; those, therefore, who now went away because they in the meantime had heard enough, or properly speaking nothing—"hearers by chance and by the by," who hear and yet will not hear. To such people, *every thing* comes the same as in parables (see Mark), for even the direct word is still more dark to them. But not because God keeps back any thing which he will not give, as is distinctly shown in what immediately follows.

Verse 12. A weighty word, as regards which an interpretation is vain, unless the Spirit reveal it to those who are taught by practice and experience. It is the great key to all the ways of God with fallen man, it is the theodicy of his holy love and righteousness as it will show itself in the end when all shall be revealed! God's free and abundant *giving* —but man's *having* as a condition thereof; God's righteous *taking*—but man's *not having* as the reason of this; these are two weighty secrets between God and man. The entire seeming contradiction in the letter, that unto him who hath shall be given, from him that hath not shall be taken away, urges us to a deeper investigation and explanation of the saying. The full development we shall leave to ch. xxv., where Christ himself explains it by a complete parable; thus much we would here observe preliminarily, namely, that the having indicates a receptivity, a faithfulness which receives and keeps. He who has, although he has not from his own strength (for all that can be had, nay each one himself who can have, comes from God), yet in contradistinction to him who has not, he has from a cause and determination within himself, as is shown in the whole of the first parable respecting the ground. He who *will have* and thereby can receive, has so far already what is to be received, for he has the open hand for the gift which is then certainly imparted, the ear for the word, the heart for the healing grace. Further, he who *holds fast*, keeps and *uses* (for only by use can it be kept), for him the gift will increase until he shall have abundantly. There is here no standing still on either side. He who *has not*, who neither will receive and take at the beginning nor use to the end, from him will be taken away *that which he has.* This still sharper contradiction decidedly implies that ὃ ἔχει, *what he hath*, is to be taken ironically.* First of all, as Luke (verse 18) has it: ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν, *what he seemeth to have*—for every ἔχων (one having) who does not keep (κατέχει) is only a δοκῶν ἔχειν (one seeming to have) in a manifold sense. It is an imaginary having, the nothingness of which is to be made manifest by a so-called taking, which yet properly indeed takes nothing from him. It is a having which has become lost through his unfaithfulness (2 John 8). Other references of this comprehensive saying are not excluded, which at last reach even to the entire judicial stripping of the unfaithful one, so that he is left naked and bare even of all that God's long-suffering had still left him as a portion in the meanwhile.

Verse 13. Therefore speak I to them *in parables:* this direct answer to the question of the disciples has hitherto, it is to be regretted, received very generally a one-sided explanation from the *following* ὅτι ("because"), although it must first of all be understood as

* Luther's saying commonly adduced here is well known: "Where the word of God is understood, there it multiplies itself and betters the man; but where it is not understood, there it grows less and hurts the man." We think this, however, not exhaustive enough, inasmuch as it does not depend merely on the *understanding.*

an evident consequence from the *foregoing* ὅτι ("for"), together with all that follows. How has this truth, as earnest as it is friendly, been obscured by the one-sided explanation which has been given to it, as if Christ here speaks to them in parables, *in order that* they may not understand! Only read what the very unjustly slighted Mark, verse 33, says truly by the Holy Ghost: He spake the word to them *as they were able to hear it* (comp. John viii. 43). Does that mean "not understand?" Christ does not merely say in what follows, as will soon appear: "Therefore speak I to them in parables, *because* they do not understand"—nor has he in verse 12 said: "Therefore, *that they may not* understand." Either of these as separated from the other is "in no sense a justifiable idea"—the latter still less so than the former. The truth takes both together, as Christ's word here stands between what precedes and what follows. Does Christ then speak purposely to the wind? Are not parables given to be heard; and, if they may yet possibly be rightly heard, to be understood? Christ does not light his lamp in vain, as he assures us in Mark, vers. 21, 23. To what purpose is it then that he lets it shine until the night comes when none can see to work, and that he so patiently and diligently instructs this people also even to the last?

A parable, as has often been truly said,* has for the hearer, according to his state and the relation in which he stands to it, two sides; it is *concealing and revealing at the same time.* But even its concealing works towards a revealing; inasmuch as it draws after it the truth which is signified, urges it only the more strongly, and precisely "because it is not understood, acts as a spur and provocative to further reflection." Whoever then will no longer be moved by it to ask, seek, find, and understand, in him, and *only* in him, it proves its *depriving*, judging power; for in the case of such their own guilt becomes now fully manifest, that they *would* not hear although they *could.* In this way is Mark iv. 33 to be understood, and thus does the parabolic address come with a final sifting efficacy among the multitude, to awaken and save every one who is yet capable of hearing and willing to hear, but to leave, or rather entirely to deliver over to righteous punishment, the wilfully deaf.

In parables (or proverbs, ἐν παροιμίαις, John xvi. 26, 29, which is almost the same, comp. Ezek. xx. 49), *i.e.*, as much as to say in a manner *unintelligible*, and indeed, where it is not fables like those of Æsop which speak of natural things concerning beasts and men, but eternal wisdom that gives form to its נִפְלָאוֹת, (wonderful things), and therein expresses the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven—the secrets of its eternal counsel from the beginning—the *understanding* of their meaning is a thing not so hastily or slightly to be spoken of. Still (and this is the other side), the eternal wisdom of love speaks in this way more intelligibly, more loudly, more openly of its secrets than ever an Æsop of the west, or a proverb maker of the east, was able to do. "The profoundest wisdom of nature, the world, and man (more correctly, the revealing wisdom of God himself), is connected with the simplest, nearest, most memorable figure. For the stubborn and the frivolous, this is still the only language which in a happy moment can soften and awaken them. After they have once heard it as a parable, the figure sticks to them, the mirror is ever turned towards them, and they cannot but look into it at some time or other" (Häfeli). "If Christ would not speak to the wind, he must needs break up the truth into parts—separate it into such instances, harsh to our ear and moral feeling, in which abstraction must make use of all its hermeneutical magic power to drive it back from the *nearness* where it causes us so much uneasiness, to the remote wilderness, amid the mist-light of generality" (Kleuker). What experience proves* in our day among the ὄχλοις or multitudes of the Church, cannot have been otherwise in the time of Christ; thus to understand the conduct and words of Christ, cannot be characterized as the arbitrary interpretation of a commentator. *Therefore*, speak I to them in parables; that to every one who still has anything, may yet be given; and then that from him who has not, may be taken away. To which *second* idea Christ *now* carries out his answer.

Verses 13—15. After having first given a direct declaration concerning the present obduracy of the people (which, however, is also to be found in the prophets: Jer. v. 21; Ezek. xii. 2—in the latter passage, it is expressly said immediately before כִּי בֵּית מְרִי הֵם, "for they are a rebellious house") Christ quotes at large the prophecy of Isaiah; the same with which John (chap. xii.) must needs close his account of the public testimony and labors of Christ, and Luke, in the Acts of the Apostles, his account of the apostolic testimony to Israel—the same as we find in the Epistle to the Romans still abiding upon them, as it was already announced at the first in Deut. xxix. 4. Ἀναπληροῦται, "*is fulfilled*," at all events intensifies the signification of the simple verb; although it does not precisely mean (as generally in Greek) *again*, or once more fulfilled, it yet means *entirely* fulfilled, now attains its entire truth; that which was already meant in the *prophecy* as such, is now first fulfilled, although it had also its fulfillment at that time in the contemporaries of the prophet (comp. this emphatic use of the word in Thess. ii. 16).

The first six chapters of Isaiah form an introductory ground-work to the whole book, consisting of three parts: Chap i., in imme-

* For example, in Bacon (*De Augm. Scient.* ii. 13): Est autem usus ambigui atque ad contraria adhibetur. Facit enim ad involucrum, facit etiam ad illustrationem.

* Although many preachers practice, as much as in them lies, the putting back of the near truth into the mist of generality, here meant by Kleuker.

diate connection with the time present, begins with the prophet's contemporaries, who were to be chastised, as it were to show the foundation upon which the entire structure of the discourses that point to the distant future is raised. Chap. ii.—v. bring forward, by way of contrast, Israel's calling and destiny, which stands in the remotest prospect, in order again to come down from this elevation to rebuke the people now fallen away of themselves (chap. ii. 5), and to show the grace which is for the righteous; here, as it were, the two extreme points are laid down between which the prophecy is to move. Here already the future Messiah announces himself by the significant name, which entirely corresponds to the circle of ideas used by Christ in the parables: צֶמַח, *sprout*, shoot of a preserved and renewed planting of the Lord, from which at last is to proceed a glorious *fruit of the earth* (chap. iv. 2). Israel is represented in a *parable* as at present *the unfruitful vineyard* of the Lord. In chap. vi., finally, there is added the sending and instruction of the prophet, who, in his own time, finds no hearing, but who is still to prophesy for the future, because under the general corruption *a holy seed* (ver. 13) remains hid and preserved. In the original text, we find nothing but imperatives addressed to the prophet, as before to the people. Whilst he threateningly announces to them: "Hear ye, and understand not!" he is himself to harden their heart, to blunt their ears, to close up their eyes. How such language, which still retains its truth, is to be rightly understood, the whole Scripture shows us; the imperative is the sharpest form of the threatening future, the prophecy calls forth into manifestation the existing obdurateness, which is to develop itself through their own guilt in regard to the word: Thou shalt speak to them in vain, preach them entirely deaf; at the same time equivalent to—Thou shalt predict their obduracy; according to the form of expression occurring, for example, at Jer. i. 10. Let it not be overlooked, that these deaf and blind ones are the same to whom healing and salvation is afterwards announced (chap. xxix. 9–12, 18, 19, xxxv. 5, xlii. 7), to which, indeed, Christ himself referred in Matt. xi. 5. Christ is, therefore, truly come *to heal them*, as Isaiah also, in his time, spoke from the grace of God in a sincere yet friendly manner to the people. But what was then manifest, receives now a more complete fulfillment; the Gospel of Christ, too, proves at first to them only an occasion of greater hardening (John ix. 39), and the true salvation also of Israel according to the flesh which is there promised, is thereby put forward to the distant times of a second future. All this in Isaiah, as a whole, partly typified in the prophet himself, partly predicted for the future of Christ; therefore, in Matt. xv. 7–9, a similar word is taken from the same connection Isa. xxix. 9–13).

The Septuagint with which the citation here literally corresponds (as also the Chaldee, at least at the beginning), renders the imperative by a more intelligible future; and Kimchi expressly observes that the imperative is in that passage put for the future. Observe, now, the correspondence: not *comprehend* or understand, although they hear; not *apprehend*, discern, or see into, although they see. Observe the further order and progress of the expression, which very significantly goes out first from the *heart* to the ears and eyes, in order to return again through the eyes and ears to the heart.* For according to the state of the heart, the ear hears; and just as one has heard, so he sees; an intelligent insight results from an intelligent hearing of the word. The way back must now be the same, namely, that the preaching which, by means of parables, is set with special distinctness before the *eyes*, should again awake the hearing ear; and thus the access to the heart is opened for the right understanding of it. But the *heart* is and remains the decisive thing, all is properly only one sense, that of the heart; they *perceive not with the heart*, they are not converted that they might be saved! The ἰάσωμαι, *I should heal*, of the Sept. corresponds exactly to the Heb. וּרְפָא לוֹ, of which we find in Mark the true interpretation: *And their sins should be forgiven them* (as the Chaldaic וְיִשְׁתְּבֵק לְהוֹן, Kimchi וְרִפּוּאַת הַנֶּפֶשׁ וְהִיא הַסְּלִיחָה). This fearful consequence introduced by the μήποτε, *lest*, has certainly (to speak with Pfenninger), a half-ironical force "They feared evil, when they heard that I would save them!" But on this very account the ground of such μήποτε is taken away from Christ, who still ever *speaks* to the deaf; and is laid in their not hearing, in their not perceiving, in their hearts, which will not be converted. Nothing is clearer than this, and the true light is thus thrown on the ἵνα, *that*, which has been obscured by the predestinarians (and which Mark, ver. 12, and Luke, ver. 10, put by contraction for the ὅτι in Matt. ver. 11). Philological controversy, which would make it a mere ἐκβατικόν (*ecbatic*), is of no avail, and certainly does not quite meet the true sense; for it is by all means the *purpose* of God, that in his grace, the fruitlessness of which he knew beforehand, man's guilt and destruction should manifest and develop itself; this remains the *judicial* element in that blindness which, otherwise in the word of truth where are no empty phrases, could never be traced back to God.

---

* Ἐπαχύνθη, the Hebr. הַשְׁמֵן, which indicates a hardening of the heart, specially induced by the fat of prosperity and pride (Deut. xxxii. 15). Βαρέως ἤκουσαν, Hebr. הַכְבֵּד, as also βαρήκοος, *surdaster*, occurs. Ἐκάμμυσαν, Hebr. properly הָשַׁע, of the smearing of the eyes, here including both sleepiness and short-sightedness, our *blinking*. Expressions, therefore, all of which indicate a *not yet entire* deadness in the power of the sense.

Once more the sum is this: Christ preaches here to the last as the apostles in like manner did, in all patience and long-suffering, above all in *order that* whoever has ears may yet hear, ver. 9. But, because the ears which they have they yet have not, or do not use, as he well knew, he speaks with the second and secondary purpose, that their not knowing may be judged as not willing.

Verses 16, 17. Christ here turns a look of consolation upon his dear disciples, as before at chap. xi. 25; hence, at a later period, in Luke x. 21–24, Christ, connecting together both addresses, repeats them. It remains true, that the Lord makes the hearing ear and the seeing eye (Prov. xx. 12); therefore it is *given* to the disciples. But only because they *have*, as was also said before. All the prophets too longed for the coming of Christ, of whom they testified (1 Pet. i. 10–12); and so was it with all those who, in past times, were righteous by faith, whose believing expectation and hope pointed to him who was now come (John viii. 56; Heb. xi. 13, 16, 39). In the simplest parable from the mouth of Christ there is more than in all the former words of God, which the prophets themselves could declare, for it is immediately added: *Hear* ye now the parable of the sower! Hear *ye* who have inquiring hearts, hear it aright—with repeated emphasis on this word "hear," whose decisive significance between God and man pervades the whole of the first parables.

Mark, vers. 21–25, and Luke, vers 16–18, give the additional information that Christ, further, after explaining the first parable to the disciples, said again what he had already said in the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. v. 15 (with which then both Evangelists connect the foregoing proverbial saying in Matt. ver. 12). The first saying concerning the light, in particular, seems, as was very natural, to have been often repeated by Christ, as in Luke xi. 33 we found it addressed to the people *shortly before*, just as now to the disciples. As the sower sows the seed that it may shoot forth, so the light *comes* into the world, as a lamp is brought into a room (such an analogy lies certainly in the word ἔρχεται in Mark), that it may give light; where it seems to hide and obscure itself, this certainly is not its proper office. At the same time, the words are still more closely applicable to the listening disciples: Think not that the *mysteries* of the kingdom of heaven, of which I spoke, are committed to you to be kept secret; you twelve know and should remember, that I send you to speak in the light that which you now receive secretly, to preach afterwards on the house-tops what you now hear in the ear! (Matt. x. 26, 27). Observe how significant, precisely here, is this referring the disciples back to the first word which was declared before all the people to be the kindled light, and how, afterwards at the first sending out of the disciples, the word which foretells the growing publicity of their preaching again recurs to this (Matt. x. 26). This prediction finds its fulfillment also with special reference to the parables, in so far as they become ever more clear as the history of the world and the Church progresses.

When in Mark and Luke we find, further, the charge addressed to the disciples, *Take heed what* (or *how*) *ye hear*—this is only to be taken as another application of the general call: He who has ears to hear, let him hear! But it is sharpened in its form, with special reference to the disciples who have eyes and ears; their *seeing* is to be a more careful looking to themselves also *after* hearing, while the people have not even the first seeing *in order to* hearing. Finally, Mark, ver. 24 is, in like manner, a repetition in another form of what is said in the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. vii. 2, and serves thus to the full understanding of ver. 25. (From which it necessarily follows that προστεθήσεται can only be equivalent to δοθήσεται, μετρηθήσεται, and is by no means to be understood with many, as Alford: More will be expected of you hearers of the mysteries of God, greater demands will be made of you.) For the rest, it is equally impossible and unnecessary for us to show how the manifold interpretations of a like kind related to the *ipsissima verba* of Christ; we remain satisfied in so far as there is no contradiction on the supposition of a substantially correct account, and not allowing ourselves to be misled by discrepancies that may be pointed out, we perceive throughout the same spirit and sense in the fluctuating letter. This is the only true result to which we must return, after all our criticism and learning—at one with the reading and hearing Church of the faithful. If any one can make out something better without injury to the faith which keeps fast hold of the word, without disturbing the simplicity which understands it—I have at least not found such in the libraries and book markets.

THE SEED IN THE DIFFERENT SORTS OF GROUND.

(Matt. xiii. 3–9, 18–23; Mark iv. 3–9, 13–20; Luke viii. 5–8, 11–15).

The parables of Christ can never be characterized as "loose and jejune," and their figures are never "obscure" (*Evang. K. Z.* 1833, No. 14). Each single parable cannot, indeed, say every thing, but must be supplemented by others; this, however, is even less true of the parabolic than of the proper form of address, because the picture-words of God in the creation and in the relations of man's history, are more full and expressive than the logically-divided words which result from human thinking. It belongs to us humbly to follow the divine truth imprinted on the figure, and rather, by due reflection, to let the particulars evolve themselves than by a too hasty interpretation to go beyond them. It is to be regretted that most preachers treat this parable of the sower in particular in such a manner, that only the general principal truth

respecting the good and bad ground remains, while the three kinds of bad ground are not clearly distinguished from each other. We will endeavor to avoid such confusion as shortly and clearly as possible.

In the midst of, and after the intensest zeal in indefatigably speaking the word of God, which only a few hear and keep, Christ here, as it were, composes his own soul, so as to take the most quiet and reflective view of the state of the case. This opens to us, at the same time, a view into the first fundamental mystery of the kingdom of heaven—the *co-operation* of divine efficacious grace with the exercise of the human will in faith or unbelief, faithfulness or unfaithfulness, *upon which its effect depends.* So long as fruit grows from seed, even to the last day, and the seed needs a soil in order to its springing and growing, so long must this be the most appropriate figure within the whole sphere of nature for such a coincidence and correspondence, according to which the fruit comes not from the earth without the seed, but only from the seed, and again the seed can not prosper and grow without the favor and will of the soil. Hence, in general, such a figure has been used at all times, to represent spiritual labor on the heart of men and its effect.

Christ, however, gives us the innermost truth when in the explanation (in Luke) he begins by saying: *The seed is the word of God, i. e.*, also conversely: The word of God is *a seed.* The word of man is also sown in many ways in the hearts of men, so that the wonderful power and efficacy of the *word* is thereby made manifest; that, however, which comes to man and works in him, in the most wonderful and independent manner, is *the word* in the highest sense (Mark verse 14), which the heavenly Sower sows, the word of *God.* Once only at the first creation did the earth bear grass, herbs, and trees, which had their seed in themselves, spontaneously without previous sowing, for then the creative word was itself the seed; since then, however, nothing grows unless seed be first put into the earth. Thus does the word of God which now is not in man, nor proceeds from him, come to him from without, and from above, as, by another application of the figure, the fructifying rain and snow from heaven (Isa. lv. 10, 11). Here, indeed, the written word is not excluded, yet it is the *preached* word that is principally meant, the written word only in so far as it is preached, or preaches and sows itself. In the word which proceeds from the mouth of God, although communicated through the mouth of man (ῥῆμα θεοῦ, Rom. x. 17), is a *power of God* (Rom. i. 16), a living, generative, and forming principle, as in every seed-corn, which therefore (to speak with Luther) no one can thoroughly sift, which bids defiance to all the learned. The word of God is also called a meat, which, however, gives life anew, and does not merely sustain and nourish what is already there, which does not assimilate itself to the form and condition of man, but rather transmutes him into its own new form, as the wonderful principle of the seed transforms the soil and its sap into the plant according to the kind of seed. It is the incorruptible seed of regeneration (1 Pet. i. 23), as ἔμφυτος λόγος, *the ingrafted word* (James i. 21). Even the smallest word and saying which comes to us from the *word of God* in the widest sense (Rom. x. 18, in the sense of Psa. xix), preached in all the world, nay, even speaking silently and yet loudly in all nature—is such a living, powerful *seed.* Christ, however, although not excluding this, yet here means and names principally the finished revelation and sum of all the divine word to man, *the word of the kingdom* (Matt. verse 19), which he sows and preaches, first of all in his own person, and then by his messengers and sowers.

Now, some have thought, that in the sower there is an intended contrast between the ordinary truth of the figure and the application of it here made, inasmuch as the sower here is a quite uncommon one; for he scatters his seed wastefully every where around, even in those places where nothing can grow—conduct which would be foolish in any other husbandman. This, however, is not right, and is an unprofitable refinement of criticism, going beyond the limits of the figure, which is quite simple and complete in itself. The parable speaks of the sower (Matt. verse 18, comp. verse 3, ὁ σπείρων), who just acts according to his office and work: *he goes forth to sow, he sows the word* (Mark verse 14). Thus did Christ pass through the whole land with his preaching, thus will he have his Gospel preached to every creature, thus are the servants of the word to leave nothing unsown, even no path, and no stone, for the field of God is by right the whole world. God will maintain his right to it, gain it again to himself, or, at least, testify to its being his: He does not even acknowledge the right of any other to the way beside the fields—as the diligent husbandman at least tries every year anew to gain the reclaimable footpath on the border or in the middle of his field; he knows well the stony ground, but he works it also before and with the seed (as we shall afterwards see): he will, at all events, sow every where for *a testimony* that he does not let the land want, that to him it properly belongs. The first great fundamental idea of the parable then is: God on his part sows diligently, always, and every where; *all* must at least *hear* the word, though it should be, in the case of many, against their will and without effect. And where fruit is not brought forth, the fault lies with the ground; it was sown also just that this might be evident.

Christ here comprises in three principal classes, one might almost say, really all the thousandfold kinds and mixtures of the soil that yield no fruit unto the harvest, which are therefore all the more carefully to be distinguished from each other. But here, it is to be regretted, the mass of preachers fall into much confusion, or, when they aim at strictly distin-

guishing, into many mistakes. When we look at the words, there *appears* at first sight to be a gradual ascent from the worst to the less bad, so that the truly good ground is at last connected with that which is least bad: first, there is no reception of the seed at all, then a shallow reception and a short growth, then there is even a complete taking root and a larger growth, not yet reaching, however, to maturity. Let us look more closely at the particulars, in order to see whether this first understanding of the words approves itself as the only correct one.

Some seed falls παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, *by the way side* (as all the three Evangelists agree in saying), *i. e.*, certainly not on the country roads and highways themselves, but in their neighborhood; the sense, however, plainly is, that this margin of the field has been wrongfully made to be part of the way, and *trodden hard* like it, so that the seed only remains lying on the surface, and is given up to destruction. If the field, which its owner and sower, nevertheless, does not yield up, comprehends the whole human world, then the road which lies beyond it, and upon which really no seed is to be cast, would be Satan's kingdom and province, or the sphere of the altogether outward natural life, for which there is no word of God at all, no seed that could spring up in it. And both are true, for viewed in reference to the human hearts lying upon its boundary, or which have already become almost such a way, it is really one and the same thing: Satan has his way and his kingdom in which the spirit has become altogether sensual, sunk into the lower sphere of the creature. Many and various are the things which have power to make the hearts of men so hard, among which, at the present time, "the freight-wagons of *business*" are not to be forgotten. These, then, are such as hear indeed with the outward ear, but no longer *perceive or understand* with the heart; who first of all live entirely *unsusceptible* in the earthly and outward, their heart a thoroughfare for thoughts and devices drawn from a sphere which has nothing in common with the truth and power of life in God's word—the *indifferent* (not merely those sunk in vice and wickedness), whose way is never to feel repentance, or to look at any thing in themselves that might awaken such a feeling, who offer to the seed no soft place into which it might penetrate, or where it might be covered. They are so when the seed is scattered, when they are brought into contact with it; more than this Christ will not say here, although we may justly suppose further, how from youth upwards, or at a later period, they may have become so by their own and others' fault. This, in its own time, God will find out and judge; he will certainly act unrighteously to no one, but yet will not overlook the secret beginnings in which the soul thus surrendered itself, and threw itself away upon vanity. Enough, that of the judgment nothing is now said in the parable, but only of the fact: *Grace* works superabundantly. Although there were no susceptible ground, *still* the sower sows the word even upon it; and is such a one truly described as ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπαρείς, *i. e.*, at least *sown upon*, as it might be translated? No, the expression has a deeper reference, and finds its justification in this, that the man properly so-called, the person himself (as he will or ought to become), is conceived of as the plant already present in the seed as *sown**—there being here an anticipation of the second parable. Christ speaks even of an ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, "sown *in the heart*"—for where there is a man there also, although it may seem quite otherwise, is still a heart and conscience, a possibility that the seed may penetrate, however hardened he may be, a *beginning* of the new growth wherever seed lies, although it may be ever checked and arrested. That which is heard, although it be not understood, yet lies on the surface, in the memory, and might still penetrate farther were favorable rain to follow the sowing—*if there were not one* who acts contrary to the good Sower. It is not a merely human and natural result, then, if the seed cannot at all spring up. *Wherever* such seed lies thus,† the *evil one* comes (Mark, *Satan;* Luke, *the devil*, so that we can make no mistake as to who is spoken of), the counter-worker of the Sower, from *his* kingdom and province, whose evil counsel and will against God's counsel of grace, which overlooks no one, is declared in these terms: *That they believe not, and be saved!* So it is now; where the Creator works, the destroyer always follows—still more, where the Restorer begins, the enemy hinders and resists. He is never more busy than in those places where God has just sowed, he always follows (εἶτα, Luke) and comes (εὐθέως, Mark) wherever he can come, to destroy the good seed. He comes, however, not precisely in his own person, but the devouring *birds* are his power and his host. He is the spirit that rules in the air and fills the atmosphere, in which those live who walk after the course of this world. Christ here, certainly with design, makes use of the birds of *heaven* (as is added in Luke, and perhaps also in Mark) as an emblem of the manifold means and instruments, all of which serve the evil one in order to the taking away of the word. The little animals appear harmless, and yet, as regards the excellent, truly heavenly seed, they are mere birds of prey (Matt. ἁρπάζει equivalent to αἴρει, Mark and Luke)—the

* Alford quite truly: "The seed sown becomes the plant; it is therefore the representative, when sown, of the individuals to whom the discourse refers." Lange expresses it: "The history of his life becomes identical with the history of the seed. The fate of God's seed in the man, is the fate of the man himself."

† In Matthew it is placed before by *anacolouthon*: παντὸς ἀκούοντος καὶ μὴ συνιέντος, where such a one is found. In Mark, verse 15, ὅπου is to be construed with what follows, so that the same sense arises.

arch-robber, Satan, lets them fly. They are trifles, but many of them together; and they are powerful, so that every bird carries away its little corn. These are the thoughts, talk, and business of the world, that dissipate the mind, and keep it in an atmosphere of frivolity, preventing all entrance to the heart of what is heard; they are not cares and lusts which come from within out of the heart, for this would be to anticipate the third kind of bad ground. Here there is as yet enough in the hindrances that fly past from without, because the soul lives entirely in this outward sphere. In Luke it is also said beforehand that the seed is *trodden down*, which belongs of course to the designation "on the way-side," so that, on this very account, there follows the assurance that, besides this, destruction comes to the seed *from other quarters*. Christ might perhaps also have said: The wind carries it away, or the like, but he will declare more strongly that the good seed entirely perishes, which could only be expressed by the birds *eating* it up.*

Other seed falls on *stony* ground; not precisely hard and naked rock (for Luke's ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν is to be explained from Matt. and Mark), but on ground which has some earth indeed on the surface, but a rocky bottom further down, as is not uncommon especially in Palestine. This appears to be a little better than the former, yet it, too, is properly no ground for growth, but merely for the first springing for a while. Rock slightly covered with earth is always soonest green, but is soon again decayed; the reason is expressed in a threefold form with one and the same meaning: Because it has not *deep earth*, therefore, also, not *moisture* enough, consequently also, not *root* (Matt. and Mark, already in the parable give all the three, and then again in the explanation), *i.e.*, only root which does not strike deep enough, therefore as good as none. The καυματίζεσθαι, ("being scorched") of the heat of the sun is indispensably necessary to all growth, it properly helps growth in what is good; here, however, the effect is a ξηραίνεσθαι, ("withering away"). These are such as are at first somewhat susceptible, who really receive and understand the word they have heard, but they are shallow and superficial; a little deeper beneath the easily moved, deceptive, false softness of heart, there is the rocky bottom of the hard, proud heart, into which the seed is unable to penetrate even less than in the trodden way (which is here preliminarily to be carefully observed). In order to the efficacy of the seed of the word, the nourishing *sap* must come from our soil, as the oil for the lighted lamp. True, the sap is again nothing but the rain and blessing of heaven, which has before been drunk in by the earth; but this cannot penetrate into the rocky ground. The seed-corn, in order to its successful growth, must send forth, as well upwards as downwards, its germ, extending in a two fold direction from the centre point of the generative principle, nay, must even at first and more strongly take root downwards, than grow upwards. Where it only speedily shoots upwards, it has but a diseased growth, and has no firm hold of the earth. But, on account of the identity which we have already found between the seed sown and the person here considered, it is said also, ver. 21 (Mark, ver. 17; Luke, ver. 17), that these *people* have no root *in themselves;* the not taking root is precisely their own fault and character. He who *quickly with joy* receives the earnest word of truth which judges the principle of the heart and conscience, perceives not at all its serious meaning and difficulty, expends his strength before the time in shallow feeling, in hasty words, instead of receiving it, as he ought, with the calm earnestness that marks a thorough work slowly effected. Then the sun arises (ἀνατέλλει, rises higher at mid-day, or in summer, according to the time of the day or year), and this the weak seed, which has shot up in a way not natural, cannot bear. This, too, is a hindrance *from without*, as in the former kind, yet different from the voracious birds which do not belong to the ground. The sunshine and its heat mean no harm to the seed, but come rather as an ordinance from God to promote the growth, and are even necessary to it. (The ἀνατέλλειν of the sun corresponds to the ἀνατέλλειν of the seed.) *Affliction or persecution* (Luke concisely πειρασμός) comes, indeed, also indirectly, through the men of this world, and from the evil one, yet not in entire opposition to God's counsel and will, but *on account of the word;* it belongs therefore itself to the word, proceeds from it, and corresponds to it in the natural order and progressive development of the kingdom. Nothing ripens without heat, and, in the case of a good root, it must promote, and not hinder the growth. The general designation of a man of the second class is πρόσκαιρος, "for a while," which is not to be rendered either by *inconstant* or *changeable* alone, for the word includes both; what subsists and continues only for a fit or conveinent time, continues only for a while.* Luke's explanation πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύουσιν, *for a while believe;* is also to be read—not merely as 1 Cor. vii. 5—but at the same time as opposed to the unseasonable καιρὸς πειρασμοῦ, *time of temptation*.

The third kind of ground is certainly neither trodden into a path nor stony, therefore the seed takes deep enough root in it, and its growth continues longer and rises higher, shoots up even into the stalk, and seems to put forth ears. Such a man *hears* the word, and that not merely as those of the first class, but really hears it as those of the fourth class·

* It is not indeed the living seed of the word of God in itself that is destroyed, but in so far as it is sown in a heart *as its seed*, the germ of a new man —as he is here considered.

* "Dependent on the time, serving the spirit of the time" (as Lange expresses it), does not lie directly in the expression.

he hears and understands it—for in all the three Evangelists, the antithesis lies properly in the *bringing forth fruit*. But it fails in this, it also does not reach this point: Matt. and Luke ἄκαρπος γίνεται, it *becomes* at last, shows itself in the final issue to be unfruitful, although a quite different appearance really gave promise of fruit; Luke οὐ τελεσφορουσι, they do not bring to the *full* period, an expression also used of pregnancy. Satan then with his devouring host does nothing to this man, he has taken the word to heart with true *apprehension* of it. Nor is he, by any means, hurt by the assault of temptations, and opposition, he has root in himself, through a deeper *experience*, which keeps him from falling away *at once*, when he is offended; he has therefore, on the one hand, a good earnest *will* to bring forth fruit, for how otherwise could the seed grow to such an extent in him? What is it then that injures him? Insincerity in every thing. The indecision of his not yet settled will! On his ground are the *thorns*, or rather, as they do not grow till afterwards, their concealed roots are in it. Here the parable stretches beyond the natural figurative sphere into that of the biblical types, according to which the thistles and thorns of the luxuriant tares, growing spontaneously out of the earth since the first curse (as it were, the serpents and vermin of the ground), represent the state of the natural heart of man, in which sin already dwells and luxuriates (2 Sam. xxiii. 6; Jer. iv. 3). This *other seed* is already there since man was made evil by the evil one; and when any one only allows this to grow up along with the good seed, Satan does not need to sow it anew, and may for a long time see the good seed growing up along with it, conscious all the while of his victory over it. This is Satan's host *within* the heart, more hostile than the birds mentioned before, so that here the circle of the three kinds of ground, where Satan maintains his right and power, completes itself. What creeps more stealthily, or is more difficult to eradicate and more dangerous, than the fibrous roots of *lust* sown from the very first in the heart of man? They *go in* (as Mark has it) between the wheat, *i. e.*, they grow up amongst it (ver. 7, ἀνέβησαν), and *choke* the word, notwithstanding the prosperous increase it has already made. These lusts are denoted by Matt. in a twofold form, as the care of this world and the deceitfulness of riches; which may certainly, first of all, be understood of the poor and the rich, although, on further consideration, it will appear, that the "*desire* to become rich" deceives also the poor, as in like manner riches carry with them their own *cares*. Luke adds to these the ἡδονάς, or *pleasures* in general, and finally Mark αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι, "the lusts *of* (*concerning*) *other things*," in order that we may not understand riches or poverty alone, in the literal sense.*

Πλοῦτος, "*riches*," is in general equivalent to property, possession, enjoyment, any thing whatever that belongs to *the world*, and every where excites *care* as well as *pleasure*. Τοῦ βίου, "of life," equivalent to τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, "of *this* world," belongs probably to all the three ideas. The ἡδοναί, "pleasures," are at the same time mere ἀπάται, "deceitfulness," and *vice versa*; nay even the μέριμνα, "care," is the same *desire* towards what is earthly, represented and disguised as care. (Ἀπάτη and τέρψις are related also in the Greek writers.) All this, however, in itself comes neither from riches nor from poverty, neither from a superfluity of the good things of this life, nor from want, pain or hunger, but only develops itself through such πειρασμός, or "temptation," and is already in the heart and grows *out* of it. Now, those who allow it to grow up *with* the seed of the word, so as at length to destroy it, are the insincere and half-hearted, who do not press on to conquest and decision for what is good, but *go so undecidedly* to work, that for a while, no one knows what will come out of them, whether or not they will yield ripe fruit and a harvest—but at last the want discovers itself!

We are now prepared, after the examination of the three classes, to look more narrowly at their order and connection, so as to get beyond the common interpretation. The *hindrances* to the springing, growing, and ripening *follow each other* according to the time of this threefold development of the seed. The first are people whom the word does not awaken, because its reception, the springing of the seed, has already been hindered; the others are "awakened" people who, however, come to nothing because they have not steadiness and root for growth; the third are even converts, whose santification does not come to maturity, but goes back again. In like manner it might be said, that the first hindrance, viewed generally and as a whole, threatens the period of childhood, which lives for the outer world, and is yet unsusceptible of the higher truth; the second, the period of youth, which is as susceptible as it is inconstant; the third, a still farther advanced age, when the ripening in sanctification depends on the rooting out of indwelling sin. Already, we see, that Christ in his representation goes out indeed from principal classes distinguished from each other by the reception which is given to the word coming or already come to them; by no means, however, in the deeper sense can he mean, that these three classes exclude each other. We must rather say, further, that *the three classes include each other*, so that he who has found himself in the one must soon also find himself in the others, whether he begin with the first of these or with the last. The three figures taken together, supplement each other and correspond properly to the whole man, in

* Not precisely: Desires after what remains (other things), *i. e.*, after this and that (after all sorts of things), but it means: And whatever else there is of this kind.

so far as understanding, feeling, and will receive the word: the first do not *understand* it, although they have heard it and think that they have understood it as any other word, so that it is still present in their memory; the second do not truly *feel* its power inwardly, although they seem to have been exceedingly "affected" by it; with the last there is wanting the pure subjected *will*, notwithstanding their knowledge and experience.* Do we not see, then, that the gradual rise to *something better* is merely apparent, and that the corruption and the resistance of the human heart rather but discovers itself in such progress, in an *ever more aggravated form?* It is altogether superficial to take the first class in the sharpest sense as representing the *hardened*, to whom the discourse cannot apply, inasmuch as the trodden way is not yet a rock. Certainly (and this is what has led to that mistake), the first class corresponds here, first of all to the blind and deaf, who are described in Matt. vers. 13, 15, according to Isa. vi.; but this unsusceptibility is very different from what dogmatic phraseology, and the Scripture also in other places, means by "hardness" in the proper sense. It is a threatening picture for them, still it by no means represents an irremediable state; otherwise Christ would not here seek by parables to open their ears to hear. The first kind of ground represents to us the outward appearance and state of things with the *majority* in all times; this first figure, taken as it were from the surface, further develops itself, however, to the second and third which were already implied in it. The hardness of the human heart is not merely the result of being outwardly trodden upon, it shows itself in a more advanced stage as the internal rocky ground †—and hast thou found that it has gone so far with thee, then will a true self-knowledge soon discover to thee also the crop of thorns. He who has become a way on which the devil's hosts have free scope, is himself to blame for this, although the first treading down of this way was the work of the devil; it is the devil, in like manner, who has made the land rocky within, and has also sown his thorns in it, although, as regards both, it is again the fault of the man *if they continue and do not give place to the word.* The three figures are distinct from each other, in so far as they may be understood to represent the *leading* character, *as manifested*, of different men, stages of life, churches, even nations; and yet they are so far fundamentally one, as there is no single individual who must not in some way or other find himself in all the three. Finally, as there is a *progress* in the manifestation of corruption from the first to the third, so there is also a retrograde movement from the third to the first. If thou lettest the tares grow, will it not soon come to this, that every word which thou hearest anew shall only so superficially impress thee as it does the stony-ground hearers? And being thus inconstant, art thou not become again a trodden way? Or rather, is it not *worse* to receive the word with joy and yet not with earnestness, so as to let it take root, than not to apprehend it at first? Is not the guilt of the third the greatest, and liable to the severest judgment?

What now *the good ground* is, upon which, when God sows at large, *some* seed always falls, and which, as we are here told beforehand, does not fail—we may easily and rightly understand from the threefold antithesis to the bad which is given in the expressions themselves, Mark, verse 8: ἐδίδου καρπόν, "brought forth" (verse 7 καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκε, "yielded no fruit"), and this it does ἀναβαίνοντα, "springing up" (while in the first ground, not even a green crop *sprung up* as the first καρπός or "fruit" of the seed), καὶ αὐξάνοντα, "and increasing" (while this αὐξάνειν was wanting at least in the second). In general, the good ground is first of all *soft* or loose on the surface, then, it is also *deep* or soft below, finally it is *pure*, free from the seed of tares. The pure and good heart, then, is *susceptible* for receiving, *solid* for keeping, *sincere* or decided, self-denying, earnestly persevering in letting the divine seed work within it by that power which ever tends towards fruit. Which triad we find again expressed in Luke, verse 15, in the ἀκούειν, κατέχειν, and ὑπομονή, "hearing," "keeping," and "patience." The first condition is the right *hearing*, that it be really heard, and is denoted by different words, in Matt. συνιέναι, "understand," Mark παραδέχεσθαι, "receive," Luke πιστεύειν, "believe." For, truly to hear the word as God's word, and to *believe* it, is certainly in the first stage one and the same, and is found wherever the heart is soft for such hearing (2 Chron. xxxiv. 26, 27, רַךְ לְבָבְךָ). But, as between hearing and hearing, so at a farther stage between believing and believing, there is still a difference. Luke (verse 13) places, in opposition to the μὴ πιστεύσαντες, *not believing*, verse 12, a real πιστεύουσι, *believe*, of the second kind, but the πιστεύειν or *believing*, must perfect itself in the ὑπομονή or *patience* (which is again placed in opposition to the ἀφίστανται, "fall away").—Let us inquire, now that we are come to the true point: How can a human heart be pure from the bad seed of lusts, and, if it must be so at first, in order to afford good ground for the seed of God, *i. e.*, if it must be already purified, to what purpose, then, is this seed of regeneration?—thus

* One might at the same time say not without a certain truth: The first are, in reference to the word, the phlegmatic, the second the sanguine, the third the choleric and melancholic together. Strangely playing upon the passage, so that the most wonderful consequences may proceed from it, Lange even views it in reference to the four religions of the world: Heathenism, Judaism, Mahommedanism, Christianity. Would that Christendom were the good ground! Missionaries find even heathenism more susceptible.

† As the rock of the sensual, natural man, reaching almost to the surface, as Braune says.

shall we find, at the conclusion of the parable the key to all the questions which it suggests preliminarily as a proposed *enigma*. As the new wine requires new bottles, and finds indeed only old ones, which itself makes new, even so it is with the good heart for the good seed. That newness of the bottles consists precisely in this, that they are made open to receive what is new, the καρδία καλὴ καὶ ἀγαθή, "good and honest heart," needs only from first to last to be a true, honest, upright heart, *then will the seed be efficacious!* There, indeed, where choking thorns come in the way, the similitude from nature is no longer applicable to the mystery of the kingdom of heaven; as a parable it has already reached its limits, where the truth goes beyond the similitude. There is a *miraculous seed* superior indeed to all natural seeds, so powerful that by its growth it can and will choke all thorns. Nay more, it can also break through the rock in striking its root down into the earth, and can make that to be again a field of God which was a way of the prince of this world. This is already the effect of the seed, and it is prepared and accompanied by the rain and the plow. He, then, who humbly and submissively yields himself up to the heavenly Sower, with all his sowing, helping, furthering, efficacy, *becomes* good ground, and brings forth his fruit. And, according to the condition or capacity of the soil, as also according to the faithfulness of the working (his own or another's) he brings forth fruit an *hundred fold* (which according to Gen. xxvi. 12, is the entire blessing of God), *sixty fold*, or *thirty fold*. Again three steps also in the degree of fruitfulness;* which means, however, that the same measure is not required of every one, that it would rather be a mischievous temerity to attempt to increase gain beyond the given talent. Mark reverses the steps in the degree of fruitfulness, while Luke, by mentioning the hundred fold alone, will teach us according to the meaning of the Spirit in such a change of words, that wherever ground brings forth as much fruit as it can, it is reckoned an hundred fold.

Where now is, and whence comes, the good ground? In this first parable it is only declared, in accordance with present experience, that when the entire word of God, the word of the kingdom, comes to men, it is found side by side with the bad; but precisely therewith it suggests the questions which the second parable answers. Will Christ then say, that there are from the first good and bad human hearts? This answer is found in Matt. vii. 11, Mark vii. 21, 22. Where is the rich man whom riches have not more or less deceived, or the poor man whom riches have not allured? Where is a poor man without cares of this life, or a rich man without care and heart-disquiet arising from his possessions? Where, in fine, is a human heart without lusts in it? No where, then, is the good ground natural. The natural, carnal man *receives not* that which is of the Spirit of God (1 Cor. ii. 14). Consequently, even the second and third kind is no longer this natural man as he is, but as grace has already worked and softened him, and has even more or less prepared an entrance for the seed. In the prophet we read (Isaiah xxviii. 24): Doth a plowman plow, or break, or harrow his land always for the sowing—without going on *to sow?* The same holds conversely: Does he sow at once, or only, without first plowing and then harrowing the land? The good land is of God's preparing; his rain softens what is hard trodden, his miraculous plow breaks in pieces the rocks, his plants spring up, choke even the thorns; his heats of affliction promote growth, rather than burn up. Before the Gospel of the kingdom, there went forth the law and the preaching of repentance; along with, and *before*, every true word, his secret, precursive grace works, in order to prepare the τεταγμένους or, "ordained" (Acts xiii. 48), for the preached word. Here the grounds that determine the decision lie much further back, and more concealed, and only come first into manifestation in the conflict of the preached word with the heart.

But, again, in all this there is no *gratia irresistibilis*, no *decretum absolutum*. The man obeys or resists this divine working, under which the progress to what is better or worse is then developed and confirmed. And, even to the last, must the sowing and working of man, spoken of in Gal. vi. 7; Jer. iv. 3; Hos. x. 12, correspond to the sowing of the word on the part of God, in order that what is sown may grow to fruit; thus it goes on even to the harvest, according to the principle laid down in Matt. xiii. 12. Heb. vi. 7, 8 describes the *third* kind of bad land in complete antithesis to the first; it is by no means the first.

Thus our parable teaches not merely the impartial, universal grace of the sower, sowing every where openly, with diligence and zeal, but also in that exceeding patience which does not yet give up the bad land, points further back to the working before and at the sowing. But man is nevertheless all the more to blame should this grace continue for him in vain. What is the *fruit* which the great, good, and patient Husbandman and Sower* will have? Not single fruits or words but a man of God born again by the word, and fitted for every good work. For this reason ὁ σπαρείς, οἱ σπειρόμενοι, σπαρέντες in the explanation given in Matt. and Mark, do not signify merely as is wont to be observed: Land *sown upon* (although in the Greek, σπείρειν ἄρουραν or γῆν, is also said)—but this form already glances over to the following parable, in which the children of the kingdom are them-

* Yet not as Roos, who for once deviates into foreign ideas, and is for interpreting thus: Thirty corns from one corn—this takes place when one faithful soul communicates the word which it believes, and by which it is saved, to *thirty others*, so that they also shall be saved!

* James v. 7 also meant of him—ἕως ἂν λάβῃ to be referred to καρπός. Thus does our ὑπομονή also proceed only from his.

selves entirely the sown and fruitfully grown-up good seed; precisely as Luke (ver. 14) uses *συμπνίγονται*, "are choked," *passively* of men, as at the same time of the fruit.

We hope that this our interpretation in some small measure answers to the word of Christ, which (Mark iv. 13) makes a thorough understanding of this parable to be of high importance: If ye understand not this, how will ye understand all the other parables? It is the enigma to which we consider those that follow, as the key. The question, *Whence?* which is immediately suggested chiefly by the first kind of ground, finds its answer in the second parable. The third parable of the great and high growing mustard seed is parallel with the second kind of ground, in which the *growth* is wanting; the fourth parable of the leaven stands opposite to the third kind of ground, in which there is the want of a purifying *penetration*. The self-denying, all-surrendering, nature of the good heart appears in the fifth and sixth, and the seventh winds up all with the separating judgment.

WHEAT AND TARES.

(Matt. xiii. 24–30, 37–43.)

The varying application of the figures in the different parables, which we noticed already at the commencement, is fitted, generally speaking, to excite the attention to penetrate beyond the figure to the thing itself. But the new application which is here in this second parable given to the "seed," signifies something more than this, and has its truth in the internal connection of these two principal parables which, rightly understood, supplement each other. In the first, we have the *beginning*, how the word, as the seed of regeneration, comes to and into men; in the other, the *progress*, which at the same time first reveals the *internal proper course* of the thing: Men themselves as the birth and fruit proceeding from the word. The new man is, as it were, nothing but the word of God, as Luther or J. Arndt would say. And, indeed as, in the natural figure, the chain which connects fruit and seed ever renews itself, the seed itself being called the fruit in the most proper sense (Isa. lv. 10), so are the children of God really sown again as seed on the field of the world. But who sows this good seed? He alone, the new holy *Son of Man*, whose humanity itself is the noble wheat-corn for all this abundant fruit (John xii. 24; iv. 36). Hence, in the first parable, over which the vail hangs, we may well understand by the sower every one who speaks the word of God, who preaches the Gospel of the kingdom; now, on the contrary, it is declared with emphasis that Christ alone, even when he employs others in the work, is the true sower. For he has the good seed, he is himself the good seed.

Verse 24. *Παρέθηκεν*, *put forth*—laid the parable before them: not precisely as a meal (ver. 52), rather as a kind of instruction, as the solution of an enigma, which, indeed, was itself again mysterious (Acts xvii. 3). *Ὡμοιώθη*, *is like*, although a common expression, yet intimates that the comparison is not made merely by the speaker, but already lies in the figure and the thing. According to the eternal counsel of God, the kingdom of heaven is thus arranged, constituted, predicted in the natural figure. In the dative *ἀνθρώπῳ σπείροντι*, *to a sower*, the whole story stands comprised. *To sow good seed*, in the deeper sense, is God's prerogative; men can merely take care of it in order to its growth, they can never procure and give the first seed of what is good. All good came from God at first in the creation, all renovating good in the evil world comes again from God, but through this Son of Man of Nazareth. Herein lies an answer more than sufficient to that question of Nathaniel. He sows *good*, *i. e.*, at the same time, nothing but good, true, pure, and unmixed seed (see ver. 27, and comp. Lev. xix. 19). On *his* field (purposely *ἐν τῷ*, instead of *εἰς τόν*), according to the right of possession, and this field is *the world*.* Christ could not possibly say any thing else *here* than "*the world*," and all preachers and interpreters who, without reason, substitute "*the Church*" for this, lose thereby a highly important ground feature of the parable. For here is already predicted and comprehended what we read in Matt. xxviii. 19: the great sowing, which was done once indeed as a living groundwork and beginning, was for all nations, in all countries; its effect goes on as a further and further sowing without limits. In no period of the history of the kingdom ought we to understand and explain as his field only what has been already sown; we ought to build no garden-hedge around the "Church," as if it were confined and enclosed within certain countries.† It is true, on the other hand, that it is not the world as the evil world, that is meant, but as the field of the Son of Man which he has sown, and will sow, as his present kingdom on the earth (ver. 41), with which the perfected heavenly kingdom of the Father (ver. 43), stands contrasted, as the *field* yields up its fruit to the *barn*. That the field is not yet the barn—therein lies the great truth which the Donatists of old did not comprehend, and therefore in their controversy perverted the whole parable. When they laid stress upon this, that Christ says "the world" and does not therefore speak of his Church in the world,

---

* Roos thinks that "in this parable, therefore, (where it is said, *his* field), the field is now the principal idea of the whole, just as before, the seed (Luke viii. 5, *his* seed)." But this mistaken idea will hardly admit of being carried out.

† Roos, therefore, is again very wrong when he says: "In the second parable the kingdom of heaven has already a special field, or a place of its own upon earth."

they overlooked blindly enough that Christ, in this phrase, at the same time recognizes no other enclosed Church-field in this world, *but leaves the boundaries open;* consequently, even the mixture, which exists in the "world," must also be understood of the world *in so far as* it continually becomes, and is, his field.*

Verse 25. On the field stands now the sown wheat, *the children of the kingdom*, here in a different sense from chap. viii. 12. There, they are such as were patiently borne with in the outward appearance and calling, who *had* a claim to the kingdom until their being cast out reveals its want of foundation; here they are such as have a true claim and retain it, they are, what they are called, the good seed. They are such as have been made alive by the word of God, bearing its goodness, its truth, its life in themselves. They are those through whose diffusion and fruitfulness the world is to become, and will become, the *kingdom*. Where any such good seed has fallen, and may yet fall, there the King who sows, prepares and vanquishes for himself slowly and patiently this kingdom. The kingdom vanquished and won as a field by sowing! What a word this for destroying all false conceptions of this kingdom! The tares are the children of the *evil one*, for ver. 39 points back to ver. 19; he who sows them is the devil (their father, John viii. 44, as the children of the kingdom have God for their Father, Matt. ver. 43), consequently they are his work (1 John iii. 8), the fruit of his sowing. The devil sows error, lies, wickedness, *offence*, and hindrance against what is good, but this sowing springs up and shows itself in *persons*, who are therefore, themselves also comprehended under the *offences*, ver. 41.

Here Christ certainly means, as the words first of all intimate, a *second sowing* by the evil one, which again comes amongst the wheat† *after* the Son of Man has first sown his good seed in the evil world, after he has sown wheat among the devil's first and every where present tares. For the devil's first sowing, the tares which the enemy has first scattered in every soul to which the word can be preached, stands already on the field of the world; for whence, otherwise, at the first preaching of the word of the kingdom, are those evil hearts which, according to the first parable, it finds? The tares here, in this parable, are then not such as grow besides of themselves on the field of the world, in so far as it is the devil's kingdom, but such as show themselves anew in the kingdom of Christ. These may properly be denoted as a second sowing, coming between the wheat, for the devil has not merely seduced men at first, but is always seducing the whole world, he delays not to come again, especially wherever God with his word of grace has come (ver. 19). He does not tear out the wheat, for this he has neither the power nor the inclination; not the power, because the strength of the good seed from God at first resists him; nor the inclination, because his malice and wickedness rather lead him to choke the wheat by a secretly growing influence, and thus to mar God's sowing. It is his greatest pleasure to sow *between the wheat*, nay (a truth which goes beyond the figure), to put into the wheat the danger and the tendency of again becoming tares,* just as the good sower has torn away his tares from him, and made wheat of them. But—and this is of importance afterwards as regards the answer of the householder—the second sowing is only a continuation, consequence, and manifestation of that precious and initial sowing to which it points back, as also he who in the fulness of time sows as the Son of Man, as the concealed Logos and Mediator through whom all renovation is effected, has already sown from the beginning his good seed as the preparation for his kingdom then coming into manifestation.

While men slept: almost all preachers continually interpret this of an offence and neglect on the part of the appointed watchmen (Isa. lvi. 10), and cannot omit bringing in here also, against the text, their otherwise well-founded castigation of their own order. It is not, indeed, enough to object to this interpretation, that this sleeping is afterwards not explained, for neither is there any interpretation of what is said by the *servants;* in like manner, taken strictly, it is not enough to say that the ἄνθρωποι, "men," in the parable are found altogether apart from the seed, the good and the bad; for the servants are represented in the same way, because the parable does not admit of its being otherwise, although they themselves are also a part of the wheat. But what already is decisive as regards the true meaning of our Lord is this, that it is by no means said: *The servants* slept—these rather show themselves as watching and guarding with all laudable zeal.† So indeed, in that period of the Church to which the parable chiefly points, the *apostles* certainly did not sleep, but watched and were zealous for the purity of the Church.‡ In addition to this, finally, the parallel parable in Mark iv. 27, gives the certain truth, that *men*, indeed, have day and night, that they *must* sleep and

* Hence, on the other hand, Augustine erroneously objected to the Donatists that *world* stands here for *Church*. This alone by no means settles the matter. Rather, because the tares are not to be cleared away from the world that is *to be sown upon*, they must also remain upon it *after it has been sown* (where we properly expect to find them).

† Observe the probably genuine reading ἐπέσπειρεν, Vulg. *supersemmavit*.

* Daub: "The enemy who puts into the wheat the tendency itself to become tares" (*Jud. Ischar.* ii. 7).

† For, with Roos for example, to speak of other servants who came afterwards as more zealous, but too late, so that now the earlier church discipline no longer prospered, is evidently against the text.

‡ Very wrongly, as also contrary even to the progress of prophetical chronology in the parables as *we* find it, Thiersch (12 *Vorlesung*) will date the occurrence later, and now accuse the bishops under the Christian empire of the criminal "*sleep*."

rise again at the proper time; no one in ordinary life (according to which the parable is to be explained) watches his field all night against such wickedness as that here described; consequently, by this feature of the parable nothing else is expressed than *by night* (as Job xxxiii. 15), in darkness and secrecy. This is the way of the evil one in all that he does, just as in the parable the malicious enemy will not sow his tares in day-light, lest the faithful servants should immediately surprise him, and counteract the mischief before it is fully accomplished. Secretly does the enemy put his seed into the Lord's field, reckoning on its springing up at a later period, so that no one observes him but the Lord alone, who indeed knows all; secretly does he *go his way* —in which words the same thing is said—he is contented with his work, and is quite willing to be denied by all who think that there is no devil, or that he has at least done and accomplished nothing more here—until the confusion, alas! discovers itself, and the doubtful "*Whence?*" is no longer to be warded off. Precisely *this* is the signification of that feature in the parable, of which Neander thinks that, being introduced merely to fill up the picture, it has *no* signification.

Verse 26. Seen from a distance and in the infancy of the young vegetation, all seems to be wheat on the field; it is also called so, and the small, concealed, but strong beginnings of the hindrance, the mystery of wickedness which Satan has inserted, in opposition to the equally deep planted mystery of grace, are overlooked even by apostolic eyes without special illumination. This was the form of the Church at its commencement. Soon, however, more than *one* Ananias breaks forth in the midst of those who seemed to have one heart and one soul in Christ; more than *one* Simon among those who believed and were baptized. What the third kind of ground before represented in the case of the individual, was, is here repeated: when the grain shot higher and brought forth fruit, then were seen the tares now much more rapidly out-growing it. Τότε ἐφάνη, then they became manifest, and, by the want of good fruit, or rather by their *bad* fruit, were *known* as a spurious, pernicious after-growth, imitating the form of the wheat. It is not without special reason that Christ has not here again said ἄκανθαι, *thorns*, in general, but ζιζάνια, *tares;* for although both go together, and tares of every kind are not here excluded, he yet brings into prominence the special reference of the tares to the wheat in their worst species. Ζιζάνια signifies what we call *darnel*, also after-wheat, cockle-weed, etc. It is, as Schubert, in his "Natural History" significantly says, the "only *poisonous* grass," the true counterpart to corn in nature, hard to distinguish from wheat. Christ has certainly both these things in his eye, its resemblance to wheat, and its poisonous noxiousness, and it is not without reason that, in the striking change of name, he here penetrates into the physiology of nature. When, however, in the Talmud, where the word is זוֹנִין (instead of זְנִין), coined etymologically from זנה, actual wheat of a degenerate kind is understood by the expression,* this is indeed true in a certain sense, but by no means corresponds to the parable of Christ, in which the genuine is distinguished from the spurious, the fruitful grain from the tares, even from their origin and seed. He here teaches his servants to distinguish what is not from God but from the evil one, although, with false and hypocritical appearance, it stands in the midst of what is good; he even predicts already that with knowing glance they shall be able to detect it when its time comes.† Thus might it be said, at the same time, that the *mixture* in the Church of Christ is not so much any thing new, as rather a *separation* of the mixture already acknowledged to exist in the world; for, inasmuch as the servants of the Lord even now see and lament the mixture in the Church, it may be said that the old and the new tares of the evil one, because they grow among the wheat, have *become manifest.* When the world becomes the Church-field, then its sin will show itself in a different way from what it did before. So is it, and so will it be, just as there is no field or garden upon earth without tares, which must be weeded out: this Christ assures us of, and predicts, up to this point (in the first part of the parable), only as a fact, as in the entire foregoing parable; now, however, he carries the thing farther to the important question and answer.

Verses 27, 28. Is not this a *field* and *thy* field? This is the question which these servants address to this Master, well knowing what and how much they are saying, and presenting thus their question in a form all the more enigmatical, and, so far as regards their own thoughts, unanswerable in contrast to the actual state of things. Where wheat grows there is a field, there a previous sowing has taken place, a sowing of good seed; else, whence comes the good fruit? The wheat then makes the *field*, be it much or little, even though ten times as many tares should stand "among the wheat" (or "upon the field," ver. 36, for this is the same thing). Now the servants farther know so much of their Master, that, in a question which wants and needs no answer, they unconditionally take it for granted that *he* has sown no darnel on his field! They do not imagine, like many, for whom the

---

* When in the times of the flood the earth committed whoredom, seed was sown and the earth brought forth זוֹנִין instead. Hence now the bastard grows among the grain.

† If the literature of the *Apocryphal* and *Gnostic* periods (truly the first ζιζάνια) are now again sought for, so as to cause offence and confusion—this is pure wilfulness. Others rightly set before those who are *candid* precisely this spurious material, in order to a salutary and convincing comparison with the genuine.

perplexing whirl of church-history and heresy-history yields no other result in the end but fearful doubt, that all this must have arisen from the seed not having been quite pure at the beginning. So much the more enigmatically—as the darnel has evidently been carefully sown in abundance—does the unavoidable doubt present itself: Whence has this field these tares? As good servants of the good and wise householder, they do not lose confidence in him, they do not immediately leave his service when they find matters so, but come to him with the *question*, as modest as it is urgent, in which they confess their difficulty. This, now, is indeed the proper question of all questions, the ground-question of the philosophy of all times, relating to the origin of evil, the enigma of sin in God's world. It treats of the tares in the world, which appears as an after-wheat even on the place where Christ has sown, and look all the worse on this account; and this second sowing points plainly enough back to a first sowing of tares in the garden of God. When we find already in the earth the positive "tendency to inculture, to wildness," this is to be regarded as a true type of humanity—which, without a first evil in it, would not be so immediately susceptible of that which destroys the good implanted in it. Inasmuch, then, as the servants inquire first of all only after the origin of the evil in the new planting, their question points also back to the other, concerning the origin of evil in general, and in reality includes it. It is as if Christ here put into the mouths of those who heard the foregoing parable—the question: Has God, then, made human hearts having rocky-ground and thistle-seed in them? In this deeper sense of the question, let us mark and feel the strong earnestness and emphasis of the answer to such a question: *An enemy hath done this.*

Thus does the entire holy Scripture reply to this question, not otherwise, not less and not more. This great answer removes the origin of evil in the human world, as completely from God, as from man, inasmuch as it names the evil one; but further than this, it answers nothing, and we, too, ought to rest satisfied with this. I have sown no tares! Thus testifies the Creator, from whom nothing evil proceeds, and this is already pre-supposed by all servants, who honestly ask, even before they receive the answer. He who, in any way, so speculates as to trace back to God the occasion and ordination of sin, be it in phrases ever so cunningly concealed—has against him God's pure and clear word in the Scripture, as also in the conscience; he makes *Christ* a liar, who not merely in his word, but in his whole person and manifestation, in his entire new sowing of the good seed, is the living, actual protestation of God against all fellowship of his holiness with what is evil. So far from the righteous Father having created it, he sets himself directly against it in his Son, and it is his work to judge it and to eradicate it. But, just as little is the first origin of evil to be ascribed to man, and the kingdom of hell is not on the earth (Wisd. i. 14). All that is evil in man has its root in a deeper, altogether spiritual, kingdom of evil—of evil which is completely so, originally and finally—and is only its sowing and issue. He who so speculates as presumptuously to rob the poor man of his single excuse, which in reality has still a ground of truth: "The serpent deceived me"—let him see well whether he is not going against the Scripture, as well as against the inmost testimony of conscience, and rendering the enigma still more inexplicable by making out flesh and blood itself to be Satan.* No, the householder, in his answer, adheres to what is right. There is an enemy who is *his* enemy (ver. 25), and of whom with a sublime simplicity, he assures his servants who were not able to comprehend his night work: An enemy has done this! In the parable it is properly ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος, *a hostile man*, *i. e.*, here, as opposed to Christ, a hostile being,† although with perfect justice, and with a profound penetration into the sense of the words, Luther taking already into view the interpretation in ver. 39, renders: *The* enemy hath done this! For the householder will thereby tacitly say, at the same time: Vex not yourselves, I know well what you know not, I know my enemy. It is not to be overlooked, how the σπείρων τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα, "*one sowing* the good seed," is followed by the enemy as the ὁ σπείρας τὰ ζιζάνια, "*the one that sowed* the tares," who has *sown* the tares, as now, so also from the beginning. This is as much as to say, Who else, then, is the evil one but this beginner and father of all evil? The sin which exists only in the living, personal will, can have no beginning out of the personal will; its origin must be in a *beginner*. There is then "a kingdom of *conscious* wickedness," out of the human—a point of unity and beginning in a radically evil personality. This, again, is among the things *hid from the foundation of the world*, and this answer is *no* answer. For the householder says nothing further; and if we speculators, less modest than these servants, should begin again to ask, Whence then comes the enemy and the devil? thou hast surely not created him! how, then, has he become the devil? the householder in the parable is silent, and the whole Scripture and revelation is silent at this limit, as also Moses at the very beginning of it in Gen. i. 2, mentions the brooding darkness, and lets the serpent speak in paradise

---

* "The doctrine concerning Satan belongs to the revelations which God hath given to man"—aye, even to those doctrines that are especially kind and comforting. He who denies here, only accuses himself beyond what is due.

† In the Roman law there are punishments against such malice on the part of hostile neighbors. Roberts (*Orient. Illustr.*) speaks of Indian proverbs concerning this; Trench (*on the Parables*), who cites this, mentions a case which occurred in Ireland of a dismissed tenant who acted thus out of revenge.

without a how or whence. The angels may, perhaps, know the when and the outward how, a little more exactly than we children of men could understand it even if any thing were written about it; but the internal How? and Whence? of the fall is most probably just as much hid from them as from us. For sin is just that which is absolutely perverse, it is that which has no ground; how, then, could there be another ground out of it from which it might be explained? The Creator alone, before whom there is no mystery, fathoms the abyss, as he does the hearts, of men (Sir. xlii. 18); hell is naked before him and destruction has no covering (Job xxvi. 6). To the eye of the creature the final judgment and the origin of evil are equally dark abysses In fine, we poor sons of man, to whom this word concerning the devil yet gives some comfort, ought to rest satisfied with this: the tares *are there*, are actually manifest as such—and the good, wise, householder says: They are not from me! *It is an enemy.* When, therefore, that heathen, urging the missionary for information beyond this point, asks, Why does God not slay the devil (as even Kant relates in his *Rel. innerhalb der Gränzen d. blossen Vernunft*, p. 100), it is better to be silent than with affected wisdom to say with Daub (*Jud. Ischar.* ii. 178), "He could only answer—From love to thee." This unsatisfactory answer, however, Daub endeavors to confirm with no small acuteness.*

Verses 28, 29. The servants, with a modesty and contentedness with the answer they had received which might well be imitated by us, proceed no further theoretically, indeed, although *practically* they do. Quite naturally and pardonably, with a zeal, indeed, which is at least more laudable than the vain curiosity that might have inquired further, If thou knowest it why didst thou suffer it? couldst thou not ward off the malice of the enemy, and protect this field? hast thou then, the Master, been at fault, hast thou slept? they rather draw the hasty inference: If the hurtful and scandalous tares are not there with thy will, then wilt thou not that we act as faithful servants and get rid of them where and how we may be able? Who are these *servants*, and what is meant by this *rooting out?* Precisely these two things are omitted in the explanation which is given of the parable, an omission which many a commentator may have greatly regretted. But in the first place, Christ will thereby show that the centre point of the parable by no means lies (as is falsely supposed) in this prohibition to root out the tares, but really and only in the disclosure made in the words: The enemy hath done this! from which follows all that is further said in the way of setting their minds at rest, and the reference to the end of the world. Accordingly, it would have been somewhat superfluous to have said further to the apostles: Ye are these servants. They saw well enough, from the explanation of the rest of the parable, that they were represented by these persons, and would soon perceive this still more clearly when the parable was fulfilled in history. What concerns our practice is made clear to us by practice, if we but give honest heed to Christ's word. The servants are plainly enough the workmen in the employment of their master, whose business it is to take care of the field until the harvest; and although they, at the same time, are a part of the good seed, they are yet represented here as in their official character distinct from the field and belonging to the master.

A short and direct *No* comes from the mouth of Christ in reply to their question; and here (more than formerly in connection with the sower) is the proper place for speaking of an extraordinary husbandry, in which the process is not the same as in the natural. For this is actually the import of the answer—Here the case is quite different, and the thing is not done merely by your thus weeding out the tares; just as it was not *you* who sowed the good seed, and saw the enemy in the night, so neither are *you* the people for making a speedy end to the mischief! True it is, that in ordinary husbandry the weeds are carefully rooted out as much as possible (ver. 40, ὥσπερ συλλέγεται καὶ καίεται, as this is wont to be done), and the servants do not first ask whether they may or ought to do so; but here the master forbids it. Now, that we may rightly understand him, what does he forbid and what does he not forbid?* Above all things it is *not* the rooting out of tares by each individual from his own heart (ver. 22), a duty that is, on the contrary, strongly enjoined, for which we need only refer to Matt. vers. 29, 30. Neither, further, are we to understand as meant a duty equally self-evident, namely, the combatting of all sins and lies (which proceed from the devil) by the good *word of God*, the word of truth—in which Christ himself has laid this down as an unconditional principle in chap. xv. 13.† We are not therefore to

[* This position of the author, respecting the inscrutableness of the origin and final cause of evil, is especially commended to the reader, as being equally sound in philosophy and in theology.—Am Ed.]

* In Tholuck's *Litt. Anzeiger* (1847, Nos. 33, 34), there is a good review of the principal points connected with this question, showing how commentators have at all times taken pains with the answer to this question in its various aspects, and puzzled themselves with impertinencies which they have raised contrary to the parable. But when in that article Stier is classed with those interpreters who have not yet even touched the real difficulty, let it be remembered that the strict interpretation of ζιζάνια, which is there afterwards denoted as the only solution of the difficulty, had already been given precisely so by me, together with many other things, in which I think that I have hit the true sense not less successfully than has been done in that treatise.

† Here Thiersch for example is quite right when he renews the old distinction: The prohibition has respect not to evil *things* (false doctrine and ordi-

look on with open eyes and slack hands when, in broad day, the enemy works mischief and puts hindrances in the way; we are by no means heedlessly and indifferently to let the darnel stand when we see it because it is there, much less are we to call it wheat (Isa. ver. 20). Further, nothing is said here of the office of worldly magistrates whom God has appointed to take vengeance on evil doers, even to the punishment of death, but only of that which the servants of Christ *as such* should or should not do in his Church, in his spiritual husbandry. There is no ground certainly for that distinction between *darnel* and other tares, on which, *e. g.*, Melancthon, Calvin, Bengel, and others lay great stress, as if open and gross sinners who are well known are by all means to be rooted out, but not the "outside Christians," as Wesley expresses it, who cannot be identified; for on the one hand it is taken for granted, that the servants knew well enough what was the after-wheat—and that not merely in the way of *presumption*, as is groundlessly maintained in Tholuck's *Anzeiger*—on the other hand, the explanation of the parable afterwards given includes actual σκανδαλα or "offences" among the tares that are to be allowed to remain. Should it be said (as is there also maintained), that these are only such as have *come to maturity* at the time of the harvest, while their doubtful beginning formerly afforded ground for the prohibition to root them out—we cannot regard this distinction as in accordance either with the text or the thing itself; for assuredly from the very first there existed manifest offences enough, and it was precisely these that drew forth the question of the servants in the parable. Still (without needing to justify this in opposition to the parable) all true Church discipline by the word, the key which looseth and bindeth even to the *putting away of the bad from the Church* (Matt. xviii. 17; 1 Cor. ver. 13), retains its undisputed right; for this is so self-evident that on this very account the parable can contain no special reference to it, and may simply without any danger abide by what it says. The parable moves in quite a different sphere from that of the question concerning Church discipline. The true explanation rather lies in this, that while even the strictest Church discipline reaches only in certain extreme cases to the *temporary* casting out in order to reformation, the question here respects the general removal without more ado of all that is essentially bad, spurious in itself. The householder forbids and will not allow what the servants wish. These would have all the tares removed entirely from the field, from their place among the wheat, from the *kingdom* of Christ (ver. 41). But because the field is the world, that were equivalent to removing the bad out of the world (slaying the heretics), in order that the good may not, on their account, have to leave the world so as to have a pure field of God—and so strange a thing as this, the *impossibility* of which is at the same time self-evident, the servants themselves neither imagine nor wish; for in the original text they really speak neither of weeding nor of rooting out, but of συλλέγειν, "*gathering*;" so that, as appears right to them, every thing may properly be in its own place. They would like to have a pure field of pure wheat; and this to God's wisdom, goodness and justice is impossible. *They do not rightly know themselves what they would have* in their inconsiderate hasty word—and this is the key to the right understanding of it. For—and we speak now beyond the figure, inasmuch as the words themselves truly point beyond the figure—if the servants had gathered the tares, it would have been difficult for them to find out *where* to have put them, seeing that, as servants, they could not condemn; and the everlasting fire is as little in their power and at their command as any other world into which they might, in the meanwhile, deliver over and convey the evil-doers —any other, we say, because their duty is to bring the Gospel to the whole of this world as the field of Christ, but not to transport sinners beyond its limits as bad neighbors.

There is then good ground for the *No.* It duly acknowledges, at the same time, their well-meant, not less laudable than inconsiderate earnestness and zeal; it is given not in the way of rebuke but of friendly instruction; hence, with what immediately follows, it does not remain a mere blunt negative, but takes the form of a confidential, condescending, instructive opening up of the ground and reason of the prohibition. If your clumsy hands were to be applied to the complete weeding out of the world and the Church-field, you would destroy the good with the bad! How? First, because in your shortsightedness you could not enough *distinguish* between them; the full-grown tare, as also the wheat, which has already come to fruit, you might know well enough, but the tender springing of the good seed from *ever successive* sowing (τὸν χόρτον), you might, in your zeal (which would rather do too much than too little, so that you might only make thorough work of it), mistake many a blade of it for tares—just as, on the other hand, many a future darnel would escape your detection.* Then the roots of the enemy's sowing lie so deep that you might not be able to get down to them, and there would be no end to your work, as the tares would always spring up again.† Further, in the

nances to which the Catholic Church shows so much indulgence!) but to persons, to evil *ones*.

* They have shown throughout the entire history of the Church, that they cannot yet perfectly distinguish between the tares and the wheat—the greater the zeal so much the less have they been able!

† Outside the parable, which indeed speaks only of wheat and tares from the first sowing, lies the truth in itself right and important, that the tares also may, under God's patience, yet become wheat. In this does the word of Christ only thus touch the limit of the parable, that we should cherish the fear

third place: Even although you could rightly distinguish every blade, and could get down even to the undermost roots, you would yet, even against your will, pull away and root out the wheat ἅμα αὐτοῖς, *with them*. For the *roots* of the two kinds of plant are as much intertwined with each other in the common earth as the plants on the surface, and even more so. Men in the world are, by the relationships of state, nation, family, and the like, so entwined with each other, and have so grown together, so to speak, that the hand of man must infallibly hurt the good, if at any cost it would entirely separate it from the bad.* So close *between* the wheat has the enemy in his cunning sown his tares, so thoroughly has he penetrated all the relations of men with his mischief, even those in which grace carries on its deep-laid work; but *God's* wisdom (not yours!) will keep watch over the good and the true, preserving the good and judging the evil-doers. Men have therefore to give good heed to that warning: Destroy it not, for there is a blessing in it (Isa. lxv. 8), as also to the apostolical rule: The Lord hath given power to edify, not to destroy (2 Cor. xiii. 10). It is most true, then, that in weeding out the tares (as Hamann says), we should make *slow haste*, lest *summum jus* be perverted into *summa injuria*. Finally, when Zinzendorf, as Schubert informs us, had recourse to the expedient of pulling up and transplanting the *wheat*, this was just the same mistake in another form; in all such Churches and congregations there is felt the necessity of preserving the tares which are ever again rising up among them, at least in the outward appearance and form of the wheat, so that they may be able to say at last: Here we have thoroughly weeded out! And then, with good intent indeed, they account for the growth of the worst tares by bringing the charge of base hypocrisy against such.† In short, the householder carries the point against his servants.

Verse 30. In order completely to set their zeal at rest he kindly says still more to them, gives them an answer which goes beyond their question, and intimates to them in what this state of things, which they are meanwhile to tolerate, will at length issue, after having shown them *whence* it was. They are right in this, that tares are not wheat, and wheat is not tares, and further in this, that both cannot always remain mixed and together. Therefore he says: Leave the matter to me, it will be rightly attended to *in its proper season!* He names both classes, and therefore recognizes only these two classes: the tares, which are in the least degree poisonous, are yet tares, and the humblest blade, with its one or two corns on the short light ear is yet true wheat; the least among the little is still a child of the kingdom, as he who yet bears no fruit is still an evil-doer. The separation will not fail to take place when the evil which has come *amongst* the good in the world, the former and future kingdom of God, will be judged and done away with. But only when this *harvest* comes will be the right time for this; now is the season for necessary development towards maturity. This development is wonderfully attained, just by the intermingling of the good and the bad.* If the evil-doers were all together on one land, what a hell upon earth! Therefore is their power broken, while apparently greater freedom is given to it. But if the good were all together undisturbed by the bad, would it not be desirable? By no means, for they are not yet perfectly good, and would not grow to maturity in righteousness without conflict and temptation, without the practice of faithfulness and love among sinners. Therefore only let both *grow* (Rev. xxii. 11) and grow *together* —which Matthew aptly expresses by the single word συναυξάνεσθαι. The harvest is the *end of the world*, *i. e.*, of this now mixed state and course of the world, τοῦ αἰῶνος; and the true reapers, better qualified and furnished for this than the servants who themselves belong to this *present* world, will be the *angels*, to whom Christ will in due time commit the work which he now forbids his servants to do (Rev. xiv. 15). These angels are just as little figures of speech or parables as the devil is; both are realities by which the parable is explained.† First of all the tares are to be gathered together, so that the righteous may witness with hallelujahs the judgments of God, and all that was right and pure in their former zeal for God's kingdom and glory satisfied; but the condemned are put out like Judas in the night, when the Son of Man is glorified among his own. What *bundles* these will be—many smaller ones in the one great bundle—when those who have sinned together, in particular the seducer and seduced, will now also suffer punishment together, and pain determined by the strictest retributive justice will consummate such fellowship!‡ That they

---

of rooting out *future* wheat along with the tares. Jerome: Monemur, ne cito amputemus fratrem, quia fieri potest, ut ille, qui hodie noxio depravatus est dogmate, cras resipiscat.

* Tares in general twine themselves very firmly above and under the earth. The darnel or cockle-weed, which is found with us among the oats, is moreover very difficult to root out, because it continues in the earth three years.

† What Lange says here is not too sharply paradoxical, that these zealous servants (as Christ, elevated above their strong feeling, sees) would be more dangerous to the wheat than the enemy—nay, that the weeders who are still to be found in the field of wheat are guilty of an offence against the distinct command of Christ.

* Or, as might also be said, of the called and the elect. For "it contradicts all ideas of Church and Christianity to attempt to fix the limits of the Church of the elect and to leave the Church of the called to itself" (Nitzsch, *Prakt. Theol.* i. 197).

† To understand with many (*e. g.* recently Zeller in *Beuggen*) by these angels (as opposed to the devil!) *men* risen from the dead, is an altogether unjustifiable caprice.

‡ It is only an ingenious application with a certain measure of truth, when Zeller remarks on

may be *burned* —as is wont to be done with thorns and thistles and all tares, when any one has cleared a field of these (2 Sam. xxiii. 7). But put *the wheat* into *my* barn—he here reminds the people again of the Baptist's words, concerning *him* who will thoroughly purge his floor and gather *his wheat* into the garner (chap. iii. 12); he thus, at the conclusion, as yet without any explanation, tells all who have ears to hear, who is the householder in this parable. Observe, at the same time, the singular *ἀποθήκην, barn*, which will represent itself temporarily, in the purified Church of the latter time, finally, in the glorified earth.

Verses 41—43. After some brief hints, he reserves for the disciples the more full and proper disclosure of the mighty consummation. First of all he now adds to the *κατακαῦσαι, burn*, of the parable in the repetition at ver. 41 an express *πυρί, in the fire*, in order that having given a distinct meaning to every thing else he may also explain this figurative fire (ch. vi. 30) as the metaphor for another *real* fire, so that in this feature also the figure and the thing almost coincide, although the *πῦρ ἄσβεστον* (unquenchable fire) of the Gehenna is of another kind from our present fire. So much only is certain from the place in which the words occur, that we are not at liberty to say of this *furnace of fire* that it is again a mere figure. It is the real lake of fire (Rev. xix. 20), of which already such passages as Psa. xxi. 10 remotely prophesy; it is by no means merely the expression taken from the furnace into which the grass is cast, or into which oriental despots, such as Nebuchadnezzar, caused criminals to be cast. The wailing and gnashing of teeth (ch. viii. 12; xxii. 13; xxiv. 51) are to be understood in the same real sense, for these tares are not consumed in the eternal fire, else it would not be unquenchable, and they never again become wheat. The Son of Man will send his angels—this points back to the entire import of John i. 51, and forward to all the plain intimations concerning the judgment hereafter given as in Matt. xvi. 27; xxiv. 31; xxv, 31. *Stumbling-blocks* and *evil-doers* we find mentioned together already in Zeph. i. 3 (הַמַּכְשֵׁלוֹת אֶת־הָרְשָׁעִים), and in Job xxxviii. 13 mention is made of the evil doers who shall at some time be shaken out of the earth; passages which Christ has doubtless in mind here. The putting together of these two has for the most part not been rightly understood, inasmuch as the stumbling-blocks are taken to denote either, in the first place, the false teachers and disturbers of the Church (Rom. xvi. 17), or, on the other hand, the idea is supposed to be expressed that every evil-doer and worthless person in the kingdom of God, already by his very existence is a *σκάνδαλον, a stumbling-block* or "offence" (as we have explained at ch. xii. 30). Christ, however, seems to speak here plainly of *things* and *persons:* in such a way, indeed, that the evil-doers themselves again belong to the general conception of things that offend in the kingdom; still, by the latter being placed first, more is said than can be explained of *individual* persons.* For there are offences brought into existence, indeed, by evil-doers, and continuing to live in evil-doers, which have often arisen at an early period, and then remain long, and continue to work their mischievous effects. "Religious and ethical *heresies*," according to the common usage of the phrase, is not comprehensive enough; there are stones of stumbling, evils, corruptions of the most various kinds, as *political*, etc. All these (*πάντα τὰ σκάνδαλα*, so that not one shall be overlooked or left behind) shall then be removed with the judgment of those who have raised them up, or who have fallen upon them, and been broken.

Then remain the righteous, who are matured and perfected in righteousness. What a separation! This takes place, indeed, by virtue of the necessary internal attraction of what is homogenous, as soon as God loses the bonds of the present order of things; but he will also employ his heavenly servants in the doing of this for his own honor and their happiness, as a reward of their faithful services to the children of men, and as a final recompense of their perseverance in righteousness. Then it will be seen that it was no punishment or injury to the wheat to stand among the tares, but rather that it has been thereby ripened for the garner. Then will the righteous who, hitherto, have borne the light of God within them or have been obscured from without, *shine forth*, from this concealment (*ἐκλάμψουσιν;* as in Wis. iii. 7, *ἀναλάμψουσιν*, and Dan. xii. 3, Cod. Alex. also *ἐκλάμψουσιν*). This is the simple sense of the word, and it contains no answer to the foolish question of Origen, the father of those who hold a final restoration: "For whom will they shine but for those who are below, who are to become partakers of their light as the sun gives them light upon earth? For they will surely not shine for themselves." They will shine in and for God's glory, just as the sun now shines before it appears, and where it does not appear to men. *As the sun:* this is an explanation of Daniel's splendor of the heavens (צֹהַר הָרָקִיעַ), which means Christ the sun of righteousness, whom all his righteous ones shall resemble in glory; but at the same time, and first of all, it is to be understood also physically, accord-

these *bundles*, how the ecclesiastical, political, social tares, driven by the tendency to association, will more and more separate themselves from the ground of the Church, and unite in all sorts of societies, sects, clubs, etc. (as already Cocceius brought forward something similar in his, in other respects, very strange "Prophetico-historical Interpretation"). The bundles in the text are bound by the angels evidently only at the end of the world—the associations of sinners formed already beforehand of themselves, only prefigure and pioneer the way for these.

* To go back to the figure, as it were the stones (of offence) and the tares.

ing to what we find more particularly stated in 1 Cor. xv. 40, 41. In *their Father's* kingdom: that is the highest and last, whereas the kingdom of heaven hitherto upon earth is called only *his*—the Son of Man's; for it extends to the time when the Son shall give over the kingdom to the Father. It means: They shall be called *children of God* (chap. v. 9, as the others of the evil one), and God shall honor them as a Father as highly as he can—"glory in them as a rich father in his well-trained children" (Val. Herberger). And at the conclusion of the *explanation* Christ adds for the disciples, as before at the first parables for the people, the awakening call: Who hath ears to hear, let him hear!

PARABLES OF THE MUSTARD SEED AND THE LEAVEN.

(Matt. xiii. 31–33; Mark iv. 30–32; Luke xiii. 18–21.)

Grow till the harvest! The parable that follows is connected with this conclusion of the foregoing, and contains first of all the prophecy that the small and imperceptible seed would yet grow to something great, that from the present sowing of the husbandman and householder (and the people must have in part perceived who was thereby meant), which had to encounter so much opposition and hindrance, there would spring up in due season a heavenly *kingdom* upon earth, as well, at least, as any other so-called kingdom. *But when it is grown*—this is, with respect to the sense, to be understood in the future; as in Mark the growing is still more strongly marked as the principal point by the two fold expression ἀναβαίνειν, *grow up*, and ποιεῖν κλάδους μεγάλους, *shoot out great branches*.* But as already in the two foregoing parables the second contained the explanatory ground of the first, so here the *leaven* stands in the same relation to the *grain of mustard seed*. The reason why the small seed of the kingdom of heaven, which is sown in the world, grows and spreads to such an extent is, that it has a *penetrating*, transforming, inwardly quickening power, a power to lay hold on every thing around it. Such growth is carried on, therefore, also outwardly before the eyes of men; not thus alone, however, but still more by an unseen efficacy. As has already been said above, Christ here still views the progressive development of his kingdom as a whole, but he makes at the same the hinted transaction to the esoteric parables, which exhibit the real existence and continued possession of that kingdom in the souls of those individuals who, with self-denial, lay hold on it. With the extension and penetration in the mass there is mingled not a little of false appearance, which, only in virtue of its pointing to the genuine growth and leavening that takes place in the true children of the kingdom, still retains a certain figurative truth. If, in the first parable, greater prominence was given to the individual, and in the second to the kingdom as a whole, the two following should now be understood as if in addition to these it were said: The kingdom of heaven, *viewed as a whole and in its individual members*, is like, etc.

In Mark, verse 30, the Rabbinical formula τίνι ὁμοιώσωμεν, "whereunto shall we liken," etc., precedes, which recurs also in Luke xiii. 18, and is likewise a ground for the conjecture, that Luke there inserts, by way of repetition, what had been spoken before—if we do not find any connection in that place (which appears to me almost impossible) to warrant the supposition of an actual repetition by Christ. At all events, it is to be supposed that Christ really, as Mark has it, spoke in the striking form of *we*, wherewith he, as it were, unites in counsel with himself, and in the most friendly manner engages to a favorable hearing, if not the people, at least the disciples who were around him. Such a communicative form of address (for it is such, and John iii. 11 is falsely compared with it) is, in the mouth of Christ, an infinitely greater condescension than when Paul in his epistles says: What shall we then say?

The change of the figure, which was calculated as well to rouse the attention as to show the thing itself in new aspects, lies not merely in this, that the entire kingdom itself again appears as a seed-corn, but the transition is now also made from the noblest and most important product of the earth for man, the claims of which have already been acknowledged by the use made of it in the foregoing parables, to another species; from corn and wheat to garden products and herbs (λάχανα); hence while in Matthew the expression ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ, *in his field*, recurs, just as at ver. 24, and Mark has the more indefinite ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, *in the earth*, Luke says definitely εἰς κῆπον ἑαυτοῦ, "into his *garden*." The *mustard-seed* is the smallest of all seeds—by the ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, which is repeated here in Mark, might be understood: Which are sown in the earth by the hand of man. It is still further to be supplied, as there are indeed smaller seeds: In proportion to the greatness of the herb. And although even this should not be literally true, as, for example, our acorn as compared with the oak might make the superlative questionable, still the *proverbial force* of the expression remains (and Christ was ever ready to avail himself of such proverbs), which seems to be hinted at here, especially by the ὁμοιώσωμεν: To use a common saying in this country (where, for example, there were no *poppies*, as has been observed). The Rabbins called the mustard מִין זְרָעִים, only a sort of seed (quasi-seed), and

* Here already, therefore, it is not merely growth with respect to size or height, but also length and breadth—as Roos would thus quite superficially distinguish between the third and fourth parables.

כְּחַרְדַּל, *as a mustard-seed*, is proverbial with them for any very small thing, as, for example, Maimonides (in *More Nevochim*) contrasts the circle of the heavens with the mustard-seed, as the smallest possible thing (בְּחַכְלִית הַקְּטַנּוּת). In like manner, there are to be found in their writings accounts of the sometimes extraordinary size of the mustard plant in the East, as of one with three branches, one of which covered a potter's tent, of another on which the owner climbed up as on a fig tree. Accordingly Christ says truly, that this λάχανον or herb, contrary to the general rule, becomes a δένδρον or tree, as being, so to speak, nature's miracle of great growth, so that we are not under the necessity of supposing the more indefinite meaning of the Heb. עֵץ (tree). Along with the proverbial, however, he here also (as in the *darnel* before) glances at the typical element in natural history, according to which a particular seasoning, quickening, and leavening virtue is ascribed to the mustard-seed. That he has this in mind is to be supposed from its being placed side by side with the parable of the leaven, for which it prepares the way; although to keep by this as the principal point and to carry it out, would be unmeaning indeed. But this twofold reference to nature itself, and to the form of speech among men derived from it, is not enough; the figure as to the way in which it is carried out points farther back to the *Holy Scripture*, as we found was the case also in the second parable. For precisely in connection with those beginnings of the prophecy of Isaiah in ch. xi. 1 and iv. 2 (from which Christ had here taken the citation, ch. vi. 9, 10, and many other allusions), stands that word in Ezek. xvii. 22–24, where, literally as here, the Messiah and his kingdom is compared to a *high tree* grown from a tender twig, so that all birds dwell under the shadow of its branches. Great tree—this is generally the prophetic figure for the kingdoms of the world, as may be seen farther in Ezek. xxxi. 3–14; Dan. iv. 7–9, where there is always the characteristic notice of the birds dwelling in it. Observe, therefore, by what a wise selection, by what an ingenious allusion, Christ here speaks thus and no otherwise of the *kingdom* of heaven: If even earthly kingdoms grew from small beginnings to great power and extent, much more would this kingdom not fail of a similar growth. Observe further how, precisely by this figure, the *outward* appearance of the Church in the world is denoted also with respect to its might and power to afford protection, as being also a *kingdom* like great kingdoms.* If therefore not directly *state churches* (which are only the dangerous and never entirely to be averted consequence of the thing in its imperfection), yet certainly national churches are according to the mind and will of Christ.* What then are the birds but, in the first place, the many men and nations who are brought beneath the shelter of this protecting structure (in Homer ἔθνεα πολλὰ πετεινῶν). They *come*, in the missionary time when the Church is being set up with power and honor, like doves to their windows (Isa. lx. 8). They either sing under the branches of the tree which Christ has planted for them (Psa. civ. 12, 16, 17)—being now true birds *of heaven* in the kingdom of heaven)—the praise of him who has prepared a house and rest for them in his altars (Psa. lxxxiv. 4, 5)—the reader will pardon this play upon all these sacred figures which run into each other—or they dwell without knowing it under the shadow and shelter (see Mark) which outward Christendom with its manifold blessings affords.

Is not this the history of the Church with its great and mighty facts represented in an interesting figure, especially for a certain period, which was spoken of above? One cannot cease from comparing the little mustard-seed in the field or garden of Judea, with this shadowing tree of the nations, and from paying devout homage to him who has here so simply foretold this: *Maximum ex minimo, in minimo* (the greatest from the least, in the least)—this is the principle that obtains in the wonders of nature, but it is still more in history, and most of all, finally, in the internal history of the kingdom of God in the heart, the sign and seal of the divine operation, of divine power in the new creation of grace. As a man knows indeed what a small mustard-seed he has sown quietly and unobserved on his field, so the counsel of God by Christ here testifies, and the import is: With these prophetical words as to the will and counsel of God agrees the fact, it has been so, and will ever be so before our eyes. But it could not be *otherwise*. Trust not to anything great in this world which is not small in its beginning, for then it grows not from the kernel, or else in all probability the tree could begin from the branches ere it has roots. He who would work deeply and widely in the kingdom of Christ, must go with Christ into the depths, and then the result of his labors as regards their breadth will be seen in due time.

Let us now, however, inquire more particularly what is the period in the history of the Church, when first the grown-up tree spreads forth its sheltering branches. Yes, the sign of Jonah has become to the world a preaching of repentance, the cross of a heavenly sign of victory; the Roman empire becomes a Roman kingdom of heaven, a Church of Christ, a Catholic Church for the barbarians of all lands. The hosts of wanderers in the migra-

* Lange well observes in his interpretative manner: As the mustard-seed even changes its species, passing from an herb to a sort of tree, so does the kingdom of heaven pass into the species and likeness of a great world-state.

* [A palpable example is this observation of the author, of the bias of education and ecclesiastical connections upon the most evangelical minds.—Am. Ed.]

tions of the people turn into this home. But is this now really the true and genuine kingdom of heaven, so that the outward appearance corresponds with its internal nature? By no means! The victory of Christianity over the world leads to its secularization: here first, in right earnest, the pernicious darnel grows luxuriantly, the false Christians and after-Christians (after wheat) crowding round the imperial throne and the bishop's seat, and a *leaven* of wickedness and knavery is at work. They maintain a controversy about Easter, which does not sound like a pleasant song of praise among the branches; the new Pharisees and Sadducees come; the return to the fundamental errors of Israel in the Old Testament—errors which the cross ought to have destroyed—strongly progresses; and many Samaritans, if not even Ammonites, take part unhindered in the building of the temple. On such a view, it is more pardonable in some commentators than at first sight we might be willing to allow, when they have understood the *leaven* in the following parable (as every where else in Scripture it denotes what is bad) to represent the remaining corruption in the Church.* This certainly needs no refutation, for Christ does not say: The kingdom of heaven is like three measures of meal into which a woman who is an enemy mixes her leaven (something like the wickedness in the ephah, Zech. v. 6–8)—but *like a leaven* which a woman took, just as a grain of mustard-seed which a man sowed. Moreover, in Luke xiii. 18, where these two parables stand alone, it is not possible to suppose that they contain a prediction of the corruptions in the Church, as, for example, the *Berleuburg Bible*, which maintains this in reference to Matthew, must itself acknowledge. But if in the figure of the mustard-seed we found so manifold a reference, may not the reason why Christ here selects precisely that of the leaven be, that there is in it a *side glance* at the evil leaven which his prophetic eye must have also foreseen, when he spoke of the tree? Indeed, the leavening, seasoning meal is, first of all, itself the last form of the fruit in which it begins to work anew, to nourish, to show itself after the manner of the mustard-seed—and for the rising of the dough into palatable bread, the leaven is good. And yet Christ, as we every where see, can never entirely forget the further significance of the figures of nature in the types of Scripture; and if, ever since the passover and sacrifices of Israel, this word has the bad sense which he himself in other places gives to it, could he fail to have this also before his mind now? He had it in his mind, and precisely on purpose *placed in opposition to* it his *good* leaven, the heavenly leaven. To understand him thus, was so natural on the first surprise occasioned by the figure (so that the hearer must have asked: How! the kingdom of heaven too a leaven?), that I at least cannot wonder enough at finding in no commentator this idea, which yet first opens up the innermost meaning of the parable, and concedes to that mistaken interpretation what of truth belongs to it. Christ will say: With this expansion of the small seed in the field of the world, the tares of corruption will mingle all the more powerfully (like a leaven), *but the good seed will notwithstanding choke the thorns*, the mustard-seed will gain the victory, what is heavenly will also mingle itself with every mixture, in a word, *will show itself as a subduing anti-leaven.*† Thus we have the true, the entire sense of this ambiguous expression, the application of which is here changed from what is bad to what is good.

The ἐγκρύπτειν, or "hiding," which occurs only here in the New Testament, derives its emphasis first of all from this. The subduing power of the little, which yet, as it spreads, must disunite and become apparently ever less and less, will operate with such profound internal *secrecy* in the world and in man. The "little bit word of God" spread throughout the whole life of nations! They are both the same meal, only the one is already leavened, the other is still to be leavened with the word of God, that it may receive taste and relish to be used as bread. The whole then remains just as it was—meal or man—for God's renewing grace does not do away with what is creaturely, it does not break up and destroy the principle or forms of life that have existed in nations and individuals from their first creation.‡ *The three seahs*, which together make an ephah, appear in Scripture as the usual measure of a complete batch, Gen. xviii. 6; Jud. vi. 19; 1 Sam. i. 24. Christ has chiefly in mind the first of these passages, that well-known one concerning Sarah's baking for the Lord in Mamre, as the kneading is also particularly noticed there. In so far, however, as he means the whole world, all mankind, the number three may further point to the three quarters of the globe then known, or more correctly still, when viewed as a prophecy, stretching throughout all future time, it may have reference to the three sons of Noah, by whom every land is possessed, and in whom the prophetical word sees represented the

* The work "On the Decree of God," etc (Frankf. 1847), so strongly tinctured with Irvingism, goes so far as to say, that not only the leaven is intended to prophecy the falling away, but (with absurd cross-interpretation) the *mustard-seed* also: for its tree has no fruit, while under its foliage nestles the seed-devouring birds of the evil one! And this is called "the only scriptural interpretation of these two parables."

* This is something quite different from what Richter's "*House Bible*" says: The *mixed* degeneracy and sinfulness of the no longer apostolically pure Church which now extends itself, is *at the same time* meant.

† Braune: As the dough is internally related to the leaven, so is the man internally related to the kingdom of God. When Zeller refers the entire parable in the last times, on the ground that then only after the judgment shall humanity be really prepared for the *meal*, we cannot agree with him. What would the leaven be then?

whole seventy nations. This is no trifling, but quite consistent with the every where harmonious sense of Scripture. Into this entire popular life with its state developments, its art, science, wisdom, and folly, war and peace, into the entire history of the world, the good leaven enters with its secretly penetrating and subduing power, and at last it gains the upper hand. The new struggles, indeed, with the old in fermentation, and neither will bear the presence of the other, but the kneader takes care that it is impregnated, and through the fermentation the batch is produced. (In Ezek. iv. 12, where an ἐγκρυφίας ἄρτος is spoken of, ἐγκρύπτειν is used for לעג.) Luther says on this: "Just as it is impossible that the leaven, after it is once mixed with the dough, can ever again be separated from it, because it has changed the nature of the dough, in like manner is it also impossible that Christians can be severed from Christ. The dough is leavened, Satan cannot separate it from the leaven, let him boil or fry, roast or burn it, the leaven Christ remains in it, and will remain till the last day, till all are thoroughly leavened who are saved." We say in addition to this: Even Feuerbach and Bauer's worst leaven is at least penetrated by the opposition to Christianity, precisely thereby is it brought into prominence, and therefore is it already infected with the principle which finally overcomes.

Who now is the *woman* who carries on the important work of kneading? It were superficial to say that the γυνή or "woman" here is merely parallel to the ἄνθρωπος, or "man" of ver. 31, because women bake as men sow, seeing that there are every where γυναῖκες σιτοποιοί, (bread making women); for the position of the words (which is never to be regarded as indifferent), is now strikingly changed. In the first parable we have merely the *sower* with the story about his seed; in the second the recurring superscription begins: *The kingdom of heaven* is like *a man* (*coelestium similitudines ex humanis*), which, in the third and fifth, is only somewhat transposed,* and appears again literally in the sixth. (On the other hand, in the seventh, where the work of separation by the angels is the principal point of view, each ἄνθρωπος or ἄνθρωποι, disappears in a passive and general "one.") If, however, the ἄνθρωπος who sowed the mustard-seed was still the heavenly Sower himself, the γυνή appears already to make the *transition* to the fifth and sixth parables where the ἄνθρωποι are *other persons*, those, namely, who now *receive*, find and seek what is given from heaven, and is within their reach, who *themselves work it out*. Thus the λαβοῦσα, *who took*, now obtains a further sense, and is to be taken more strictly than the foregoing λαβών. For the mustard-seed is as yet the first form of the heavenly seed which God put into the earth, but the leaven is a thing already there in relative perfection, a thing which has been made in a former and first baking. To take this and to make further use of it requires human co-operation and labor. We shall afterwards find and show, at Luke xv. 4–8, that there the *woman* is really *the Church*, namely, the true Church in which *the Spirit* lives, through which he works (Rev. xxii. 17): referring in passing to this proof, afterwards to be adduced, we do not stay to find here, as there, the work of the *Spirit* throughout the Church in the wonderful divine-human *thorough working* of the dough by the powerful hands of this woman.* In relation to this, the worldly Romish, pseudo-catholic missionary church, is only the historical likeness, and thus in the last of the exoteric parables a forcible transition is made from the external appearance to the *internal* truth.

Until *the whole* is leavened—or until the meal is leavened *through and through* (ὅλον equivalent to ὅλως). If this, in the fullest and most proper sense, is never true of the entire dough of mankind (for what then would be made of the tares and the separation at the end?) it is yet true individually and personally of the elect. These find the treasure which lies hid every where in the field, they seek and value the one pearl which, in a manifold way, offers itself to every one who knows it, so that he may entirely possess himself of it; in them the *soul* works through the might and impulse of the Spirit, selling all and thus obtaining all, until the whole man is leavened. And, in this depth of the microcosm, Olshausen's explanation of the three measures by *spirit, soul, and body*, which he brings in too soon, may find its confirmation; for—as those who have looked deeper have long since seen—Shem, Japheth, and Ham, in the microcosm of the world's history, *correspond* to this trichotomy of human nature. The little mustard-seed in the individual is now, as Christ also says elsewhere, the first small spark of living faith which removes all mountains, and from the small beginnings of the first graces and prayers, the sanctifying new life at length penetrates as a leaven the whole man, if he on his part does not neglect these two things, to continue in patient growth, and diligently to co-operate in the ἐγκρύπτειν or "hiding."

* Against the interpretation of Wächtler (afterwards to be spoken of), let it only be mentioned in the meantime that the "kingdom of heaven" is a quite special term, the thing compared in all these parables; therefore the apparently strictly grammatical position is not valid, and the kingdom of heaven, ver. 45, might be likened to the pearl, not to the merchant. When Plato speaks of his σοφία, that is something quite different (*Stud. und Krit.* 1849.)

* To knead in—that is the true work which the hand of God will have done by our hands—not to pluck out! The woman appears here as strong, if we keep in view the interpretation—by no means (as Braune thinks) as "a weak woman"—as also a child may bring the kingdom of God into a house!

THE TREASURE IN THE FIELD.—PEARL AND NET.

(Matt. xiii. 44–50.)

As the householder in the parable went, in his answer, beyond the question of the servants, and showed in addition to the Whence? also the Whither? so Jesus, with the explanation which the disciples asked, goes on to give them the next two parables over and above, which then, by the conclusion of the third, vers. 49. 50, lead back to vers. 41, 42; consequently this entire supplement of the treasure, pearl, and net, are, as it were, a developing application, a deeper explanation of the foregoing *separation*. Would *you*, as righteous, at one time shine like the sun—as those who turn many to righteousness like the brightness of heaven? Now mark and *hear* what I have further to say: The kingdom of heaven is *again* like—becomes, the nearer it draws to the separation, ever more perfectly like to a thing *hid*, which indeed one may *find* unsought, but in order to get and keep which, one must renounce every thing else; which, finally, must be even *sought* with the greatest earnestness, must be bought at the cost of the complete renunciation of every thing else. Those who do this are the righteous.*

According to Jewish conceptions, the kingdom of the Messiah was to be the most public thing in the world, and it was the will of Christ (ch. v. 14, 15), that the light in his followers should shine clearly before all the world (ἐκλάμπειν, ver. 43), as a city set on a hill; yet he says here beforehand that it will unfortunately *not* be so, least of all in the last times of trial before the judgment, in the times of obscuration caused by the *mixture* which comes not merely from the devil, but is, on the other hand, also the result of the divine purpose, so as to bring the leaven into contact with every thing that may be at all susceptible to it. The *treasure* hid in the *field* is, on the one hand (in connection with the second parable), still the precious *seed*, but at the same time also (now entirely departing from this figure) a *treasure*, or a precious possession in general. The field in which this treasure lies hid in the outside of the kingdom as existing in the world, viz., the *Word* and the *Church*.† Ah! how many treasure-seekers pass by, how many treasure-diggers dig beside it, because their eye and heart are turned towards another false treasure! because (to speak with Lange), they seek their bread just as in husbandry, only in a "decent conformity to the outward ordinances of worship," without truly *seeking* the Gospel which lies hid "deep beneath the law" (the outward ordinances, institution, etc.), like the merchant afterwards mentioned who aimed higher. The real treasure is so near them, they tread upon it and might lay hold on it with the hand, if they but knew the right spot. Luther says again: "Learn from this to know the kingdom of heaven; many seem to possess it who possess it not, and he who truly has it, seems as if he had it not." They even diligently cultivate the field of the Church, so that it may bear them—happiness and comfort in this life; but they do not see the real treasure therein, nor bring it out. Why then do they not *find* it, as well as this one in the parable, who is of course the representative of all true believers in common? It is not said that he sought or dug for it; the *hid* treasure then must have lain *open* enough to every true finder. It is to be observed that this finder is not, and does not need to be, *such* a seeker as the merchant in the next parable, but yet that he has something of his spirit and character; for he at least *discerns* and *lays hold* on what he has found. These two parables again represent two things which properly belong to each other, the offered grace of God, and the endeavor on the part of man; although these two come specially into prominence in different periods.

The fortunate finder now wants to have only the treasure, as the merchant the pearl, *yet for this he buys the field*. Is this, perhaps, merely a feature in the parable without particular significance? Then it would at least represent the *wisdom* to be used in acquiring the spiritual substance, such as the children of this world use in reference to the earthly: in order that he may make sure of not losing his discovery by any other finding it, he again covers it up and buys the piece of land; as its purchaser the treasure would at that time, according to Jewish and partly also to Roman law, belong to him. Nor was this any injustice to the possessor, who was leaving his best property to spoil in the earth, and knew neither how to find nor to value it; how, otherwise, should the right man for such a treasure get it? With still less propriety could Christ say: And he stole it, carried it off! If any one is satisfied with such an explanation of this part of the parable, let it be so; but it appears to us that the buying of the field really contains in it the deeper truth, namely, that one cannot get the treasure without the field, *i. e.*, that no one can have the jewel of the kingdom of heaven in the heart without the appropriation of all the outward institutions which guard it, without the right use of all its means of grace (in vain possessed by so many). We have no sympathy, then, with such an interpretation as this: The good man

* In the general survey with which we began, it was already said that, in the last three parables, the inner state and progress of the kingdom of heaven in the *individual persons* is spoken of. It is therefore, however, *not merely* meant that the kingdom of heaven will (as Lange thinks) at *every* period remain a concealed treasure "for the individuals—even as a world-religion," but the parables really at the same time advance forward to a later period when that will be more the case than before.

† And that especially at a time, when "the kingdom of God is as it were buried beneath the clods of false Christianity, of superstition, human ordinances, and ceremonies" (Roos). And we would say further, also under a good divinely-established ecclesiasticism—for the field must be bought.

only had not strength enough immediately to carry off the treasure alone; for the way in which he acted is manifestly praised, as being that which led rightly to the end he had in view. Dost thou discover, by the revelation of God graciously vouchsafed to thee, the living word of regeneration, and the true Church, remember that neither of these comes into thy heart in the way of the Separatists, so as that thou mayest sever it from the external word and sacraments in the degenerate Church; for the treasure belongs to the field, the buyer of the first must also become the true possessor of the other. But as this is entirely an inward affair of the heart, it must be done secretly, and without the knowledge of those envious persons who might follow the treasure, although they did not themselves value it or use it, or who, as mockers, might throw it away as if it were old rusty iron. The true finder *hides* what he has found, as in the field from profane eyes, so in his heart, *i. e.* shuts it already in his overjoyed heart, ere he properly has it. This seems to be the true meaning of the figure, which is not otherwise to be pressed. And now he betakes himself in haste and in earnest, *in the joy* of his heart (a more deeply-seated joy than that in ver. 20), to selling and buying. For he must give up all his property for it, as is meant in Luke xiv. 33, and more particularly carried out by the apostle in Phil. iii. 7–10; this is the concluding point in which the two parables of the treasure and the pearl coincide.

Wächtler recently persists in maintaining, even after Steffensen adduced clear reasons against it (which we will not now repeat), a strangely inverted explanation of the parable of the pearl; we can only allude to it here; it scarcely needs any special *refutation* for the sake of those who in any way agree with it, beyond our positive development of the general sense of the parable. We have already spoken of the strikingly tenacious adherence to the grammar as respects the formula of comparison. "As the merchant goes forth to seek goodly pearls, so does the *kingdom of heaven also go forth* to seek goodly subjects"—this is held to be the only possible meaning; yet this proposition already sounds so strangely as to deter us. To correct a possible misunderstanding of the former parable, as if the man can only thus accidentally find the treasure, the design of this parable is said to be to show how the kingdom of heaven (Christ) rather seeks man. The good pearls are—"the souls who let themselves be saved and made children of God, the elect." And what is the one precious pearl? First of all it is said to be "those that are best disposed towards Christ, to whom he entirely yields himself" (as if to sell all and to buy could mean to give, and entirely to yield himself!) Afterwards, as an improvement on this, it is said to be "the communion of the saints, the invisible Church," out of which, indeed, there can be no good pearls. And here may also be mentioned the turn which Scriver* also has given to the thing (although more in the way of accommodation—"it *might* be so explained"), when he says, that the pearl shows the great value in the eye of Christ of a human soul which is to be saved. But we still think that "treasure" and "pearl" are to be taken together in the same sense, the kingdom of heaven alone can be the pearl found by the seeker—this explanation alone corresponds to the entire system of the seven parables, and confirms itself on every side. The "*doctrine of Scripture*" which is opposed to this, viz: "that the man is not the subject who effectually seeks the Saviour, but the object who is effectually sought by the Saviour," has not much weight here, inasmuch as the Scripture, with no less perfect propriety, speaks often of our seeking, our selling, yielding ourselves up, bringing ourselves to, etc.

As Solomon (Prov. iii. 13–15) and Job (chap. xxviii. 15–19) compare true wisdom with gold and silver, precious stones and pearls, or rather exalt it above them, the parable would be somewhat intelligible to the disciples from this allusion to the Scripture. Still the meaning here goes much deeper than what was then said of the "fear of God;" the *pearl*, as a treasure and possession, is here represented rather with reference to the *obtaining* and *appropriating* of it than was the case with the treasure lying in the field and waiting for the finder (just as in chap. vii. 6, "that which is holy," and "*your* pearls;" also in Prov. iii. 13 and Job xxviii. 12, the finding, the obtaining is the principal idea). It is the real "stone of the wise," whose true name no one knows but he who has it, and who bears the great *eureka* in his heart: this last and most internal parable needs and admits in the least degree explanation by many other words. The ἄνθρωπος ἔμπορος, seafarer or travelling merchant (Kleuker: who travels for jewels), possesses as a δόκιμος τραπεζίτης (reputable exchanger), that *wisdom* which we found also in the buyer of the field, even in a higher degree, for he *seeks* really *good*, *genuine* pearls. But the nearer the end of the Church draws on the more necessary will this testing wisdom be, in order to find what is sought; for not merely is true Christianity hid by the manifest falling away (which is not so much pointed at here), but amid the motley mart of confessions, sects, and opinions, the perplexing cry which is to precede the coming of the Lord, Lo, he is here! Lo, he is there! in this chamber or in that desert—amid the manifold forms of Christianity, each of which praises its own books, its own agencies, its confessions of faith or societies, there is need of a good understanding in the seeking heart; nor is any society of Moravian Brethren with their Bohemian stones the true field which one has only to buy.†

* Third *Sermon* of the first part, in my edition, i. 77.

† That (according to Roos) again at a later period the pearl may be freely bought even without

That the seeker first of all seeks many and many sorts of pearls (in the plural), shows that he has not yet learned (and this is natural enough) the experience which he will obtain after he has found, and of which the Church loudly enough holding forth that experience sings: "If I get this one thing, which compensates for all, then shall I in this one thing enjoy every thing"—or as it might with equal truth be said: Then shall I enjoy this one thing in every thing. Therefore Christ says here, ἕνα πολυτιμον μαργαριτην, "*one* pearl of great price," while before, in the Sermon on the Mount, he himself speaks of *pearls* in the plural. The men who offer them for sale according to their appearance know the precious one themselves just as little as that owner of the field knew of his treasure; and yet it is not to be bought from these ignorant possessors as a thing of trifling value, but Christ himself—who so wonderfully offers for sale his holy jewel, that he on his part may try the triers, and bring it to the true man who is worthy of it—gives it upon no other terms than those which Solomon has already mentioned: *For all that he has* (Prov. iv. 7). He who will rather continue *seeking*, and who goes back when it comes to the great *discovery*, he who begins to cheapen so as that he may still retain something of his own, cannot obtain it. But he who goes on and offers violence to the kingdom of heaven, and who boldly counts out the great price in the face of the mockery of the spectators and traders, he is the true buyer. O what a gracious word about *buying*,* when yet the price consists only in our entire poverty, debt, and misery! But what righteousness and truth in this, that the pearl is yet so dear, and assuredly in no other way to be obtained! What in earthly things were a foolish whim, is here the highest wisdom.

In opposition to this next to last parable—which, in the *one* buyer, has shown us the small number of true possessers as opposed to the foolish multitude, and the hidden Church, as, *so to speak*, itself the treasure in the field, the pearl obtained *by Christ for himself* (for so now, comparing anew, may we invert the sentiment)—comes last in the series, which shows, on the other hand, the great mixture in the wide net, thus again turning back, but now only to bring into prominence the inevitable *separation* as the chief and concluding idea, by the final οὕτως ἔσται, *so shall it be*. If, in a former parable, the tares were sown against the will of Christ by his enemy, we have here the other and innermost side of the thing, namely, that it was notwithstanding *according to the counsel and will* of Christ! He who there says: Let both grow together! had also said before: Let the enemy sow! and in holy love, a love which goes beyond all the malice of Satan, a place was given to the tares in his field, if haply wheat might yet be made out of them through the miraculous power of the opposing leaven. The bad fishes, too, were purposely fished and drawn in along with the others. If any one were still in doubt as to the meaning of that saying: The *world* is the field—his doubts must be set at rest when he finds here the bad, who are to be cast out, distinctly represented as being *in the net*, which is certainly not the same as *the sea*, but is drawn through the entire sea. The kingdom of heaven is not something specially set apart for any outward Israel, nation, or country, but the great *sea* of nations is its sphere, the restless raging sea of fallen humanity (a figure pervading the whole of Scripture, for one example of which we would now only refer to Psa. lxv. 8). Into this sea it sinks as a net hid beneath the waters. Christ will have infant baptism, conversions, national churches, and all that belongs to such a penetration of the leaven into the entire dough; and the Catholic Church, although in itself an untrue type, is yet right in its maintenance of this truth against the most well-meant, erring separatism. The wide σαγήνη, the great *drawnet* of God, is πάναγρος (all-catching), it works and draws with it whatever it finds, whatever comes in its way.* This net has many nooses, many small nets, which here and there many a fisher of men throws out, and that not merely like Peter, "at Christ's word," but many only προφάσει, "in pretence" (Phil. i. 18), at their own hand; nay more, even against his knowledge and will must Pilate write the superscription of the cross, and Caiaphas prophesy of the scattered children of God who find the truth therein. All things in the world's history must work together for good, for the *calling* of those whom the eternal purpose has distinguished; the history of the world is itself the history of the Church, and has in it the great net which the one great Fisher of men, with all the nets and hands that are helpful to him, draws by his strong hand to the shore. As the fishes are sometimes *taken in an evil net, and the sons of men snared in an evil time* (Eccles. ix. 12)—so man also knows not his time, when the good hand of God which draws into the kingdom of heaven comes upon him for the first time. The fishes are in the net ere they know it, even when they think they are still free to swim in the sea, for the net hides it-

---

the *shell* (corresponding to the field before), we think quite wrong, because the *seeking* is precisely intended to denote a distinguishing from the spurious as the result of investigation—its costliness therefore does not lie open on the surface. The two parables are not at all thus to be combined.

* At which Wächtler takes very groundless offence, since only a predominant *receptivity* is conceded to *us*. Does he forget all those passages of Scripture which speak quite otherwise also of our doing, yielding ourselves, venturing, exchanging, holding fast?

* "Those missionaries are bad fishers who even at the first would separate the fishes (by baptism). They should take much more pains to catch them in masses, instead of losing time in unapostolical discriminating" (Richter's *Bible*).

self from them.* Ye fishers who, as wise and faithful servants, would follow out the mind of Christ, draw gently that you may not scare away many a draught. The water itself must move about in the net, the sin of the world must prepare for the universally offered grace of God, the raging of the nations and kingdoms must help on the kingdom of heaven and the gathering of the people of God; many a leviathan is caught, and although he would fain get out yet cannot break the strong net.

Thus, indeed, it brings together ἐκ παντὸς γένους, *i. e.* great and small, high and low, distinguished and obscure, whatever there is in the water (Psa. civ. 25). But with all this variety, there are only two kinds of which at last account is taken (see chap. xxii. 9, 10). In τὰ καλά and τὰ σαπρά, *the good* and *the bad*, the fishes are purposely not at all expressly mentioned, nor are they throughout the whole parable; ἰχθύδια, "*fishes*," is not to be supplied (seeing that עצוּמים or mighty ones, and תַּנִּינִים or sea-monsters were also caught), but the neuter is to be understood in the same way as καινὰ καὶ παλαιά, "new and old," in ver. 52. The sea of the world and the kingdom's history has a *shore*, as this αἰὼν or "word" has a συντέλεια or "end." There it will be seen what has been caught, what must be again *cast out* of the net, and just as little of the latter comes into the ἀγγεῖα or "vessels" as of the tares from the field into the barn.† The fishes in the parable are either eatable or not *fit for use* (which in general the word σαπρός also signifies), fishes which indeed might have made good food, but which unfortunately have died in the net, and, amid the swarm, have become *corrupt;* but the parable says nothing of this, in order to abide by the principal point. To this principal point belongs now only the third and last question which comes after the former questions, Whence? and Whither? namely, When will this be done? The answer was also given before: When the plants are *ripe*, *i. e.* here when the net is *full*. This means not merely, When the πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν, or "fulness of the Gentiles," which in its number is known only to God, has been brought in (Rom. xi. 25), when the foreordained number of the elect is complete, although this also lies in the background, as it is on account of the good that the net is drawn—but at the same time also: When the whole sea is fished out, when all that were swimming in it are in the net (Matt. xxiv. 14). As in the second parable the harvest was described only as future (it is by no means said: And the reaper came)—so now, on the contrary, the final decision appears as present, immediately follows.

Verses 49, 50 contain again an *explanation* unasked, but they only repeat the foregoing vers. 41, 42 (might the disciples also in heart repeat ver. 43!), and bring the last three parables into one frame with the conclusion of the second. It is this: The gathering is done also by men, but the separation only by the hands of the *angels*, with whom we cannot again with Zeller join the reigning and judging saints. Already does this literal repetition (for in vers. 39 and 41 the angels of heaven are certainly meant) refute the strange idea of the excellent Olshausen, that the ἄγγελοι (angels) here are the messengers or ἀπόστολοι (apostles), because in the parable the fishers themselves perform the work. This, however, is still the question, for in the whole parable, just in order to keep this in the back-ground, neither the fishers nor the fishes are named, and it is expressed in the indefinite form; as at ver. 40, ὥσπερ συλλέγεται, "as they are gathered," so is it now with the whole story of the σαγηνη βληθεισῃ, or "net cast," as if it were equivalent to ὥσπερ βάλλεται, "as it is cast," etc. The angels shall *go forth* from the throne and presence of God, and of the Son of Man, at his command and commission; they shall make a clean and true separation of the few righteous from the many wicked. What in the similitude was an emphatic ἔξω, "without," left indefinite, is in the explanation, again the fearful furnace with its wailing and gnashing of teeth; still, in order that the friendly promise (ver. 43) for those who have *ears to hear* may sound above this dreadful conclusion, there is already, in ver. 48, a gathering together of the good (συνέλεξαν τὰ καλά) placed before that gathering together (συλλέγειν) of the bad.

THE STORES OF THE HOUSEHOLDER.

(Matt. xiii. 51, 52.)

"Parables are indeed pretty and ingenious things, but one must also *understand* them"—says the excellent *Wandsbeck Messenger* (Matthias Claudius): therefore Christ asks at the conclusion, if they have understood him, as in Mark iv. 13, he referred to this at the beginning. This question was not for the people but for the disciples, that they might be thorough μαθητευθέντες or learners. And Christ, who could not follow the Socratic method in revealing the mystery of the kingdom of heaven, must first teach the disciples also, ere he ask them such a question. Forget not, ye under-masters, to do the same, neither the teaching first nor the asking afterwards. Have ye understood *all* this—the last through the interpretation that was given of the first—what has not been explained, and about which you do not therefore ask me? (for in

---

* It is not precisely right with Braune to lay emphasis on: They are *caught;* because the kingdom of God appears to them at first as a letter.

† The ἀγγεῖα (not *the* vessel in the singular as Luther has it) certainly correspond in some measure to the barn in a foregoing parable, but we may infer from the plural that this feature is here to be less urged.

Mark iv. 34, πάντα is not meant literally of every single parable, but of the import of all, which they might perceive from the explanation of some). The good disciples, because they had really *understood something*, and because now these stories were not as at first entirely unintelligible to them, answer in their naive simplicity: *Yea, Lord.* Christ receives this answer as true, for he who understands something is certainly in the right way. Luther: He praises them just as if they had understood, because at some future time they would understand. He deals with his disciples as with children, in the simplest earnestness and the most earnest simplicity, for he thinks of what they shall become by the Holy Ghost, and has patience with their folly or simplicity. He does not repel them from him as a proud master by saying: Ah, how can ye now already know and understand what the kingdom of heaven is, as my wisdom has spoken of it in these parables!

For their future office, in the discharge of which their "Yea, Lord," would come to be ever more true, he now says what follows. And so thoroughly has he got the taste for parables, after the eternal Wisdom in him opened its mouth in this way, that this last word also takes the form of a parable, which Matt. ver. 53 therefore includes under the ἐτέλεσεν τὰς παραβολὰς ταύτας, "he had *finished* all these parables." Perhaps meanwhile the table was covered in the house, at least the θησαυρός, "treasure," of the householder here is the store-room of the meats (Psa. cxliv. 13), and the whole is to be compared with ch. xxiv. 45. We might at first say: What condescension on the part of Christ thus to speak of himself as of *every* scribe! But this he does not properly do, for he himself is no γραμματεὺς μαθητευθείς, "scribe instructed;" he speaks of his disciple's office in which they are to follow his, the Master's, example just set before them. But he is certainly the *Householder* who has *now* given out things new and old to the people, and the disciples, the guests and the inmates of the house; still *every one* is *therefore* (διὰ τοῦτο, after such an example) to be like this householder. When Christ says "*scribes*," he gives it to be understood, as we have seen, that these seven parables also were founded on the Holy Scripture, were foreshadowed in it; then also he places such true scribes whom he forms and sends (ch. xxiii. 34), emphatically in opposition to the present false ones. Instructed or taught *for the kingdom of heaven:* this is the grand distinction, the fundamental idea of all true instruction and learning, upon which all true *understanding* depends. Instructed, namely, in a twofold sense, for himself and for others, that he may gain it himself and spread it abroad in others. The importance of αὐτοῦ which is the main point of the sentiment, is not to be overlooked; out of *his* treasure, almost as at ch. xii. 35. For the treasure and provision of the wholesome doctrine must through experience have become my own, in the way spoken of in the fifth and sixth parables, the θησαυρός or treasure must be put into a θησαυρός or treasury, if I am rightly and fruitfully to use it. Not from knowledge got by learning, not from books, not even from the Bible, that inexhaustible store-room of the Chief-householder, can one teach and preach as Christ here means, if the truth does not first go through one's own heart.

New and old—that is in the parable the produce of this year and of years far back (Song of Sol. vii. 13), for the nourishment and sustenance of the family, not (according to Neander, for example) jewels laid out to view, in which old or new does not signify so much; in the interpretation of the parable, however, it has indeed a manifold sense. The ground-idea is: According to the wants and taste of the guests, as it is good for them, or, by pleasant variety, agreeable to them. There is not to be a constant repetition, therefore, of the one old thing, that the people may not get disgusted;* therefore the *new* stands first. But neither is it to be always the new, or a new form for the Athenian itching ears, but as in the true wisdom for the kingdom of heaven all that is new really rests on what is old, the old therefore is not to be forgotten, even the first repentance sermon and the truths of the catechism are ever again to be held forth! The old is ever to become new by new accessions to it, the new must confirm and recommend itself by leading back to the old. Further, by the new and old is meant—not precisely, as Luther every where and here also finds, Gospel and law, for what is here spoken of is instruction into *the kingdom of heaven*—but the new word of the kingdom of heaven in the *fulfillment*, in convincing harmony with the old word of *prophecy* from the *Scripture*. By all means also the word of *Moses* as the old, but only in so far as it harmonizes with the Gospel, and essentially coheres with it. Further, because nature, as well as creation and history, is a writing of God, nay, the original, first book of wisdom, to interpret whose letters, and to put them into words, Christ opens his mouth in the commentary upon it, which forms the other writing, one may understand also these old metaphors, and stories familiar to every one, of the seed, the tares, leaven, net—and that by these the new ideas, the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven may be pleasingly taught. And whatever else he who will only diligently gather into his treasure, in order faithfully to bring forth from it, will find therein what may be called new and old.†

---

* Hence Neander speaks (wrongly) of "agreeable variety" in the modern or ancient jewels that are displayed.

† Yet not (with Neander) the "formal accommodation," here supposed to be allowed, nay recommended, which makes use of ancient expressions, without taking them exactly in their entire truth, which speaks of the authors of books, according to ancient opinion, without confirming such opinion.

For the Master, at the conclusion of his discourse, will say to his disciples: Only use all this diligently for yourselves and others, gather in assiduously in order to render back again, so will you learn ever better to *understand* all this (ver. 12).

THE FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND.

(Matt. xiv. 16–19; Mark vi. 31, 37–41; Luke ix. 13–16; John vi. 5, 10–12.)

Although what is further narrated in chap. xiii. 54–58, is by no means the same incident as that recorded in Luke iv. 16–30, but a repeated visit to Nazareth at a later period, on the details and significance of which we should have much to say, if we had now to deal with the narratives, still the *words* of Christ (ver. 57) are only to be rightly interpreted in their original connection in Luke iv. 24. We therefore refer the consideration of them to that passage, and will now pass to what follows.

Jesus hears from the disciples of John who came to him, and whom the death of their own master now at length leads to the true Master, not merely the (already known to him? John v. 35) lamentable death of the Baptist, by the cruel act of King Herod, springing from his conceited weakness, but into which he was on this occasion driven against his will—he also hears from them what the same king had said concerning him, Jesus, that he was, as many told him, John risen again from the dead, and that he would like much to see him (Luke ix. 9). This wretched king, under whom the King of Israel lives and works as a subject, now first noticed by him, this man, whose inner life was exhausted, who was made up of contradictions, speaking of his kingdom like Ahasuerus, and yet the slave of his Jezebel, willingly hearing the prophet, and unwillingly killing him, who will be a Sadducee, and yet thinks of a resurrection, who has a superstitious fear of the Lord Jesus, and yet has a curiosity to see him, is anxious for this, and yet takes no steps towards it—this Herod, Jesus, as by a fit judgment, avoids. Yet we read no word from his mouth concerning the person and conduct of "his king." He went over the sea κατ' ἰδίαν, *i. e. privately*, here (comp. ver. 23 and Luke ix. 18) without the people, but with his disciples, the apostles who had just returned from their mission. For, while the first obnoxious preacher of repentance dies, twelve new ones are risen up in his place, besides the one whom Herod now fears. Christ withdraws himself at the same time therefore on account of the information of the disciples, and we read in Mark iv. 31, the words of his mouth: *Come ye also apart into a desert place and rest a little!* For the press of the people going and coming was great, so that they could not even take their repast; it was shortly before the passover, which feast Christ did not observe on this occasion after having performed his work and his testimony at the feast of Purim. He speaks not of his own but of the disciples' *rest;* because they were somewhat too full of all the things *that they had done and that they had taught*, he kindly leads them into the solitude where is the true *rest*. They are not to create such a sensation or make such a noise among the people on their return to them. Come *ye* also (ὑμεῖς αὐτοί) now into retirement, as I am wont to do and even now have need of it for myself; rest yourselves from your journey, because ye too have labored! But when Christ permits or commands rest he yet significantly adds: *A little.* More is at present not yet granted them, unrest soon again sought out him and them. The crowds of people hasten on foot round the sea, and Jesus soon again goes forth from his solitude (ἐξελθών, Matt. and Mark; not out of the ship, but equivalent to δεξάμενος αὐτούς, Luke, in order to receive them with a salutation), heals their sick, and addresses to them again much instruction concerning the kingdom of God. For instead of displeasure at the disturbance, there is only compassion in his heart for the sheep without a shepherd. Yes, he is moved too even by the unintelligent zeal with which they run after him, and forget their food; they are not to suffer on this account, and he determines in the counsels of his wisdom now to give a sign which at the same time lovingly interprets to the people that word in Matt. vi. 33, and testifies of the bread of life, but which shadows forth something special for the disciples after their first official work. The Evangelists together give us six words from the mouth of Jesus on the occasion of this miraculous meal, the true order of which will clearly evolve itelf from a right understanding of the whole.

Evidently the *first*, in which Christ will signify to Philip alone *what he has already determined to do*, is denoted in John vi. 5 by the Evangelist's words before and after, as the beginning which Jesus makes. *Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?* Here have *we* (in such things he is ever ready to speak thus) all at once again many guests; we ourselves have indeed got enough, as for this purpose, partly, we came hither; but *these* are hungry, as I suppose, must still have a meal to-day, and in their zeal have thought nothing of this: it is fit therefore that *we* entertain them; what thinkest thou, beloved Philip? That this was the disciple who took charge of the food may rather be doubted, for Judas carried the bag and bought generally what was needed (John xiii. 29). We will more correctly understand

John's words concerning the πειράζειν, "proving," by supposing that Philip, whom the faithful Master now singles out from the rest, needed the trying question, owing to his own state of heart (comp. John xiv. 8). He understands not, however, the gentle reference, contained in this *Whence*, to the miraculous power of the heavenly Father, but adheres literally to the *buying*, to which belongs also the question, For *how much? Bread* for *these*, said Christ, when he lifted up his eyes on the πολὺς ὄχλος, *great multitude;* and the disciple begins naively to *reckon*, and finds, on a hasty calculation, that a certain round sum (proverbial among the Jews; there can hardly have been so much in the Saviour's store) is yet far too little to satisfy such a multitude, so that *every one* at least may have *a little!* After this conversation between the two, the same thought now occurs to the rest of the disciples, which must very naturally have suggested itself, and they come to Christ reminding him that he should now bring his instructions to a close, in order that the people might yet find something to eat. They considerately give beforehand two reasons (only one of which Luke places after the request, after he had himself named the other): Here in the desert there is nothing to be had, and it is now late.*

But Jesus spoke to them all the *second* and now more open word, in which the *we* becomes a *ye*, and the buying becomes forthwith a *giving: They need not depart, give ye them to eat!* You propose their going away as necessary, but they are with me, and I say to you now: Must every thing go always by natural calculation? They are already tired enough, and must not give themselves more fatigue. If the disciples had at times fed one or two hungry guests from their stock of provisions—now they are to do the same with the thousands! This he said again to try them, whether they would not of themselves, especially after the great things which had just been done and told, hit upon the thing which he had determined to do. His striking word might have brought to their recollection that similar one of the prophet, 2 Kings iv. 42, 43; it is at least, on this account, as well as in accordance with the constant humility of Christ, that he speaks thus, and does not say: I will give to them! But they do not in this instance say: Lord, at thy word we will give them to eat! They perceive nothing, and answer as the servants of the prophet did on that occasion; they bring forward (according to Mark) again the same reckoning which Philip had just made, with the proverbial sum.† They are indeed very much to be excused, for it is truly human and not without a certain reason in God's ordinance, always to think and speak thus at first; Moses, the man of God, once spoke not otherwise before Jehovah (Num. xi. 21, 22). But here we may learn, at least, not to be too confident in our reckonings, so long as they are made for *plus* or *minus*, *without the host.* How many great counting houses and mercantile houses have forgotten in their books the column for the blessing or—the curse of God!

Before the answer of the disciples followed, Matt. ver. 17, Luke ver. 13 (Luke is at least literally accurate), we have, according to Mark's account,* a *third* word of Jesus to consider, viz: the intervening question proceeding from *him*, which very naturally connects itself with the reckoning just laid before him, as a reply to it: *How much bread have ye? Go and see!* I will divide and multiply differently from you. "We *have* not what thou tellest us to *give*, neither so much bread as will do for these nor so much money as will *buy* it even should we *go away* for that purpose"—so say you, but I say to you: Ye *have*, go away and only see *how much* it is, then will *I* take care that it be *enough*, and that every one gets not merely a little. Thus does Christ point to the present gifts of God which we have, in order to *bless* these; for the ordinary method must certainly be observed first, so that even miracles come only in this way. Where there is a door, one does not break through the window; where there is still *something* present, nothing new is created. Now Andrew speaks in the name of all the disciples, who agree with him: Here is a lad who has five barley loaves (the smaller bread, hence Judges vii. 13), and two dried fishes—that have we here or may soon have, but not more. Because, therefore, they cannot answer: We have *nothing*—Christ holds fast by what they have, and speaks *fourthly* (observe in this connection of the different accounts the ever-advancing gradation) the word of majesty, in which the transition is made to the miraculous power, and the increase is promised: *Bring it hither to me!* the five loaves and also the two little fishes; we will despise nothing that we have—but bring it to *me!* Now, they observe what he would do.

And he told the multitude to sit down; more exactly, according to Mark, he told the disciples to make the people do this; Luke and John give expressly as the *fifth* word of Christ: *Make the people sit down!* Or, let them sit down in rows *by fifties.* Thus exactly does Christ observe order in what he does, and here beautifully illustrates what is written in 1 Cor. xiv. 33–40, as has been at all times noticed The small stock of provision is brought before him, concerning which Andrew asked: What is this among so many? The multitudes arrange themselves in expectation of what is to come, probably not distinctly marking till the end of the meal, that here there was given a sign of miraculous power. On the rich green

* Matthew: The proper time is now past; Mark: Much of the day is already past, reckoning from the beginning of the day, therefore: High time; Luke: The day began to decline; for it was between the two evenings (Matt. vers. 15 and 23).

† We rather suppose this, than that the Gospel which was compiled from the account of Peter contradicts that of John even in such a circumstance.

* Among whose "graphic pictures" we cannot be so bold as to put the *ipse fecit.*

grass, which brings to mind the rich hand of God in the sustenance of the cattle, the separate rows of men, who are now also to find pasture, look like so many garden-beds.* They are not to mingle at pleasure with each other as at festivals of the people in the way of the world, but solemnly to sit as at the table of God in the kingdom of heaven. Then Christ took the five loaves and two fishes, looked up to heaven, pronounced the *blessing* over them (as Luke expresses it, blessed *them*, the loaves and fishes), and began now himself to break and to divide, that the disciples may do this further. He does not first command that the five and the two become five hundred and two hundred, to be taken openly by the multitudes; he conceals the miracle as much as he can, and no one sees rightly how it multiplies itself in his and the disciples' hands, any more than one sees the grass growing. *Εὐχαριστήσας διέδωκε, when he had given thanks, he distributed*—writes John; if what follows were only a gloss, it is yet, according to the other Evangelists, true; he himself breaks and distributes ever on without its coming to an end, and the disciples, who carried what they received through the ranks, perceived this. They know not themselves *how* it is so, but their faith grasps the *whence*. If, in the first ranks, they may have been still anxiously sparing, soon they gave to all as much as every one wished. For when God opens his rich hand he satisfies, according to, and with, his good pleasure (רָצוֹן, Psa. cxlv. 16). The more of the life of faith and receptivity for the divine power of this feeding there was in the individual, so much the more easily satisfied would he be with a little; but those too who ate quite naturally, were all filled. Here is set up the heavenly ladder of true "tradition," where "the blessing of the first hand runs through many hands, even to the end." The Father gives the gift to the Son, the Son to his servants, from whose intermediate hands all people receive it (1 Cor. xi. 23). Here is apparent, also, the purport and significance of the sign for the apostles who had just returned, inasmuch as, while, so to speak, imprinting a seal upon their first mission at its close, it foreshadows their future official work. *Give ye* them to eat! You need only to *have* something for such giving, my blessing will multiply in your hands in the giving. Nay, we might well say, that Christ had done all this in reality, more for the sake of the *disciples* than of the people.

The words of the prayer of thanksgiving and blessing† are not given, for it is most probable that, with a simplicity sublime in its humility, Christ had just said the grace commonly used in Israel. But while the three Evangelists merely narrate the taking up of what remained over, John specifies still the *sixth* word of Christ: *Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost!* Quite as simple as unostentatiously natural, and yet as profoundly significant as all the former unsearchable words of his mouth from the first to the last.* Also in 2 Kings iv. 43, 44, *what is left over* (as at Ruth ii. 14) is a sure proof of there having been enough; it was not to be altogether consumed, for God's gift is never exhausted, there always remains something over. And, behold! there was more of what remained over than of the original stock. But it is not for a memorial alone that they are to gather it; chiefly rather, in order that the people may not foolishly take relics of it with them. *That nothing be lost* of the dear, precious gift of God—this Christ gives as the reason. Wonderful union of the divine riches with due activity on the part of man! Beautiful picture of the working power of God in nature, which is at once lavish and careful! But Christ teaches and recommends to us precisely here, not merely that "gathering carefulness which keeps together at the right time, as belonging to the art of *well-doing*;" he gives us a still deeper ground, inasmuch as this carefulness belongs in general to *doing justly*. *That nothing be lost!* This is the single decisive ground upon which rests our household faithfulness with God's gift, of which *we* cannot create the smallest crumb, and which is to be regarded as valuable and holy—not faint hearted anxiety about the future, as if God's hand were shortened for us or others when our hand has not enough.

That God's hand has been rich and open in the hands of Jesus extended in miraculous blessing over the little, these men now at the end, when all were satisfied, have seen and experienced in this *sign* which Jesus performed. But, alas! in human fashion they see nothing more in it than the bread of which they had all eaten, and because it seems to them a very pleasant thing to have their table so easily covered, they will forcibly take to themselves this prophet who is indeed the Messiah, and at once proclaim him King with rejoicing, a king who would be better to them than Herod! This is the third instance related by Matthew of Christ's being taken for what he was not—the other two being at ch. xiii. 55, where the Nazarenes see in him the "carpenter's son"—and ch. xiv. 2, where by Herod he is mistaken for the Baptist risen from the dead. Christ, in compassionating love for the people, in faithful wisdom for the disciples and all future believers, performed this sign at the same time as a proof of what means

* Mark thus portrays the whole scene; the numbers with him may be variously understood: Every two fifties opposite each other as a hundred, and so fifty times; or unequally at least fifty, at most a hundred together; or most simply, a hundred times fifty.

† Which according to the Mishna had only to be said by one even for the largest company.

* One might preach many discourses on *every* point elucidating the true meaning, as Zinzendorf (*Pensylvan Reden*) has a rich and masterly sermon on the holy *order* of God, which we should imitate in all things.

were at his command, had he been a demagogue seeking adherents; while he takes care again that his disciples be not carried away by the error of the people, sends them forward to the ship, takes decided leave of the people against their will (though they presume not to contradict or resist him), and again goes to the mountain of his former solitude, there to *pray* from late in the evening till far into the night.

CHRIST WALKING ON THE SEA.

(Matt. xiv. 27, 29, 31; Mark v. 50; John vi. 20.)

Christ had commanded his disciples this time to cross over the sea *before him*, and had promised therefore to come after them without telling them how. Did he intend to walk round the lake during the night, which scarcely any one did during the day if ships were to be had, or did he intend to follow them in the morning in another ship (after having withdrawn himself from the people)? Neither of these suppositions is very conceivable; so that for the following miracle it only remains to be supposed that he himself knew well what he would do. He would once more show to his disciples in all stillness, even although no storm had arisen, his power over nature and the creature, in virtue of which there were ways for him every where. They, however, had, late in the evening, now come (according to Mark, ver. 47) to or beyond the middle of the sea, from twenty to twenty-five stadia, as John states, which was about two-thirds of the whole breadth (being altogether, according to Josephus, forty stadia or five geographical miles), and when now the storm arose, they made, in spite of all their exertions, very little more way by the fourth watch of the night (three o'clock in the morning), the wind being directly contrary. And Christ was not with them—this was worse than the former time, although their faith might instead have still clung to his power and majesty so shortly before revealed to them. Then he *saw their distress* (Mark ver. 48) from the mountain of his prayer, even through the night and darkness, and came to help them; yet it seemed to them, on first seeing his figure, as if he would go past them, inasmuch as he went to the prow of the ship, or, which may also be concealed in this, that he acted here as in Luke xxiv. 28.

God the Lord, who spreadeth out the heaven, *walks upon the waves of the sea* in his creative power (Job ix. 8)—this is now truly represented in his Son, who also thus gathers the winds in his hands, and binds the waters in a garment of his majesty (Prov. xxx. 4). This is more than was done by Moses and Elijah, for whom the depths must first be dried up. Not, however, in the exercise of omnipotence, but in the higher nature of the ideal man, in the might of the spirit over matter, of pure and perfect faith to which every thing must be subject, does Christ come forth from prayer to walk *upon the waters* (ὕδατα, which beneath his tread cease to be κύματα, *waves*). This inner life corresponding to that of his glorified state (analogous to Phil. iii. 11) breaks forth, according to his and his Father's counsel, in this moment of special elevation, in a way which was not always possible for him who so often crossed that sea, because he had no occasion to will such a manifestation. The disciples all see *him* whom they so anxiously wished to have beside them, nay, who had promised to come after them, approach so near to the ship that he can directly speak with them and Peter with him; his well known form would, if they could see a man walking at all, be also distinguishable at this distance, but that they are again perplexed by his going past them. *What is that?* they ask among themselves in terror, and the fear which now first breaks out in earnest, precisely when the helper comes, answers: It is an *apparition*, a φάντασμα (phantasm)—and when the terrifying word is spoken, they *cry out* for fear. Is it a welcome from the Sheol, to which they fancy they are now near? This it cannot be, for the thing upon the sea assuredly looks like the Lord; it is more likely, therefore, to occur to them, that their excited imagination now morbidly deceives them with the figure of him who has been so much in their thoughts—if, indeed, they have any definite idea at all of this φάντασμα. This is the *fourth* mistaking of Christ by his own dear disciples—prelude of the terror awakened in them by the sight of the risen Lord—most characteristic contrast to his own tranquil power over the elements! Man, in his present state, in the fear and perplexity of spirit which may so easily overtake him, sees apparitions, takes even his Saviour as he draws nigh in divine power at first to be such; this, however, is always better than, in the opposite folly of boldness, to take a φάντασμα of his own thoughts as the Lord and Saviour—for where Jesus really is, he will with his friendly "*It is I*" dissipate the mist of fear in all who do not, in their pantheistic illusion which looks on the laws of nature as the living (rather dead) God, hold that no one *can* walk upon the waves of the world and of history, and that the Christ who appears to any one to do so; is only a phantom of his own creation!

Be of good cheer, it is I, be not afraid! John, because his thoughts are ever hastening to the ἐγώ εἰμι (I am he!) of Christ, passes over the *Be of good cheer*, θαρσεῖτε, which in Matt. and Mark prepare the way for this comfort-bringing *I*. We recognize this word of kindness which he is ever so ready to address, which even yet from heaven, he delights to address

to timid hearts (Acts xxiii. 11). In order that the majesty and miraculous nearness of the *It is I* may not terrify them, he encloses it, so to speak, on both sides by words of encouragement. *Fear not!* This is the word used by the graciously appearing Lord already in the Old Testament (as we have shown at p. 30, on Luke v. 10), but now first in the mouth of the Son of Man has it the full power really to take away all fear. Thus did he come into the world with his miraculous manifestation: I am the helper. Happy he indeed who in the true faith of a disciple, although it may at first be weak, gets acquainted with the gracious Master in order to be helped, so that then every new *It is I!* always more effectually dissipates anxious fears, until the gracious words are heard for the last time in the last fear of death, as in Rev. i. 17, 18. But how often when Christ comes to his disciples in extraordinary ways, when he draws near to them in the cross and in distress, and thus brings salvation and blessing to them, is there a repetition of this *mistaking* of his well-known form!

A Philip or a Thomas among the disciples doubts perhaps for a moment or two longer, even after such words, whether it is really he. They must first have him beside them in the ship; a John has enough in the inwardly adoring, calmly expecting assurance, *It is the Lord!* But the forward Simon Peter, the easily and strongly excitable, will still further, and after a cry of fear, momentarily display great faith, in token that he also is the Lord's Peter. Not as if in a yet hypothetical "If it be thou," does he take doubt along with him from the first, for then the first step would not have been taken. Oh no, the start is bold enough: Lord, if (*i. e.* because, there, as I see) *it be thou* —on this firm ground and bottom, he proceeds in hasty boldness of faith to tread, and like his Lord, *upon the sea.* But wherefore now is *this?* The other inference would alone have been natural and simple: Come then into the ship to us, and we shall all be saved! But in the questionable little word "me," always questionable when it too hastily replies to Christ's powerful *I*, ere it has been specially asked and called—lurks the secret flaw in the great faith, on account of which it must soon again become very little. Had Christ of himself called out: And thou Peter come out to me—he would certainly not have sunk. But because he will outrun the others in showing his faith, the real Peter must show himself just as, alas! he still is, and give a warning of the future denial of his Lord; falling back again as suddenly as he had raised himself. So far does Peter know, feel and acknowledge what is right, that a κελεύειν or *bidding* on the part of Christ must precede his ἐλθεῖν or *coming;* but he provokes this command, almost bidding himself do what should have been left to Christ to command.

What does Christ do? With a wisdom at every moment which we cannot enough consider, which always does what is right every where, and in every occurrence reflects at once the holy prudence of his whole conduct, he replies by a single little word to the almost prolix address of the disciple. He does not refuse the truly needless request, and with that false mastership into which we undermasters are so apt to fall, repel the bold disciple: Wherefore this now? I come to you, I have nothing to do with thee in particular, I do not need thee here on the waters. Peter needs him and receives, in the granting of his request, the better lesson by experience. He grants him his will. But he does not assent to all the terms of the request as formally spoken by the too courageous disciple; he does not add, *upon the water*—not even *to me*—as little does he say κελεύω, *I bid thee*—for in all this there would have lain the certain promise of a successful issue, which he neither can nor will give. He says merely, at the same time literally granting the desire of the disciple: *Come!* namely, as well and as far as thou canst, it will be seen whether *upon the water* and *to me.* This is the divine manner of acting and of leading in such cases. Joab at length, with angry compliance and without love, gives to Ahimaz who persists in asking, "Let me, I pray thee, run," the answer, *Run!* (2 Sam. xviii. 19–23). But Christ gives his word of permission in true love, which will not let the disciple sink, but will merely teach him by experience that to the best meant beginning of faith, if it has any self-conceit in it, the ὑπομονή or endurance will be wanting. He had not (as Roos here thinks) *a pleasure in this*, that Peter should inconsiderately beg so strange a command—but he willingly embraces the opportunity of giving this Peter a powerful lesson by actual experience—*in this*, indeed, Christ, as the truly good Master has always pleasure.

The bold disciple, having now gone from the ship upon the water, walks one or two steps (not more, for Jesus was near), confidently towards Jesus—then he *sees*, looking away from Jesus (*wherefore* this?) the strong wind which a few moments before he did not see, and yet which had been always there; as out of fear into faith, so now again he quickly goes out of faith into his former fear. And because, of course, only the faith of the entire will can bear him upon the water, he begins to sink, his doubt now beginning to break out (καταποντίζεσθαι, as at ch. xviii. 6, expresses more than a mere sinking down of the feet), he must, as a *punishment* before all the other disciples, who are now at rest, once more *cry out* for fear, and instead of his former exclamation, must call out the true word befitting our weakness, which he had forgotten, and which none of us can so soon get beyond, least of all in the false steps of Peter: *Lord help me!* All the fisher's natural skill in swimming (John xxi. 7), is at this moment gone, for when one has once committed himself to the miraculous sphere of faith, the power, art, and prudence of nature vanish, one can make no combination of the two. He who comes to a stand-

still in half-wrought miracles, has also, in the hapless miscarriage, forgotten and lost what he could otherwise do naturally. What occasion might there have been now again for Christ to address to the disciple a more sharply rebuking word of instruction: *See!* thou forward and presuming one, thus it fares with thee. I knew well that it would be so—or words to this effect! But when the thing itself speaks so powerfully, there is no need for him to say any thing more; his heart, too, has no delight in making the disciple's confusion more conspicuous by any words of his. No, he *helps* whenever the cry is addressed to him, "*Help me*"—this is the one principal thing in his heart, in his words and conduct. Nor does he call out merely a second κελεύειν, or bidding, so as to make his *power* appear great in contrast with the disciple's weakness: Walk again! sink not! hold! but he at once stretches forth his lovingly-inclined hand to the disciple near him, sinking beside him who stands, *lays hold* on him, so that thereby the faith returns and the sinking ceases, says nothing else, not more and not less than: *O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?* Such words of Christ are unsearchable beyond all human thoughts. With all the defects in Peter's first faith, it was yet truly a great faith, the faith that He who walks on the water can bid others also do the same. Nor can we properly at any time have too great faith in the presence of Christ—if, of course, it be unmixed with self-confidence and self-will. But the greater the faith gives itself out to be, so much the more foolish is then even the smallest *doubt*, which, therefore, Christ here calls, as at ch. viii. 26, the being afraid. He might, indeed, have said here also to the sinking disciple: Wherefore didst thou fear? This would have been more humbling in contrast with the former courage of the disciple. But with this altogether kindly *word*, he will not shame him into conviction but encourage him; he discloses the innermost ground of returning fear as lying on the boundary of perfect faith. Not even until after he has laid hold of him and raised him up to himself, until he has purified, strengthened, and perfected the wavering faith of the disciple in his own faith—the faith of the Master—does he address to him the word which denotes the whole thing as now *past:* Wherefore *didst thou doubt? Wherefore* indeed? Thou wouldst and couldst walk in thy will, didst even walk! Has, then, he who comes on the sea to me, to regard and to be afraid of the wind? Thus in the greatest kindness does he overlook all of evil or of sin that had been mixed with the faith of the disciples, and most graciously repeats his rebuking word, *O thou of little faith!* O Lord, *thy* faith is perfect, thy *love* is perfect—we all add with shame, and presume not ever on our own authority to rebuke a Peter with *this* word, which the Master alone may and does say to all.

THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD AND THE STATUTES OF MEN—WHAT DEFILETH A MAN.

(Matt. xv. 3–20; Mark vii. 6–23.)

Christ speaks freely and emphatically of the *commandment of God and the ordinances of men*, placing them in direct and sharp opposition. First of all, he speaks of the blind leaders of the blind, because they themselves by their forward questioning occasioned his doing so, and the people standing around may also have heard; but he speaks also to the people to whom he calls in the ever-growing zeal of love and truth. He rebukes, or rather recompenses, the naively bold question, by immediately meeting it with another strongly accusing *question in return* (ver. 3), in which already the whole answer lies. *God's* commandment and doctrine goes first, it alone is valid! Human statutes must be broken, when, and because, they break the word of God. This heavy charge he proves forthwith, illustrating it by a *capital example* taken from the midst of the existing system of lies (ver. 4–6), and then, faithful to his wonted manner, he seals his words and doctrine by a *prophetical word of Scripture* (vers. 7–9), which brings to bear on the particular example the most general rebuke, penetrating to the *root* of hypocrisy. First, there is the adduced proof, then the rebuke, and this is given humbly, not upon his own highest authority, but upon that of the word of God written before. He forthwith, however, again, as becomes him, carries forward the word of God in his own doctrine, and enunciates before all the people a *general principle* (ver. 11) penetrating still deeper into the thing, a principle which goes even further, already prophesying the abolition of the outward ordinances of the Old Testament, inasmuch as he rightly explains their true meaning. The disciples, to, still prejudiced in the same misunderstanding of the Old Testament statutes, out of which the Pharisaism that clung to them took its rise, understand neither this simple and clear principle which appears to them a "parable," nor the reckless zeal, as it seems to them, with which Christ has just spoken to the people against their leaders; they induce him therefore to give further explanations by two questions. In reply to the first: Whether he intends not at all to spare the Pharisees, but purposely to provoke them? he lets them know that *human statute is to be*

extirpated, because it is false and pernicious (vers. 13, 14). The other question which follows this explanation: How, then, is the principle expressed at ver. 11 to be properly understood? is met by the reply, that *before* giving the answer, he would rebuke *their want* of understanding (ver. 16). After the rebuke follows the doctrine (vers. 17–20), which, at the conclusion returns to the first occasion and beginning of the whole. Thus has Matthew, who in chaps. xv.–xxi. represents "the ever-growing conflict of Jesus with the authorities at Jerusalem," here again, as we have found to be his wont, concisely and with an eye to the main substance, given the import and progressive sequence of the connected words of Christ on this occasion; Mark, on the other hand, is more full in his account, inasmuch as he not only retains many sentences which Christ may also have spoken, along with what Matthew gives, but (as is especially evident at ver. 15) enlarges by way of explanation for his readers, precisely as at the beginning he gives detailed information respecting the Jewish ordinances. He is moreover not exact when, inverting the order, he gives in the outset the prophecy of Isaiah, and then the convincing example, thereby also quite losing the counter-question put by Christ at the beginning, which contained the immediate answer to the one addressed to him. Had we only Mark's account of our Lord's words on this occasion we should lose nothing indeed essentially belonging to the import—this would rather be the more clearly brought out: only the significantly measured form and sequence of his words would be lost. Provision has been made, however, by the mutually supplementary Gospels, that we should lose nothing: Matthew preserves also the frame into which Mark's explanatory statements admirably dispose themselves. Thus does the inspiration of *the Scripture* as a whole confirm itself, while, in the particular writing of which it consists, scope is sometimes left for what is human; a principle which, in the four Gospels, finds its highest confirmation.

If in Matthew it is by no means necessary to supply ἐλθόντες, *that came*, at *οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων*, *those from Jerusalem* (he purposely omits this, in accordance with his general delineation which now begins, and in which the masters of Jerusalem are placed in opposition to Christ, as has been said above, thereby, as it were, giving a superscription to what follows)—yet it stands beside it in Mark. Were they then Scribes and Pharisees who were returning from the Passover (John vi. 4), and had perhaps been specially irritated against Jesus by what had taken place at the feast of Purim, according to John v.—who lived elsewhere, and now, meeting him on their journey, make up to him? But then the designation *οἱ ἀπό*, *those from*, in Matthew would not properly be *correct;* yet we might suppose that they were really persons from the metropolis, the high school of hypocrisy,* who appear here with special authority,† and who had perhaps purposely come after Christ to watch him and to call him to account (which latter Mark seems to indicate by *συνάγονται πρὸς αὐτόν*). They boast proudly of their *παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων* or *ἀρχαίων*, *tradition of the elders* or *ancients*, of the so-called oral law handed down from Moses (תורה שבעל פה), which they have invented, and which they hold so steadfastly against the Sadducees who reject it, that the mere text of the Bible is declared to have no validity at all without it; farther, of all that the *πρεσβύτεροι* or *elders* by a like authority have added to it, so that no one on any account dare transgress it. "To study only the text is a waste of time—the written word is water, but the interpretation and that which is added to it is the wine—if the Scribes say the right is the left and the left the right, hear them"—these and such like sayings we read at this time in the Jewish writings. Christ had already, in the Sermon on the Mount, openly opposed his *ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω*, "but *I* say unto you," to the *ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις*, "It was said by them of old time," but the opposite of this is now again boldly laid down by his irritated opponents. Especially were the frequent and various washings (Mark vii. 3, 4) a principal part of their hypocritical ceremonial. R. Jose says in the Talmud: He who eats bread with unwashen hands—כאילו בא אל אשה זונה, "is as bad as if he were to lie with a harlot," and gives this as an interpretation of Prov. vi. 26. R. Akiba, who, when in prison, had once so little water given to him that there was not enough also for drinking, chose rather to die of thirst than to eat any thing with unwashen hands! This later obstinacy shows, at least, how bad it must already have been in the time of Christ, and what strong grounds he, who was not wont readily to give offence, must have had for acting as he did, when he purposely did *not* wash his hands before the Pharisees (Luke xi. 37, 38). The disciples, of course, followed the example of their Master, and the question with all its boldness only presumes to accuse these, although it is certainly meant to hit the Master of such disciples, who of course learn what they do from him.‡ Observe also how the *horrendum:* They wash not their hands! only follows as a proof of the general assertion before laid down in a general form, *They transgress the tradition of the elders;* an inference from one thing to all, and on this occasion not without justice, for these

* Rabbi Nathan: If the hypocrites were to be divided into ten parts, nine would be found in Jerusalem and one in the rest of the world!

† Yet not certainly as a deputed commission, as Lange thinks. In that case Christ would have answered the authorities with more respect.

‡ In the highest degree *ironical*, only still more severely denoting their presumption we might (with Von Gerlach) supplement the question thus: "If thou as a prophet, perhaps, art excepted—wherefore dost thou teach others such transgression."

people know well what Christ in general thought of their παράδοσις or tradition.

Verse 3. Christ had spoken as yet very gently, in the Sermon on the Mount, of the Scribes and Pharisees, and even further on, in the growing warmth of his public rebukes, only sparingly and moderately, as appears when we take a nearer view of the web of conscious hypocrisy and actual folly, avarice and ambition, veiled under the covering of what was holy, with which they, by their customs and ordinances, ensnared the poor people. He certainly may have oftener refuted their doctrine in particular instances than the Evangelists were directed to record for the benefit of posterity; still we have reason for supposing that his special polemic against it, at all events on an average, bore the same relation to his teaching on the whole, as is now represented in the Gospels. The true reformer *preaches*, first of all, the truth positively, certainly at the same time from the first not shrinking from the open general contradiction—Not as the Pharisees! in order that the truth may not suffer from a seemingly pusillanimous silence, or even from the artifices of a false accommodation. He wisely observes further, in his *conduct*, the limit between a yielding conformity to the more innocent customs, and a decided protest against such principal parts as are of essential significance in the system of lies which is to be combatted (although these, singly and in themselves, might seem quite as harmless as the washing of hands in the present instance)—just as we find in the conduct of Christ. But then he waits for the attack, and when called out, he comes forth to victory in an attitude of severity. So it is with Christ here, in opposition to the Pharisees. They have attacked him, through his disciples, with a side glance of cowardly malice; he himself opens out directly against them: Wherefore then do *ye* transgress? They have with much seeming reverence pushed forward the tradition of the *ancients*, to which they were not at liberty to refuse obedience; he charges upon them also the keeping of even this as a continued παραδιδοναι; for the sake of *your* tradition! They have spoken, by a seemingly holy expression, of *transgressing*; he shows them to whom this word, in its severest sense, properly applies. They have brought forward the tradition of the ancients as an inviolable whole, no part of which one may touch or break (as James ii. 10 says of the law); he puts over against this as a sufficient answer to it, τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ, the alone true, in all its particular commandments, one, and entire, *commandment of God!* This is the original command, before which no ordinance of the ancients has any force. The commandment of *God*, not Moses; thus, says Christ, with the strongest emphasis, beforehand, and again in what follows: *God* has commanded! with which Mark, in his more enlarged account agrees, giving it thrice instead of twice (vers. 8, 9, 13), although in the particular example, ver. 10, he has it: *Moses* has said, in order thus to show how both are the same. We have here again another strong confirmation of the Old Testament from the mouth of Christ; a fundamental testimony to the great authoritative principle of all human teaching in relation to God's revelation, upon which alone every, not mere emptily protesting reformation stands with positive right. The ordinance of man in general, and as such, already transgresses the commandment of God even when it would support and further it, for it is written: Ye shall add nothing to it and take nothing from it (Num. iv. 2, 12, 32). There is need for no *fence* around the law, as that must soon become only an obstructing barrier; only too soon and too easily, as all history shows, is the opposition between the divine and the human forgotten, and the sole authority of the former destroyed by placing it on a level with the latter, so that the adding to it is already itself actually a taking away from it. From these beginnings a farther advance is made to transgression and abrogation. Here, too, lie the principles of all true doctrine respecting the relation of tradition to the canon; here must a check be laid on the first root of the abuse, y an unconditional maintenance pure and free of the words, with which *no* word of man is to be confounded: *God* has commanded, *God* has said!

Verses 4—6. The fifth commandment is (as at chap. xix. 19), particularly instanced as being most directly obvious to the conscience, and in so far a specially holy fundamental commandment (the first, in respect to the human life, Eph. vi. 2), which forms the connecting link between the first and second table, and in which are involved the germs of all fear of God and love of our neighbor, of all piety and morality in Church and State. He who violates it, has assuredly committed an offence against the order and plan of God in its very kernel. It is, at the same time, a universal word which *God* speaks every where among the heathen more plainly than the rest of the ten words given from Sinai: Thou shalt honor father and mother! The other word which stands beside it, and which, by the *punishment of death* even for an offence against this commandment in words, very strongly confirms it,* is to be found not merely in Exod. xxi. 17 (with ver. 15), immediately after the giving of the law from Sinai, but is repeated in Lev. xx. 9, and again sounds its Amen for all the people among Ebal's curses (Deut. xxvii. 16), while Solomon, too, gives a special emphasis to it (Prov. xx. 20, xxx. 17). In opposition to this, now comes ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε, but *you* are bold enough to *teach*—properly, only to *say*,

* This citation by Christ is besides important in opposition to those who regard capital punishment as a measure disapproved by the "mild" Jesus. "Precisely in it does Christ find the fitting expression of the holiness of God, and the entire severity of his will against the lax and arbitrary conduct of the hypocrites" (*Evang. Kirchenztg.* 1843). Reasoning against capital punishments from *the Scripture* is in general a failure.

inasmuch as this λέγετε designedly follows the strong word ἐνετείλατο, *commanded*. Care has been taken in the Jewish writings that we should well understand what is here meant, although Mark also gives no farther explanation. Δῶρον, as Matt. renders קָרְבָּן,* signifies in the first place a *gift* offered to God, then any gift, present, or dedication for the sanctuary or its servants; hence in Matt. xxvii. 6, the Temple-treasure also bears this name. Now the selfishness of the Pharisees made out of this doctrine their statute, that this *Corban* must take precedence of every thing of being of the highest sacredness. There existed already a so-called נֶדֶר אִיסָר, *votum interdicti*, *vow of interdiction*, by which any one might bind himself in reference to another not to accept this or that from him, and to give him nothing in return, and it was the usual and most emphatic form of such a pledge to say, "It shall rather be Corban," and thus to escape from every other obligation. It was a formula of swearing and cursing literally as it stands here: קרבן שאני נהנה לך, "It is offered, whereby I might profit or serve thee!" (comp. Matt. xxiii. 16, 19). Chiefly of children towards their parents do we find it frequently expressed in the Rabbins: "Let what I shall gain be consecrated, so that my father may eat nothing of it," and the like. In the statute: By Corban is the man bound—it was not merely implied that he was at liberty to do nothing contrary to it, even although it were the command of God; but even when what was refused and denied by this word was not actually offered as Corban, if the word had only been spoken hastily in the heat of the moment, it must yet stand inviolable.† How often may this Corban have been said, in anger and malice, or through the shameful selfishness of children, seeing that, even in Christendom, and to the present day, the sin of shunning the maintenance of parents still cries so often to heaven! It will from this be understood why Christ gives prominence to and connects with the foregoing κακολογεῖν, or *cursing*, this case in which by one little word this wilfully daring statute overturns the holiest obligations of reverence and love among men. Δῶρον, "a gift"—without ἔστω or ἐστί "be it," or "it is"—denotes the curse formula as such; by its being directly spoken to the father or to the mother the worst example of it is presented, when the parent asks and the children refuse, although substantially it retains its truth even when not done precisely in this form. To honor father and mother is a commanded worship of God superior to all self-chosen forms of worship:* this honoring comprehends under it, of course, taking care of and supporting, as a grateful requital (Sir. vii. 28); so that it is very unnecessary to show, as some have done, that τιμᾶν, *to honor*, has also this signification (Sir. xxxviii. 1; 1 Tim. v. 3–17). What the children have belongs to the parents—so writes Philo on the *Decalogue*. Whoso withdraws any thing from his father or his mother, and saith it is no sin, the same is a companion of the destroyer—thus did Solomon already almost prophesy for the future (Prov. xxviii. 24). Such Corban was an unjust possession, and an abomination (Sir. xxxiv. 18). If, according to Num. xxx. 4–6, the father could control the daughter of his house in every vow and bond, so that it should not be valid if he disallowed it, how much less ought so shameful a vow as this to have force.† But *ye teach*—thus must Christ rebuke them—that whoever has said Corban, the same needs *not* also to honor his father and his mother! The greater number, indeed, read as if there were a break in ver. 5, after which Christ himself speaks; this, however, sounds to us too harsh, although we might retain the καί, *and*, as genuine. In this καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ, which is evidently the apodosis wrongly supposed by some to be wanting, "he needs not *also* (not even) to honor" father and mother—the daring *counter-command* of men is brought forward in a sharply convictive form, so that by this is directly confirmed the stronger repetition of what is said at ver. 3: And thus ye have not only transgressed, but entirely weakened and *abolished* the command of God by your tradition. Mark, who has entirely omitted the self-evident apodosis ἐὰν εἴπῃ, *if he say*, brings out the inference thereby in a still stronger form: οὐκέτι ἀφίετε αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ποιῆσαι, you allow him no longer to do any thing. He has already, at ver. 8, expressed the same antithesis by ἀφέντες and κρατεῖτε: You leave, dispense with, the command of God as a subordinate, less binding thing, in order to maintain only the παράδοσις of men; in like manner, at ver. 9 again with the repeated ironical καλῶς (which is at the same time still to be understood as at ver. 6) ἀθετεῖτε ἵνα τηρήσητε, "full well ye reject—that ye may keep." He specifies, moreover, at ver. 8, that Christ also expressly mentioned before the βαπτισμοὺς ξέστων καὶ

* Mark: κορβᾶν, ὅ ἐστι δῶρον—just as Josephus (*Antiq.* iv. 4, 4): δῶρον δὲ τοῦτο σημαίνει κατὰ Ἑλλήνων γλῶτταν. But whether in this simple δῶρον be expressed at the same time the oldest and most general ground-idea of all *offering* before *God* properly speaking (only gift, not atonement or substitution), we are inclined strongly to doubt in opposition to Rudelbach and Guericke (*Zeitschrift*, 1850, iii. 504).

† So much is true, but it is going too far to affirm that, according to the doctrine and practice, it was enough to say: Thou shalt have as little of it as if I were to offer it!

* There is a Chinese saying: If a man show reverence for his father and mother in his house, why go farther to burn spices?

† In general then the text here stands in opposition to all unjustifiable vows, inasmuch as we are only entitled to vow what it is in our power and right to perform. Luther used it in particular against even cloister-vows taken in opposition to the will of parents.

ποτηρίων, "washing of cups and pots," and represents him as adding twice at ver. 8 and 13: *And many other such like things do ye.* Christ may indeed have expressed himself thus, inasmuch as he brought forward the Corban "as an example;" still Mark seems here, at the same time, to fall into an amplifying fulness of words, in order rightly to denote in his *own* manner the same contrast which Matthew with his conciseness represents still more sharply and truly.

Verses 7—9. *Ye hypocrites!* who cover the grossest transgression of the law, with miserable, trifling, outward observances, with empty phrases, and yet must know what you persuade yourselves and others that you do not know! (Luke xi. 40). Every ordinance of man that is contrary to the existing word of God, is in its innermost origin and development truly hypocrisy, and can only consist with a general relation to God such as Christ now imputes to these hypocrites from the prophecy of Isaiah, thus sealing his own plain words of rebuke and reprimand with a prophetical testimony. *Καλῶς προεφήτευσε περὶ ὑμῶν, Well did he prophesy of you*—this may certainly also mean: his words are quite applicable to you, are *true* (really and truly, is it not so? which καλῶς may also mean, Mark, ver. 9), when spoken of you. Such accommodation is certainly also allowed, and occurs here and there. But we must here contradict those who wisely remark that Christ applies prophetical words merely to his own time, and yet hastily affirm that a prophet speaks only to his contemporaries. It may be thoroughly demonstrated that, even in by far the most instances in which it appears to be so, there yet remains a προφητεύειν or prophesying as regards the future for which the whole Scripture has been written aforetime; chiefly in the case before us did the Sprit in Isaiah mean more than the then existing people. But to demonstrate this fully would require a profound investigation of the whole subject of Isaiah the prophet, to whose prophecies (truly ill-used in the recent exegesis) the present writer has given the most careful study. It may be permitted, at least, to note the following.* In the entire section, Isaiah xxiv.–xxxv. (under Hezekiah, when Israel goes down and Judah remains), a threatening and a promise are three times set over against each other, and the prospect as regards the future opened up for the people; either as false Israel to be rejected and to fall in the judgment of Babylon, or as the true Israel of God to attain to the salvation of Zion (as both were already at ch. xiii.–xiv. opposed to each other). Of these three "layers" (as we like to designate the uniformly commencing sections of the prophetical discourse) the *middle* one embraces ch. xxviii.–xxxii., in which this general view is specially amplified into a *doctrine*, and stronger prominence is given to that which forms the innermost ground-intuition of all the prophets, namely, that by purifying judgments the true Israel is to be separated from the false, is to be won and prepared (ch. xxvii. 6–13). Thus now is indeed ch. xxviii. connected with the state of Israel and Judah under Hezekiah, but forthwith (for the prophetical address pulsates in such contrasts and combinations) ch. xxix. stretches far beyond, speaks of more than one future siege and dispersion (comp. ver. 3 with Luke xix. 43), comprehends (ver. 14) the wondrous dealings of God with this people even to the still future removal of their blindness (vers. 18, 19); it speaks therefore (vers. 9–14) by no means merely of the then existing state, but of the *entire intermediate period* which now lies open to view in the present Rabbinical Judaism (to which alone the whole delineation in its most literal sense applies), and which in the time of Christ must already in its first groundwork have manifested itself to him in the same character. Then follow chs. xxx.–xxxii., which, again returning to the contemporaries and connecting with their conduct, and yet reaching forward to all times, contain an exhortation on this prophetical text: "Yield yourselves to the guidance of God and go not in the ways of men! I the Lord am he who alone leadeth you to salvation!" O that we learned to read the prophets with such a profound and comprehensive glance as Christ read, understood, and explained them!

What Christ here adduces, is properly in the original text (although the Sept. only renders the לָכֵן following, not the יַעַן כִּי) a protasis, whose apodosis thereby brought to mind contains the threatening: "Therefore will I also proceed to do a marvellous work among this people, even a wonderful work, for the wisdom of their wise man shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid!" I will give them up to their blindness, so that out of Pharisaism shall at length grow the madness of the Talmud. With all their other differences Matthew and Mark are entirely at one in the citation, with the exception of the immaterial transposition of the οὗτος, *this*, and the completeness of the first clause which is probably genuine in Matthew, and has fallen aside in Mark (for we can neither dispense with the ἐγγίζει as the necessary antithesis to πόρρω ἀπέχει, nor with the στόματι as the point of connection for ver. 11 afterwards). *Mouth* and *heart* are divided, as Ezek. xxxiii. 31, and "on the lips" is still more emphatic than "in the mouth." In the main substance (only that τοῖς χείλεσί με τιμᾷ is transposed for ἐν τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσί με, as also διδασκαλίας) the citation follows the text of the Sept. (where וּתְהִי is read for וַתְּהִי). The sense remains the same. What the Hebrew says is properly: And their fear before me, their whole religion and piety is a learned, outwardly imparted, commandment

* With which at least the *Introduction*, p. 70 to 72, in my interpretation of the *Not-pseudo Isaiah* may be compared.

of men—the Greek gives prominence by the μάτην to the *nothingness*, the emptiness of such worship, and thus admirably corresponds with the ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων, "*commandments* of men"; comp. the same expression, Col. ii. 22. They are, as it were, not even worthy the name of ἐντολαί, *commands* (as of the Decalogue), at all events they are the commandments of *men*, for the קַדְמוֹנִים (ancients) also, with all that they say and lay down, are nothing more. Human commandment and human doctrine never go farther indeed than the *hand* and *foot*, while God desires the heart of his people. If this be far from him, then must he also put his people from him, so that rejecting them, he says: *This people*—no longer *my* people (as Isa. xxviii. 11, vi. 9, 10, viii. 6, 12, and so in many places).

Verses 10, 11. Christ now, seeing that he has spoken of the corruption of the whole people as proceeding from these incorrigible hypocrites, leaves the blind leaders (ver. 14), and calls the *people* openly to him, in order to give them a faithful, earnest warning against such doctrine of men: *Hear and understand.** In Mark, still more emphatically, *all* the people —Hear me *all* of you and understand. In like manner afterwards once more: If any one has ears to hear, let him hear! In a strikingly compact antithesis and plain apophthegm, he embodies his important doctrine, which, with deep-searching wisdom, is opposed to the lying and hypocritical work of outward ordinances, in order thus "to stamp it as the people's coin." What defiles the man, and what does not—namely, the man properly so-called, the inner man upon whom God looks—by this is already indicated what the explanation afterwards (vers. 18–20) brings into full light. When, however, Mark omits precisely the antithesis between going into and coming out of the mouth, although in this the point of the saying as a "parable" lies, and puts instead of this his ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, "without the man," as also the more forcible οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινῶσαι, "*cannot* defile him" —it is quite evident that this is an anticipation of the subsequent explanation, and hardly corresponds with the original form of the saying. Even in the explanation afterwards he does not mention the mouth, so that one might include under what he says, also the actions proceeding from the man, while yet Christ in the first place means only the *word* as the most immediate out-going of the heart. We see that Mark has less the gift of seizing and representing discourses, than of delineating narratives; still we see, at the same time, that notwithstanding, he was allowed to fall into no substantial error. What Christ means is also clear enough in his account. All that comes *from without* to the man, such as eating and drinking (and then, farther, eating with washen or unwashen hands, etc. καὶ ἄλλα παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλά, comp. Rom. xiv. 17; Heb. xiii. 9)—is in itself an ἀδιάφορον, or thing indifferent, can neither defile nor *cleanse* in the true sense of the word. Even in the sacrament, eating and drinking is in itself nothing, with reference to which Origen found reason to apply the saying anew to the Christians.. It is evident, moreover, that it is by no means therefore a matter of indifference what one eats and drinks, in so far as this, on the other hand, comes out of the heart and works in the heart; for even the first prohibition of God was a prohibition of meat, and in Luke xxi. 34 Christ warns his disciples against burdening the heart with surfeiting and drunkenness, and the apostle must needs earnestly point out to the Romans and Corinthians what it is to eat from faith and in love. When, in opposition to temperance societies, some have sought recently to justify the use of brandy as being something that only goes into the mouth, the argument has been well answered: See how impurely it soon again goes out by the mouth! All this will afterwards appear more precisely in the explanation given by Christ.

Verses 13, 14. When Christ came to the house (see Mark) the disciples ask him to give a more particular account of what he had been saying. Their first scruple respecting the unsparing manner in which Christ shamed and offended the Pharisees, as well as the answer which Christ made to it, is found only in *Matthew*, who is the more intelligible notwithstanding the greater conciseness of his account. It is very natural that, of the two questions which they have at heart, this should be the first to break forth; for although (ver. 11) they had not quite understood what they heard, yet its manifest contrariety to the Pharisaic doctrine was to them evident enough. How, now, if the people should appeal to this word of Christ against their masters? The thing appeared to them all the more perplexing the less that they had been accustomed hitherto to such warmth on the part of their Master; with an amiable boldness (for his humility had accustomed them so to speak with him) they ask him whether he who, at other times, knows and well considers every thing, has this time also known and considered what great offence his words must give to the Pharisees. Why didst thou speak the word so publicly and openly to them? Answer: As by my acts, I protest against their ordinances, and ye with me, so did I also speak this now *in order to root out the ordinances of men!* Be not concerned in doing this, about giving offence to the seducers, there is a present necessity and duty—for such ordinances are *destructive.* Never more sharply than here has Christ expressed himself in favor of a decisive resoluteness as opposed to all *compromise*, which would yield any thing of the salutary truth Those, however, altogether mistake the mean-

* Euthymius: ἐκείνους μὲν ἐπιστομίσας καὶ καταισχύνας ἀφῆκεν ὡς ἀνιάτους. τρέπει δὲ τὸν λόγον πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον ὡς ἀξιολογώτερον, "them indeed having silenced and shamed, he left as incurable; while he turns his discourse to the multitude as more worthy to be addressed."

ing of his words who, in ver. 13, already understand the ἐκριζοῦσθαι, *being rooted up*, of the destruction of the *persons*, referring to the parable of the field; for the rooting up which is here commanded must evidently be something different from that which is there forbidden. Bengel's remark is quite correct, that φυτόν, *plant*, is what has grown naturally, φυτεία, *planting*, what is planted and fostered by man. Consequently the *plants* not planted by the heavenly Father (in his vineyard, his people) are here, it is evident, precisely the ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων, "commandments of men," ordinances, doctrines, regulations, which must be cleared away again. (See, on the other hand, chap. xxiii. 2, 3, by way of supplement to what is here said.) Not till ver. 14 is any thing said of the destruction of men: and first, that this is the sad result of those ordinances; consequently, that precisely for this reason the error is to be rooted up, so that the poor men may not fall by it into perdition. The seduced perishes with the seducer (Luke vi. 39)—unless the saving truth of God interposes. This, however, is done, and shall be done, irrespective of its being an offence to the seducers; it is a salutary offence when the blind are called to halt on their way to the pit. Therefore let them go, do not mind them, be not concerned about their *being offended*. The reforming protest against human commandments has divine *right*, it is a holy *duty;* at the same time, there lies in ἐκριζωθήσεται, *shall be rooted up*, the *promise* indicated, that a time will at length come when there will be an end to the reforming which at present continues to be ever necessary. Meanwhile, in patient hope and earnest zeal, every after-growth of human ordinances is to be resisted and abolished by the pure word, as much as possible, although the men themselves, out of whose evil heart they proceed, are to be borne with, and may not be rooted out of the world, which is God's field. Blind leaders of the blind: thus has Christ already spoken in the Sermon on the Mount, and again he speaks similarly at Matt. xxiii. 16, 24; here, however, he at the same time alludes still to the prophecy of Isaiah, chap. xxix. 10–12, 18; ix. 16; iii. 12.

Verse 16. Hereupon, Peter, in the name of the rest of the disciples, brings forward the other question, as to how this offensive discourse is properly to be understood, with respect to which they had only perceived that there lay beneath it much that was important, new, and as yet unheard of in Israel. The explanations of the parables in ch. xiii. made it a pleasure to them to ask such questions, and therefore as affording, so to speak, a just ground for their request, they call the simple word in ver. 11 (for this is evidently meant, as the answer shows) also a *parable*. It was, properly speaking, scarcely so to be designated, as the slightly interpretative form in which Mark gives it, and in which it at once becomes a most plain and direct address, shows; besides the going into the mouth and coming out of the mouth was no figure, if they had only recollected ch. xii. 34. Still, as the going into the mouth was plainly enough to be understood of eating, *the coming out of the mouth*, which is directly opposed to it, may with their weakness of comprehension have led them astray; probably in addition to this the surprising contradiction to the *divine* laws respecting meats (as still later, Acts x. 14), may have awakened great doubt, so that they could not reconcile themselves to the discourse as a whole. Christ, however, who on this occasion, with justice, ver. 10, had expected even from the people an *understanding* of the main truth, which was so simple, first of all chides his disciples for their want of understanding, ere he gives the answer: *Are ye also yet* so very deficient in understanding? (ἀκμήν for κατ' ἀκμήν, scil. χρόνου, *till this moment*, as the directly following οὔπω corresponds). Are ye not able as my disciples at once to perceive what belongs to the man properly so called, the internal man? Are ye also yet so taken up with what is outward, so prejudiced in Pharisaic notions and offences, that you mistake for a parable this otherwise literally clear discourse, and rather seek something else beneath it than the truth lying openly on its surface?

Verses 17, 18. The course of thought in the discourse on to the conclusion is this: *Mat* is morally indifferent, ver. 17, *words*, on the contrary, are important as coming out of the *heart*, ver. 18, *consequently* by nature evil and impure, ver. 19—upon which then, ver. 20, winding up the whole, returns to the first theme of the entire discourse. There is a decided difference between κοιλία and καρδία, for the former, the *belly*, with its meat belongs to what passes away of the present outward man (1 Cor. vi. 13), while the latter, the *heart*, is the θησαυρός (treasure) of the man, properly speaking, and his disposition of mind.* (Compare also Col. ii. 16, 17, 22, in order to see that Christ here, while he rejects the commandments of men relating to the sphere of the outward and indifferent, at the same time undeniably makes already in this general statement a prophetical allusion to the impending abrogation of the Levitical laws regarding meats, Acts x. 14, 15; 1 Tim. iv. 4.) For it was indeed necessary that such hints should already come from his lips, in order that what was afterwards so fitted to create surprise might rest upon his authority: and precisely because he will include this in his far-stretching glance does he adhere (which Mark has overlooked) throughout the whole discourse so specially to the *mouth*, the eating, not the hands and their washing. He will certainly,

*Compare the passage in Philo: στόματι, δι' οὗ γίνεται θνητῶν μέν, ὡς ἔφη Πλάτων, εἴσοδος, ἔξοδος δὲ ἀφθάρτων. Ἐπειδέρχεται μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ σιτία καὶ ποτά, φθαρτοῦ σώματος φθαρταὶ τροφαί· λόγοι δὲ ἐξιασίν, ἀθανάτου ψυχῆς ἀθάνατοι νόμοι, δι' ὧν ὁ λογικὸς βίος κυβερνᾶται (*De opif. mund.* 1. 29).

at the same time, say: The reason of the *divine* commandments hitherto, which relate to the mouth, lies not in the meats themselves; they in no wise mean the eating or not eating in itself, as the Pharisees take them, and in their own fashion multiply them, but obedience. Every thing clean and unclean—where God has hitherto declared any thing to be unclean (as likewise ordained washings)—belongs to the *heart*, so that in those cases the eating or not eating already previously *comes out of the heart*, just as was the case in the forbidden fruit of Paradise. In saying this Christ speaks without false affectation, and with holy dignity, of every thing human, even of the ἀφεδρών or "draught"—partly on account of the obtuseness of his disciples on this occasion (as if he said to them, thus must I speak to you in a downright way, in order that you may understand), partly, in the exalted point of view according to which, even in the Old Testament, laws were given for the impurities of men, in their present state unfortunately burdened with such (Deut. xxiii. 12-14). Profoundly significant is the certainly genuine additional clause of Mark, who here also supplements what is said by Matt: καθαρίζον πάντα τὰ βρώματα, *purging all* [the] *meats*. The participle to which ὅ ἐστι, *which is*, is to be supplied, applies to the whole clause: Which process, which business of separation at the end (*not* the previous washing) purges all meats, *i. e.*, removes from the *meat* properly so-called, that which, in some sense certainly, is impure in it, and thus does enough for the occasion; as, first of all in a physical, so then in a higher sense, compensation is made by evacuation for what, speaking generally, is impure for man in the whole business of meats. That of which Christ here so significantly speaks was for him, therefore, even a humble work of *purification* for the βρώματα, "meats," in the enjoyment of which and their passage through the flesh he was made like to us.*

All, therefore, that enters into the mouth goes in this natural way to be purged, and does not really defile the man with abiding impurity. But does *all*, too, that comes out of the mouth and heart *defile* him? It is true that (in Matt. and Mark), πᾶν, *all*, is not repeated here, yet the τὰ δὲ ἐκπορευόμενα, τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον, *but the things, thing, that go forth*, are put quite as generally. Nor does Christ say, by way of limiting these expressions: But whatsoever *evil*, *impure*, thing comes out. He means, therefore, truly all that the naturally corrupt heart of man brings forth, he takes the natural man as he is, as entirely impure, and of himself ever defiling himself anew; it is precisely this that with great severity he opposes to Pharisaism! The τὸν ἄνθρωπον, *the man*, which occurs twice in ver. 11, and now recurs in the explanation (Mark has it emphatically still oftener), is the culminating point of the whole discourse, which rises from the *belly* to the *heart*, and thus to the *man*, properly speaking. That which goes into the belly belongs not to the man in the sense in which Christ here uses the word. Therefore Mark more fully: That which from without comes into the man (*i. e.* in the common use of the term and to appearance), *cannot* defile him; *for* it goes *not* into his heart (properly his *inner part*), but into the belly, and continues, therefore, also in the εἰσπορεύεσθαι, *entering in*, to be yet properly ἔξωθεν, *without*; to which ἔξωθεν an ἔσωθεν, *without and within*, is then twice sharply opposed. What the tongue from natural, unrestrained impulse speaks, is only evil and poison from the hell of the heart; what the man lets out, is partly a manifestation of the impurity of his innermost being which is already there, partly a fault, inasmuch as he, every time reacting upon himself, further stains himself with his own filth (James iii. 6, 8). From this we will understand the sharp concluding words in their striking generality.

Verses 19, 20.—A *dictum probans* (proof text) for original sin, as strong as we could wish it to be. Ἐκ τῆς καρδίας, "*from the heart*"—this means certainly *the man*, here spoken of as he is in himself and every where; Mark has besides τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *of men*. Ye are totally and entirely *unclean* in your *sins*, Christ would say; here eating or washing from without, will afford no help, but there is needed an entirely different *cleansing* of the altogether perverted and corrupted heart (Jer. xvii. 9). This the wilfully blind Pharisee overlooks, and goes on defiling himself, while he foolishly holds with so much zeal his manifold distinctions of clean and unclean (chap. xxiii. 24, 27; Luke xi. 39, τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν, your own inward part, ye merely outwardly washed vessels!) Christ will certainly not thereby say that out of every man's heart and mouth only evil proceeds; but where good proceeds, there it has been previously implanted by grace, and comes therefore not properly from the man himself. He might also have said: Out of the heart proceed hypocritical words, when the people draw near to God with the mouth, ver. 8—but he has said this already, and he now rather discloses to the hypocrites what other sins in general, if not in works yet in equivalent

* A later Jewish statute prescribes that a man should go to stool, and if possible empty himself out ere he sit down to meat, in order that he may eat with *clean* stomach and belly; which the very wise Rabbins find in the "putting away of the old before the new" (Lev. xxvi. 10). If this, perhaps, had been said even at that time, we might find in it an occasion for Christ's discourse, which accounts for his going so far into the matter. For the rest we have here at the same time a testimony against that Gnostic doctrine, for example of Valentinus, which Clemens of Alexandria thus mentions: ἤσθιε καὶ ἔπιεν ἰδίως, οὐκ ἀποδιδοὺς τὰ βρώματα, "he ate and drank peculiarly, not evacuating his victuals:" so great was the power of the ἐγκράτεια (continence) of Christ: ὥστε καὶ μὴ φθαρῆναι τὴν τροφὴν ἐν αὐτῷ, "that even his food did not grow corrupt within him" (cited by Dorner, i. 457).

words, are always flowing out of their heart (chap. xii. 34, 37). As a comprehensive generic idea, stand first of all the broad and deep-reaching *διαλογισμοὶ πονηροί, evil thoughts.* These are the innermost, first, heart-discourse and heart-thoughts, which in every word and work, were already there as properly sin, ere they represented themselves outwardly; in them precisely the *ἐξέρχεσθαι, going forth*, of all sins from the heart is made convincingly manifest.* These are lusts and passions, doubts and contradictions, these are in particular, for example, such questions also as were before addressed to him (ver. 2), and, on the whole, such elaborate systems of lies as do away with God's commandment; we cannot take the expression too generally in order to comprehend under it the catalogue of sins which follows. This, however, is in Matthew specialized only according to the decalogue, from which the concluding and transition-command of the first table was adduced before; therefore the catalogue goes on from this point, and all the sins against the commandments of the second table are named in correct order. *Βλασφημίαι*, "blasphemies," are accordingly calumnies and insults against one's neighbor; the last commandment had already been included in the *διαλογισμούς*, "*thoughts.*" This simple arrangement might occur to Matthew, who here abridges more and extracts the kernel, while in Mark we find a greater variety of species. And though he may have added some expressions, yet the conclusion again speaks to us as genuine and original, and invented by no reporter. First of all, Mark also follows the order of the Sinaitic commandments (with the exception of that remarkable transposition of the seventh and the sixth which sometimes occurs): *μοιχεῖαι, πορνεῖαι—φόνοι—κλοπαί* and *πλεονεξίαι*, "*adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts*, and *covetousness*," are evidently to be taken together —now (instead of the literal *ψευδομαρτυρίαι*, "false witness," of Matt.) he has four other expressions which, however, by the following *βλασφημία*, "blasphemy," show that they yet collectively belong to the ninth (Lutheran eighth) commandment. For by *πονηρίαι* "wickedness," side by side with *δόλος*, "deceit," are evident'y meant wickedness, malicious acts, injuring one's neighbor through falsehood (comp. Rom. i. 29)—*ἀσέλγεια*, "lasciviousness," in like manner, beside *ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός*, "an evil eye," cannot fall back again into *μοιχεῖαι, πορνεῖαι*, "adulteries, fornications," but in its fundamental signification means *petulantia*, self-will, wantonnesss. As theft and covetousness, doing injury and guile, belong to each other as the more open and more concealed form of the same sin, so also does petulence bear the same relation to the עַיִן רָע or evil eye of envy. All these are still included in a certain measure under the one commandment: Thou shalt not speak or be false against thy neighbor; they however penetrate so deeply into it as to reach beyond it to the *last* commandment, which is wanting in Matthew. Finally, in the concluding words after *βλασφημία*, "blasphemy," which are peculiar to Mark (the connecting link lying in the twofold sense of that expression, blasphemy against God and against our neighbor), a return is made in a most direct and profound manner to the general *ground* of all sin, as the first table reveals itself in the first commandment: *pride* against the Highest is, as inward idolatry, the evil ground of all sin (Sirach x. 12, 13, in the Greek), while from this pride flows all the *ἀφροσύνη*, "foolishness," that is connected with sin. Thus does the conclusion lead completely back to the beginning, and there is here attested by Christ, we think, a truth which cannot be too thoughtfully considered, namely, that all *want of understanding* in the blind, all *unreason* and folly on the part of those who are led captive by human madness in opposition to God's word, is a fault and a sin proceeding out of the evil ground of the proud heart; which will be made manifest in the Sadducees and Hegelians of our own day before Christ's judgment, as it was then in the Pharisees.

THE CANAANITISH WOMAN.

(Matt. xv. 24, 26, 28; Mark vii. 27, 29.)

That Christ *departed* (Matt. *ἀνεχώρησεν*, Mark *ἀπῆλθεν*), refers evidently to the stir that had just been made and the offence that had been given, from which, according to his usual practice, he again withdraws himself. He does not, indeed, betake himself beyond the boundary of Judea actually into the country of the heathen, for this, on account of what is said, ver. 24, is not to be supposed,* but near to it, towards the confines of the country of Tyre and Sidon.† From this time onwards we

* "The *διαλογισμοὶ πονηροί*, in relation to the following *φόνοι, μοιχεῖαι*, etc., are certainly not to be understood as a distinct species of sin beside the others, but as the *first step in the development* of sin, with which the others are then connected as the realization of these in act" (Jul. Müller, *on Sin*, i. 337, Clark's *For. Theol. Library*).

* The visit to Phœnicia, here by mistake inserted, is therefore only a chimera of Sepp's, which we have already put aside.

† Matt. *εἰς τὰ μέρη*, here equivalent to *versus regiones*, as the Syriac expresses it, for Mark says,

observe in the Gospels that he also more and more avoids publicity in Galilee (see especially Mark ix. 30, *παρεπορεύοντο*, which Grotius rightly interprets *παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἐπορεύοντο*, they went by by-ways). The inhabitants of the sea-coast around Tyre and Sidon were called in the special sense Canaanites (Judges i. 31, 32; Num. xiii. 30; and, with a play upon the name, Isa. xxiii. 8), or Phœnicians (*Φοινίκες*, Exod. vi. 15; Josh. v. 1, in the Sept.), in which case the Syrophœnicians and Libyphœnicians (*Συροφοίνικες*, *Λιβυφοίνικες*) were distinguished; and when Mark at the same time designates the woman in respect of her *γένος* or "nation" by *Ἑλληνίς* or "Greek," he only means by this in general, a *heathen* woman, so that we cannot find with Niemeyer in her striking reply (ver. 27) a "fine Grecian wit." The beginning of the account, in Mark, makes it appear as if she had sought out Christ in his house, but the crying after him (Matt. ver. 23) plainly shows that she had already called to him on the way. According to Mark iii. 8; Luke vi. 17, the fame of Christ's deeds was spread abroad also in this district; so soon therefore as this woman of great faith, who had a daughter possessed of a devil, had heard of the coming of the great Helper, which could not be hid, she sought him out (Mark ver. 25). She addresses him not merely by the general title of honor, *Κύριε*, "Sir," but, in order that she may make no oversight, she adds also the Israelitish appellation, "Son of David."† She begs for *pity;* but he pities her not! The fountain of mercy, usually open to every hand that only touches the hem of his garment, flows not, the much lauded Physician and Helper will not heal and help; the friendly mouth, which is ever so ready to give comfort, is silent. He answered her not a word—not a word either, however, of refusal: I will not, dare not, help you, be gone and leave me or the like—to say this is to him impossible, for it becomes hard enough for him to be silent. The disciples cannot understand their Master; it has been so much his practice to *dismiss* all suppliants by hearing and helping them, that this has become the understood rule of his conduct. *Ἀπόλυσον αὐτήν*, *i.e.*, not certainly: *Put her away* at least, if thou wilt not help her; but it includes the helping as pre-supposed. Still, their request on her behalf springs not purely from sympathizing love, but here is a seeming against a seeming; the compassionate Master *seems* harsh, and the disciples *seem* more compassionate than he, while they are thinking at least quite as much of themselves as of the suppliant and her distress. For although the reason they give for their request is intended at the same time to mean as regards Christ: The people hear it, and now there will arise a real stir which yet thou art anxious to avoid—still the most important reason to them betrays itself in the very bold "us:" the Canaanitess is disagreeable to us, and troublesome with her crying. Hence they do not express themselves in the manner most natural to the awakened feeling of love: Help her, hear her (do take pity on her! would certainly not have been proper)—but, *Send her away!* Pray, make haste, and rid *us* of her and her crying! A truly injurious supposition on their part that such a reason could move Christ to help her, as it did them.

The remarkable answer of Christ opens to them an entirely different point of view, in which he kindly passes over every thing in the way of rebuke, actually defends himself humbly against their misapprehension of his conduct, and *adduces a weighty reason* for his surprising silence. Most of the practical commentators and preachers fall here into the error which has become traditional, namely, that Christ, thoroughly knowing the woman's heart, had from the first determined to help her, but meant previously to draw out her great and exemplary faith by a feigned refusal in the way of trial.* Thus the pre-determined counsel of God is improperly mixed up with the human acting and consciousness of Jesus, which is by no means at all times and entirely to be merged in the former; so here beyond regard to that which happens to the woman certainly in part as an example for us, the innermost significance of the narrative for Christ's own person, the wonderful conterminons meeting of the divine and the human in him, upon which, in the passage before us, much light is thrown, is not at all understood; thus is entirely overlooked a circumstance that lies quite on the surface, namely that Christ, when he first breaks silence, says what we read (Matt. ver. 24) actually *to the disciples*, as necessary information for them, and by no means merely that the woman may thereby hear it *obliquely*. This is, consequently, the real key-word to the enigma of his seemingly harsh silence (which Mark surprisingly enough passes over, while it is essential to the story as told in the Gospel of Matthew); this is indeed a truth which we are not at liberty to explain away as if the words were not spoken in earnest.

I am "*sent*,"—in this expression (as he elsewhere also says, I am *come*, and that sixteen times, but on the other hand he speaks only four times in the first three Gospels, and forty

εἰς τὰ μεθόρια, *in confinia*, border, neighborhood. Matthew says of the woman: *ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων ἐκείνων ἐξελθοῦσα*, "*came out* of the same coasts"; Christ had, therefore, not come into her country.

† Which reference to the Jewish designation presents no difficulty whatever, so that we are not under the necessity of supposing with Lange (after Sepp), that the daughter who was possessed had a revelation of the name Jesus and the title Son of David.

* Even Bengel incomprehensibly thinks, that Jesus, in the exercise of his foreknowledge, made this entire journey to the borders on this woman's account.

times in the fourth, of his being sent and of "him who hath sent him," comp. John vii. 28 and the context)—in this expression he represents his whole earthly life and labors as subject to the Father's commission and appointment. In this commission is exactly prescribed what he is to do (Luke iv. 43), and besides obeying this he does nothing. Now, as the *sent* prophet, miracle-worker, and Messiah, he was, on account of the promises, actually a servant of the circumcision (Rom. xv. 8); not until his exaltation, was the salvation to be extended also to the Gentiles (John xii. 32). He was, therefore, bound by his instructions, as he here not less clearly than humbly says to his disciples. He *actually thought*, in his silence toward the first and only suppliant from the heathen world, properly speaking (for such is this woman in the Gospels): I dare not help her! Else he had been quite as prepared to answer her prayer as he was that of the centurion of Capernaum, the friend of the Jews. He will not, by passing over to a foreign sphere, draw to himself many needy Gentiles by giving help to one, and by thus opening a new theatre of action which is yet closed to him, give offence to the Jews as if he were not their "Son of David." It was not merely fit (as Bengel, on the other side, observes half correctly), that he should lay down, by way of testimony (before giving the help which he had determined to give), such a protestation against further consequences; but the protestation is meant in literal and entire earnest just as it stands. "The keen scenting, timorous, light-hating sagacity of the watchmen on Zion, the close suffocating air" (to speak with the poet Lange), has driven him, if not over, at least upon the boundary of the Holy Land; yet he speaks of that wicked Israel, whom he has to rebuke and from whom he has to withdraw himself, here as always, outwardly with the honor and dignity becoming him on account of his calling (for example, John iv. 22). For it is, and continues to be, *the house of Israel* to the lost sheep of which alone he is sent, in the first place, during his life upon earth. He has not now left them in order to give them up, and turn without distinction to the Gentiles before the time; he himself, in faithful obedience to the Father's commission as a whole, does not now at once perceive that the Father has brought to him here an exception to the rule—until he comes to see it in the victorious faith of the woman, as he oftentimes learned his Father's will, as regards the particular case, by what happened to him. Only thus we believe is the full justice of an unprejudiced interpretation (without bringing into it what is not there) insured to this earnest and most significant word of Christ's mouth, and to the entire narrative in which it stands. It is a *heathen woman* who now, contrary to time and order, desires help of the *Messiah—this* the disciples had forgotten, but he knew what significance belongs to this, and maintains the great distinction, when it is proper to do so, as firmly against the inconsiderateness of men, as, on the other hand, he can humble Jewish pride, and prophesy of the *future* salvation of the Gentiles who accept its offered blessings.

She has heard this—the poor heathen mother who feels the plague of her little daughter as her own, and asks compassion and help for herself in the healing of her child; but she does not let herself be led astray, she reasons not thus: It is then not true what I have heard of his readiness to help *all*. He is indeed but the Messiah of the Jews, who has no compassion for us heathen! Either Christ now at least stood still, when he spoke to his disciples, or she forces her way through to him, falling at his feet and ceasing not to cry: *Lord, help me!* No longer, "Son of David"—for this, as she has perceived, belongs only to the house of Israel, but she still repeats: *Lord*, mighty universal Lord, I leave thee not; *help me!* The most condensed form of expression wrung from the anguish of her heart; nor does she any longer say, *Have mercy on me!* but what at bottom is still stronger than this. Will Christ now help? Not yet! She first receives directly the same information as the disciples, and that expressed still more strongly, in which Christ rises from mere silence to the worst of excessive harshness—and yet there is no express refusal. It avails not that thou callest me Son of David, thou art a heathen woman. Christ here adopts the language of the Jews, who called the Gentiles *dogs*. Those who before were the lost *sheep*, to whom the shepherd belongs, are now the *children*—namely, of the *house* of Israel, the family of God, and what he now is, or can give, is the *children's bread*. Already, however (alluding to further perseverance), there lies beneath the seeming harshness the utmost *kindness:* these unbelieving Jews, who have even now almost driven me from their country, are yet the *children!* Οὐκ ἔστι καλόν, *it is not right*, not proper, cannot be desired, that one *take* the children's bread arbitrarily, contrary to the order of the house, and *cast* it to dogs! The *Berlenburg Bible* adds not amiss: I dare not—"*else might the Jews say*," It is not right. In their right and name, indeed, Christ here speaks; yet his kindness, which cannot deny itself, softening still further the severity, of his words, says *little dogs*—in which diminutive the idea of uncleanness (chap vii. 6), gives place to that of dependence, of clinging to (as now the woman does), of belonging to men and the family.* The words "sound like, No! they do not however say No, but waver and hang in suspense" (Heinr. Müller)—only every claim preferred in the impetuosity of the prayer must be broken, and every *right*, even were it only that of the Jews to the fulfillment of the promise, be taken away from this *heathen* woman. In this οὐκ ἔστι καλόν and κυναρίοις ("it is not right," and "[little] dogs") the

* In which feeling for the mode of expression Luther also has put "little dog" in Tob. vi. 1.

compassionate heart of Christ already moves towards the *presentiment*, that it is the Father's will to make here an *exception*, anticipatory of his *mercy* (Rom. xv. 9). According to Mark, he said before this: Let the children *first* be filled—in which πρῶτον there lies the idea: It is not yet *time* for the Gentiles. This gives another spark of hope to the suppliant; it is at the same time a prophecy of the Spirit from the mouth of Christ, which might suggest to us the thought—Ah! they are unhappily too *full*, seeing they have cast the bread of God away from them, out to the dogs!

The same spirit which bids Christ speak thus and not otherwise, now teaches the heathen woman to advance farther, and to seize hold of the help which has been held out to her in this harsh word. Well might she afterwards her whole life long be astonished almost, at the bold, ingenious, pressing answer which the spirit of grace and supplication instantly suggested to her; for this spirit works every where in such moments of anguish, when a human soul struggling for the help of *God* (and that this was the case here is evident in the κύριε) becomes wise and ingenious to lay hold on the smallest finger. There is in the words of the woman, along with the ἀνθρώπινον or human also something θεῖον or divine, in virtue of which it was worthy of occupying a place in the Holy Scripture of the New Testament, as a pattern of wrestling prayer, the most perfect unity of humility, which bears all denial or chiding, and of trust, which is yet never given up.* She cleaves to the friendly word, "little dogs," in which Christ has betrayed his heart to her—"she catches him in his own words" (Luther)—"takes the sword out of his hand and slays him with it" (Heinr. Müller)—"drives back the arrow into his heart" (Rieger). *Yes, Lord!* thus speaks humility; pride would say: No, I am not a dog, I will not be cast out among them! No! says pride in many even till this day; but "No, *Lord!*" even when the Lord accuses, rejects all claim, shuts thee out as unclean from the family rights of the heavenly Father's dear children! Oh, that *then* at least, all might surrender themselves with the all-conceding acknowledgment: *Yea, Lord!* Oh, that we might learn from this woman at all times to *connect* with this, as closely the powerful importunate "but yet." In the connecting together of these two words is involved the whole order of salvation and prayer. Such faith finds the promise in the very refusal, makes the unworthiness, precisely as neediness, the plea for favor. The dogs—hast thou said? *Well, then*,† the dogs are and remain *beneath the table* when they are hungry, and do not let this little place in the house be taken from them. When the children break their bread (Mark has now παιδία for τέκνα) when from *their master's* table ψιχία fall (double diminutive: *little crumbs*), there is then no need, properly speaking, for λαβεῖν καὶ βαλεῖν, *taking and casting*, which I am not asking; for the dogs are contented even with the smallest share, if only they do not starve with hunger! I am even now, O Lord, not far from the table; even now there falls for us Gentiles a crumb of bread from Israel's table, seeing that thou art on our boundary. The dogs eat; well, I too may eat—it is done and there is no preventing it. Thus does the word of the woman outbid all refusal on the part of Christ, and to understand and feel this aright belongs to the right understanding of his *reply*, in which he acknowledges himself all at once *overcome*.

Mark expresses this reply more according to the sense: For *this saying* go thy way, the devil is gone out of thy daughter! Thus has he also correctly rendered more in human style, as another would have spoken, the acknowledgment and granting of her request, the precise original expression not being in his mind; Matthew, however, here also literally preserves the sacredly classical usage of Christ. Hitherto Christ had not accosted the woman, but in this address all is at once granted: *O woman!* Now, after the chiding she receives a commendation in requital: *Thy faith is great!* He does not find fault with her for holding on, for being so urgent, for crying after him; he rather praises this, inasmuch as it proceeds from faith. The cry of the disciples for help, ch. viii. 25, proceeded from the weak faith of natural fear, the "help me" of this woman from great faith. He commends and rewards not the natural love which made the child's distress her own ("have mercy on *me*, help *me*"), for in this there was yet also the impulse of nature, not as in the case of the centurion's zeal in behalf of his servant. He specifies not the humility but the faith, for precisely in humility, in the full consciousness and acknowledgment of unworthiness and the absence of all right, is faith great; only where one desires and hopes for *grace*, is there *faith*. This woman has wrestled more victoriously than Jacob, who stood upon the ground of a promise; her praying has become a *willing*, before which Christ's first humanly-formed will disappears, in order that what has now plainly become the will of the Father in her may be done. As Mark began his whole narrative with a *willing* on the part of Christ, *while yet he could not* (ver. 24), so what the woman wills is now done, by a holy wonderful

* For Ναί is here certainly not a continuation of the prayer, as many are for rendering it, thus destroying the most profound psychological truth.

† Thou sayest quite truly—but I interpret it differently precisely *for* me. That is the proper sense of καὶ γάρ in the original text, which is too fine to be translated. We are not at liberty (with Von Gerlach) merely to understand: Yes, Lord, *it is lawful*, for even the dogs, etc. Such a Yes would be almost a bold *contradiction* of what Christ had said, instead of the humility which necessarily belongs to it. Luther has with delicate tact brought out the true sense here.

yielding, in the proper sense, on the part of Christ.* Now then, as thou wilt, not as I will, or would. *Such* faith has a claim and right which the Son of the Father, even as David's son, may not resist. Let not this be explained away, let nothing Docetic be brought into Christ's first or last word, so that the kernel of the whole incident may remain untouched, the testimony given in the human life of the Son, to the unsearchably mysterious truth between God and man, that *faith* conquers, and every thing yields to its will! This Christ says—and that he can and must say it, was probably to himself here one of the most important and blessed *experiences*.

THE FEEDING OF THE FOUR THOUSAND.

(Matt. xv. 32, 34; Mark viii. 2, 3, 5.)

And they praised the God of *Israel*.† Thus writes Matt. ver. 31, not precisely because the people then also certainly so expressed themselves, but by way of contrast to the preceding incident. Jesus betakes himself again to those to whom he is sent, he goes up to a hill near the sea of Galilee, his wonted resort, and there almost inviting and waiting for the people, sits down. Already (according to Mark) he had healed the deaf and dumb person on the way; now, in conformity with the duties of his office, he heals without further ado all whom any one may but boldly and reverently cast at his feet. To what a pitch was it now come in something more than a year's time since his first signs (John ii. 11, 23) with the crowding, pressing, and urgent claims of this *people*, as opposed to the enmity of their wicked leaders! Scarcely a couple of years more of this (the enemies of the Good Shepherd having tolerated him thus long)—and they were again accustomed to the works of their God, as formerly they were in the wilderness,‡ they desired them as their right, and as the ordinary course of things (see shortly Mark ix. 22), and yet were as little saved from death by them, as their fathers were by the bread from heaven. Precisely this is the folly of these sheep wandering in their sin; they know not their true malady, and seek not the true medicine and meat for eternal life. He had seriously told them this at the feeding of the multitudes on a former occasion; yet he begins now to perform his signs with patient testimony, to help and to feed at least their bodies, to show good to them as much as they desire and can receive it. It may be questioned whether, as some have said, these crowds of people who had continued with him three days were better than former ones, or were more inclined to the words of his mouth, than to the works of his hand: there is no special ground for such a supposition; and that they do not say in so many words: Spread again for us a table in this wilderness! (Psa. lxxviii. 18, 18), cannot be reckoned as a great commendation.

But the Good Shepherd's heart cannot deny itself and cannot refrain; his emotion again breaks forth in the words: Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον, "I have compassion on the multitude." As in Matt. xiv. 14; xx. 34; Mark i. 41; Luke vii. 13; this is always an expression and outgoing of that deep compassion (Matt. ix. 36) with which Christ (as in former times the God of Israel, Judges ii. 18; x. 16) stoops even to the bodily wants of the wretched, whether on a great or small scale, because their great distress—that which is truly so—moves his heart. These words in the mouth and heart of Christ have called into existence all the institutions of philanthropy, unknown to heathenism, for all sorts of indigence and distress. They are hungry—this now with Christ takes precedence of every purpose of withdrawing himself more and more from this time forward, and of all hesitation about raising again a stir such as he wished to avoid. That they have continued three days with him (although in a very different sense from that continuing with him of which we read in Luke xxii. 28), he kindly reckons to their praise; for there was indeed a spark of faith in this, in which he rejoiced. Only once to forget bread in their nearness to him—how much better than the character of so many at this day, who so often forget and forsake him in their anxiety about bread! The time comes for dismissing them to their homes, but he bethinks himself with accompanying love of the νήστεις, *fasting*, on the way, how they might faint—he cannot reconcile himself to this, and therefore he must say: οὐ θέλω, *I will not*. According to Mark he added (entering into particulars) the words: For several of them are come from far! (Certainly ἥκουσι is not, as Luther understands it, a remark of the Evangelist, but a continuation of the direct words of Christ; ἥκω is the present with a perfect signification, *are* from far.) "Here tell me whether, if the people

* Therefore, truly an "inconsistency"—as Hase heads the paragraph—but not "a beautiful weakness, the only one in his life."

† Which formal expression occurs from Exod. xxxii. 27; xxxiv. 23 (Josh. vii. 20; xiii. 14; 1 Kings i. 30), onwards through Psalms and prophets to Mal. ii. 16—which Sepp ought certainly to have known, instead of inconsiderately observing on this passage in Matt.: There were therefore many *Gentiles* among those that were cured.

‡ These words of the people whether occurring here or elsewhere can for the present only signify: Our old God still lives, and turns again to his people; comp. Luke vii. 16; i. 68; Matt. ix. 33.

had sent a message to Christ to tell him of their necessity, they could have presented a stronger case for themselves than occurs to the mind of Christ himself? Ah, good Lord, have compassion on the poor people, only think that they have continued now three days with thee; that they have nothing to eat, for they are in the desert; if thou lettest them go away without having eaten, they must faint by the way; remember that several of them have come from far! See! he himself considers all this before any one tells it to him, and has already himself made just such a prayer as they might have in their hearts, so that no one could carry it so well in his heart. I already have compassion, he says, and have already considered every thing."* He, however, takes the disciples into counsel with him as he often does in his kindness, and his whole address to them implies without its being expressed: What think ye, shall we not feed them again? The frequent remark, that this time Christ speaks first, while, on the former occasion, the disciples had directed the attention of Christ to the thing, is founded on an oversight of what we read in John vi. 5, 6; so much only is true here, that on this occasion he at once calls all his disciples together, and will thereby certainly bring to their mind the thought of the five loaves among the five thousand (Matt. xvi. 9).

And now the same Matthew, whose profound clearness in rendering the discourses of Jesus we so much admire, informs us, not less faithfully than strikingly, of his own and his fellow-disciples' perplexity on this occasion, from which it at first appears as if they had actually entirely forgotten the former miracle of feeding the multitudes. Yet we would not express ourselves on this point quite so strongly as Wizenmann: "It is, moreover, if Matthew was fabricating the story, the most *awkward* thing conceivable that he should have let the disciples give this answer." Looking at this answer psychologically, it is rather so to be understood, as expressing neither an entire forgetting nor an entire believing, but just their natural wavering state of mind and position. So much they indeed take for granted, that *they* are to have something to do in the feeding of the people, because he has called them to him, and πόθεν ἡμῖν, "Whence should *we* have?" sounds almost like a delicate allusion to the former occasion—a shy question which they only reverently conceal: *Is it to be in the same way again?* (Mark, indeed, has instead δυνήσεταί τις, "Can *any one?*" which sounds somewhat more indefinite.) It is certainly inconceivable that they should not have at all remembered the former miracle; but Christ had, on this occasion, allowed the third day to arrive before doing any thing, and many a want he did not supply in this miraculous way; they venture, therefore, to think neither one thing nor another regarding his present intention; in their embarrassment they do not at the moment well know what they shall *say*, and in reality they just say what is most direct and straightforward. Perfectly *honest*, they will neither boldly advance with their half faith to a repetition of the miracle, nor will they oppose their half doubt to what Christ has said as a direct contradiction; they therefore recur rather to what they said on the former occasion: *Whence* should we have so much bread in the wilderness as to fill so great a multitude? (On this occasion the stronger expression χορτάσαι, *fill*, is used to correspond with the νήστεις, *fasting*.) Christ at once receives this kindly, because there was in it at the same time something which recalled the procedure on the former occasion, and he therefore repeats now his former answer: *How much bread have ye?* (Mark vi. 38. viii. 5). This signified: *By all means in the same way again!* Whether the power of God really will not or cannot* create any thing new since the creation, without the "materia praejacente"—into such subtle questions we do not enter. If aught stands written to this effect, then must we read it, and if it be at this day done before our eyes (who knows all that is done?) —then our wisdom would have an end, just as the present physiology of animal life in the presence of the toad living for centuries in the stone. Now it is here said that the disciples had a little bread and a few fishes; that Christ first of all asked after these, and took them, is natural. Let him who has any wish to inquire farther suppose the case: We have nothing at all! and whether Christ would then have said, Then must the poor people indeed faint! or whether he might still have filled them with, or without meat, and done to them according to his compassion. Suffice it to say, he took also *the fishes*, which the disciples before had called *little fishes*, and, according to Matthew, at least had not counted them, while according to Mark they had not even named them—he *gives thanks* for every present gift of God, but his thanksgiving becomes a powerfully increasing blessing, when the people need and his *heart wills* it.

* Luther, *Sermon for the 7 Trin.* in the collection by Niethammer, where also he avoids and even corrects the error of his translation in Mark.

* It is a question, whether among the κυλλοῖς (ver. 30) there were maimed persons to whom Christ supplied the members that were wanting? About which, however, Grotius says, differently from Olshausen, Non video quid obstet, "I see no reason to the contrary."

REFERENCE TO THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

(Matt. xvi. 2–4; Mark viii. 12.)

Nothing is more natural than that the demand for signs should be repeated; it may quite possibly have occurred several times besides those mentioned at ch. viii. 12, here, and at John vi. 30: though not *so often* as alleged in certain standing objections and phrases brought forward against preachers, missionaries, and Christians in general, and differing according to the country and people; for the power of Christ to dismiss and deter from these objections, was greater than ours. Equally natural is it that he should repeat the same answer to the same challenge, especially as it certainly was other persons who only repeated the challenge, or rather brought it forward anew from the same disposition of mind. If this, then, was repeated once or twice, the striking answer of Christ would become commonly known in its general purport, and it would be said among his opponents: One must not come to him with this demand, else one gets for answer, The wicked and adulterous generation, and the sign of Jonah.

As, after the first feeding of the multitudes, the obstinate people desired bread *from heaven*, so probably the demand of the Pharisees and Sadducees here stands in some connection with the foregoing second feeding. They have heard of it, and (as at ch. xii) want to counteract the impression upon the people: "Who knows how this came to pass? Can he yet further, yet more conspicuously and surely, attest his power? We have asked this of him in vain!" For, that he will at all events not do what they desire, thus much do these hypocrites certainly know beforehand, although with no clear insight into the true reason of this. They say it indeed, πειράζοντες αὐτόν, *tempting him*, as Mark adds. Still, there is mingled with this presentiment of the truth, and with this malice that suppresses it, the actual folly of the Jewish opinion, according to which heavenly and earthly signs were at that time distinguished, and it was supposed that the latter might be wrought also by evil spirits (by Beelzebub). On the former occasion, therefore, when a sign was asked, it was a sign *from heaven* that was meant, as Luke says (ch. xi. 16). Matthew, however, here, for the first time, expressly specifies this. The idols of the heathen or the devils can show no sign in the heavens—as we read in the book of Baruch, ch. vi. 66 (comp. iv. 7; 1 Cor. x. 20), and the later corrupt taste has invented enough of apocryphal *manifestations from heaven* (2 Macc. ii. 22). It is uncertain whether those who now make the demand are thinking of signs such as these, or of those that are canonical, or bread from heaven such as Moses gave, causing the sun to stand still as Joshua did, calling forth thunder and rain (Jer. xiv. 22) as Samuel and Elijah, or something else; only they can hardly have had in their thoughts the Messianic signs in the heaven (Joel iii. 3, which many commentators mention here).* He has given them enough of Messiah-signs, and yet they will not receive him as the Messiah! Had he even done as many signs in the heaven as he did on earth, they would assuredly have impudently come forward still more with the objection: "What good is done to us by all these appearances and spectacles, which dazzle the mob, and which aërial spirits may produce for him by magic? Let him, instead of this, heal our sick, the lame, and the blind, as it is written in the prophets, that we may know that it is he!"†

According to Matt. ver. 4, Christ gave these knaves literally the same answer as at ch. xii. 39, where we have already explained it in its profound import. Mark, ver. 12, only indicates the same by a general expression (εἰ δοθήσεται, a formula of swearing, like the Hebrew ים), but adds, after his manner, which oftener represents the thing by such delineation of the feelings or gestures, that Christ *heaved a sigh* from the bottom of his heart (τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ), which sign finds also its expression in the words, either literally spoken, or to this effect: *Why does this generation seek after a sign?* Whence and wherefore but from unbelief and hypocrisy, which repels from itself the evident miracles and clear proofs already afforded!

Matthew who, in giving the discourses of Christ, is always the most exact of the first three Evangelists [?], so far as regards the inviolable kernel, informs us, however, that Christ here, as is always to be supposed in similar cases, by no means merely repeated the former answer, but put before it something new, which is again repeated in Luke xii. 54–57:‡ You are generally wise enough to observe and discern in the sky *what sort of weather* is already present over the earth; if you would thus attentively look at the signs now present on the earth, they would be to you signs also from heaven. However general the manner in which Christ here speaks of

* With least probability of all, the star of the Messiah according to Balaam's prophecy!

† Pfenninger's *Judische Briefe*, v. 159.

‡ And that not without a difference: here to Pharisees and Sadducees, there to the entire people; here only of the aspect of the heavens for good or bad weather in general, there specially of particular weather-signs; there more closely pressing the application to *this* time and *themselves*.

the signs of the weather, what he says is yet strikingly and picturesquely carried out; for when Christ touches any thing in nature he hits it exactly; when he says any thing to men he takes close and pressing hold of them. The sky is red in the evening as also in the morning, and yet the evening and morning redness is not the same; moreover, it is not the clear evening redness, and the cloudy morning redness. The one prognosticates a pure atmosphere even for the following day, the other shows already the present *χειμών*, the violently overflowing or tempestuous rain, although it is as yet dry and calm. (*Εὐδία* and *χειμών* are the most general antithesis of the daily weather. The verbs ending in *-άζειν*, the immediately repeated *πυῤῥάζει*, and the adding of *στυγνάζων* the second time—are, in the Greek, strongly and vividly picturesque.) Such rednesses, otherwise similar, you know how to distinguish, and to observe the difference of that which has the *στυγνάζειν* or lowering along with it;* you speak as sure weather prophets, when you see these different prognostics with a wise *Then*—saying concisely with great certainty: A fine day (is indicated for the *morrow* by this *evening*)! to-day, rainy weather! (Not even an *ἔσται*, *it will be*, is required, as in our own language.) *Στυγνός* or *στυγανός*, "lowery," does not (as we find maintained by some on this passage) originally mean *dark*, but, in reality, *sad*, although already with reference to the outward appearance (hence *στυγνὸν ὄμμα*, hence also *στυγνάσας*, Mark x. 22, as an indication of the inward *λυπούμενος*; see, however, also Ezek. xxxii. 10, in the Sept.)—the expression corresponds with the utmost propriety to the following *πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, "face of the sky," which is not (after the Hebrew פְּנֵי) to be taken for aspect in general, but: The sky looks sad or joyful, presents to us a *gloomy* or cheerful *face*. In this lively way does Christ, with the true human feeling to which he will here appeal, apprehend nature, so as in the *γινώσκετε διακρίνειν*, "ye can discern," to point to the eye so receptive and open for natural things. But now he puts *in oppositim* to these signs of the weather, which the sky presents to us when we look at it, the *σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν*, *signs of the times*, which by right should stand *side by side* with them. Already the Syriac is wrong, when it renders this expression as if it meant the signs of *this time* (דובנא הנא)—as at Luke xii. 56 Christ certainly said (*τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον*). This application, which is indeed meant, is for the present, left to be made by themselves, in a more general way, while in the first place the before-mentioned distinction of clear and gloomy days is compared to different *times*, and their conjunctures. There is no ground for supposing that *καιροί*, *times*, stands here specially for the Messianic time, compare elsewhere Mark i. 15; Luke xix. 44. Christ rather means to say, that there are in general *signs of the times*, every time has its own, all *χρόνοι* (spaces of time, periods) have as *καιροί* an import, consisting of the events that happen and coincide, to which one can and ought to give heed, in order to understand what time precisely it now is. These signs of the times to the single eye, the upright heart, should at least be quite as evident as the signs of the weather in the sky (which, according to Gen. i. 14, are also connected with still other signs of the times). Nay, these signs, in the things that happen to nations and to man, *are* indeed, at the same time, in the most proper sense of the word signs *from heaven*, of the divine government and its counsel, for all who rightly consider what indications belong to earth, especially in the light of prophecy. Not as if Christ will here *merely* (although this also has its truth) put the unhappily so often lightly-esteemed and neglected observing of the time with natural wisdom, *in opposition* to the observing of the signs from heaven; rather are we admonished here to consider the time with the true, divinely-opened eye. Israel especially had, in addition to this, the *word of prophecy* given from heaven, in the light of which to prove and learn what God, from time to time, had caused to happen; not otherwise did the prophets in earlier times come to know their times from the former word, and thus find and receive new disclosures for the present, and the remoter future. If this holds good in general, it must do so in the highest degree in regard to the time of times, the period of fulfillment and visitation in the most proper sense, in which every thing now cried aloud: Who hath ears to hear let him hear! who hath eyes to see let him see! To the Sadducees also, even without prophecy, were manifest the *signs* of the time of the Messiah, which were now present in abundance. Let ch. xi. 4–15 be recalled; what was there said Christ means here, and still more, even in the widest sense—not merely his miracles, his works, or his whole labors, after Elias had cried in the wilderness—but also that the sceptre had departed from Judah, that Daniel's year-weeks had come to an end,* and whatever else the attentive might observe; even the wicked generation might be a sign to *itself*, were it only to judge rightly of itself.

But it *will* not do so, and, therefore, Christ rebukes it when it asks and requires signs; therefore, he asks, on the other hand: *Ye hypocrites*, who know so well to *discern* the redness of the sky, *can* ye really not discern the signs of the times, not perceive the great significance of the present time which is full of signs, in contradistinction from all that have

* Quod si et nigrae (nubes) rubentibus intervenerint, et pluvias (Pliny, *Hist. nat.* xviii. 35). Christ is no stranger even to meteorology, and when he speaks of this he has well considered what is right in the ordinary sayings of men on this subject.

* For the ancient interpretation of these prophecies remains sure against all new ones.

been before it? If ye only *would!* Here is a text for a sermon to the conscience, the truth of which continually renews itself more or less strongly, although it was only then true in the strongest sense. Thus are men *hypocrites*, inasmuch as though wise in natural things, they show themselves and make themselves blind in spiritual, and like many even at this day "rather look to the weather and the barometer than into the Bible and their own heart." What is said of the weather is itself, at the same time, figurative, and to be further extended: In the political horizon they discern peace or war, εὐδία or χειμών, *fair weather* or *foul*, with cunning pragmatism as prophets of news, but as *prophets of the kingdom* to perceive God's work on the earth they are wilfully stupid, and yet, at the same time, act as if they really desired for themselves signs from heaven! Such a generation is still always, as it was then, referred to the sign of Jonah which is now set up in all the world, to the sermon concerning the risen crucified One and its effect on the earth; this is the true sign from heaven. He who believes not this, how is he to be helped against his will? And *he left them and departed!*

BEWARE OF THE LEAVEN!

(Matt. xvi. 6–11; Mark viii. 15, 17–21.)

The *warning** against the leaven of the *Pharisees and Sadducees*, which he now gives to his disciples on the way in the ship, stands in close connection, as we shall soon see, with the incident just narrated. *Leaven* is also among the heathen a metaphor for what is corrupt, bad, in so far as fermentation is taken as allied to putrefaction. In this signification the Israelites were forbidden to use it as a meat-offering (Lev. ii. 11; Amos iv. 5), as also to avoid it during the seven days of the passover (Exod. xii. 15, 19; xiii. 7), and it is, even in the New Testament applied as a figure by the apostle, 1 Cor. v. 2. The Rabbins call the יֵצֶר הָרַע, or the natural sinful imaginations and aims of the heart, שְׂאוֹר שֶׁבָּעֲסָה—*the leaven in the dough*, "because as a little leaven it leavens and corrupts the whole dough."† Accordingly in this warning Christ has certainly in his mind nothing merely outward, but, precisely as the apostle in addressing the Corinthians, a *disposition*, a *state of mind*, which, deep-sinking and all-penetrating, either steals into the heart, or is already there; the διδαχή, *doctrine*, of Matthew therefore (ver. 12) either expresses the same thing regarded internally (as our word *system*, equivalent to principle), or perhaps (which at least may be possible) is intended to hint delicately, that the understanding of the disciples at that time had as yet not penetrated into the depths of the word, but still remained standing by the "doctrine" instead of the disposition of heart.*

* Mark uses here the expression διεστέλλετο. This word elsewhere in Greek signifies originally to distinguish, then to say or appoint any thing definitely and plainly, hence at Matt. xvi. 20. Hesychius explains by διεσαφήσατο. The Septuagint puts it for הֹזְהִיר, to impart light and instruction upon any thing, then also specially to *warn*; hence in the New Testament διαστέλλειν is chiefly to *forbid*, (see Matt. xvi. 20; Mark v. 43; vii. 36; ix. 9). Elsewhere also, Heb. xii. 20 τὸ διαστελλόμενον, in general, that which was spoken to them—as Acts xv. 24, οὐ διεστειλάμεθα, we have *said expressly* or *laid down* nothing concerning this—as distinguished from, *commanded*, properly speaking. Here, therefore, in Mark, it means, to say openly to them, pointedly and earnestly *warning* them; with which the anxiously careful misunderstanding of the disciples is intended to stand in contrast—"What does he mean by this so pointed word?"

† This general reference is sufficient as a motive for the warning. Lange again certainly interprets too subtilely when he thinks, that "with the feeling of one who was driven out"—as if he now "made his removal from the Jews who had become heathen," Christ with a typical retrospect warned them against taking along with them the leaven of the Egyptians. Although in other respects the idea appears quite ingenious, that "in the *removal* from an impure theoretical community they must have a higher care than the fear of being, in the first place, *without bread*, namely, the care lest they should *take along with them*, into the new order of things, any of the leaven of the same corrupt tendency of life deep in the secret recess of the heart."

* At all events, as regards the *Herodians*, the *doctrine* taken exactly can no otherwise be applicable than when understood of the "bad *principles* which prevailed at the court of the king." (See Braune on the passage, who interprets it just as we do.) In like manner, Neander well observes, that the "doctrine," properly speaking, of the Pharisees and the Sadducees, outwardly signified, could not at all be thus connected as alike. It is only an odd use of Scripture springing from his own ideas, when, for example, Nagel (in the *Lutherische Zeitschrift*, 1847, 1, p. 22) cites in favor of his close pressing of the doctrine, that Christ (xvi. 12) did command them to beware of the leaven of *false doc-*

In Luke xii. 1, where Christ *repeats* the same warning to his disciples before all the people, and names only the leaven of the *Pharisees*, he immediately adds to it the decisive explanation: *Which is hypocrisy* (comp. on this, above at ch. xi. 39–44). We shall scarcely go wrong, if we lay this explanation here also at the basis, although at first it is only the Pharisees who are called hypocrites, and *here* very remarkably *the Sadducees also* are classed along with them. In Mark we read, instead of this, καὶ τῆς ζύμης Ἡρῴδου, *and of the leaven of Herod*, which is substantially the same, only the Sadducees are denoted in that special point of view, in virtue of which the Pharisees themselves took them into fellowship to make common cause against Jesus. The *Herodians*, as they again appear in connection with the Pharisees in Matt. xxii. 16, and Mark iii. 6, were not exactly a special sect; nor, on the other hand, were all Sadducees precisely Herodians, but this name designates chiefly the political adherents of the Herodian dynasty who clung to the Romans, their protectors, and in so far, therefore, both by their Sadducean theory, and by their practice and their treatment of the circumstances of the time, stood in the sharpest opposition to the orthodox Pharisees, who, from Israelitish pride, abhorred and keenly felt the heathen sovereignty. Not the less, on this account, were these enemies united at heart, when the object was to tempt and assail Jesus, as they had just before, at ver. 1, appeared together making common cause. Perhaps the disciples, in their simplicity, had indignantly reprehended this mistaken demand of the *Pharisees and Sadducees*, which had been so sharply repelled by Christ; and Christ, wisely putting them to shame, checks their as yet unwarrantable judgment, and tells them that they were not yet so surely exalted above the state of mind of these persons, and had also reason still to *beware* of their leaven.

Leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees—thus Christ views as fundamentally one, two parties, who, as regards the outward expression, seemed at that time, as at all times, to lie far separate from each other. The whole of Israel (not taking into account the few Essenes who stood almost outside of Israel) was then divided into these two opposing parties, so that every one must needs belong either to the one or the other; either with the one going at all events as far as Zealotism, which would refuse to give tribute to Cæsar for God's sake, or with the other as far as an entire adherence to the political court religion of the royal family, reigning by favor of the Romans. Jesus, however, will in his disciples form another and a new party, alike opposed to both, and yet not Essenes, but genuine Israelites in the fulness of times, in the kingdom of the Messiah now come. *Ye hypocrites!* Thus had he before rejected them both together; here, therefore, also he means, in the first place, the leaven of their hypocrisy. This, however, is not yet the deepest import of his words, in so far as he classes them both together. In the Pharisee, also, the secret Sadducee lies hid, beneath all the show of strict orthodoxy and zeal for the law; for they are *hypocrites*, because they are properly *unbelievers* in heart. The ground of all hypocrisy is the putting aside and repelling of the certified truth; on the other hand, also, all open unbelief, Sadduceanism, Herodianism, is in substance still the same *hypocrisy*, only in an inverted form, in so far as the freethinker and politician carries his delusion *in like manner against conscience*, as the right truth and wisdom, for show only. It is a hiding in the one case and an uncovering in the other, but both are equally false and human. While, therefore, when both are spoken of together as hypocrites, the honor of the "*a parte potiori fit denominatio*" falls to the Pharisee, and the Sadducee must *nolens volens* be contented to be reckoned in the same category—the Pharisee is, thereby, also *at the same time*, called a Sadducee, *i. e.*, the one as the other an unbeliever. This is the leaven of the *Pharisees and Sadducees*—different in outward appearance and yet the same; the unbelieving hypocrisy and the hypocritical unbelief in its innermost oneness, such as must betray itself in hostile fellowship against the truth of God in Christ. Let us now in the application pass beyond the limits of Israel, and see how this Israel itself, in its decline and corruption, cannot cease to be a world-historical type of man and of Christendom. Orthodoxy and rationalism, zeal for the letter and criticism, pietism and libertinism, church zeal and political worldly-wisdom—also the "dry science without energy" (which Roos here mentions), and the energetic literature of unbelief and immorality—who can name and comprehend all the forms which, in theory and practice, on this side and on that, this twofold leaven has assumed, and even now assumes at this day? Thus it threatens the disciples of Christ every where, in public teaching, discourse or writing, in social life, finally (for otherwise there would be no danger), in their own hearts, which readily sympathise with the subtilely scattered elements of falsehood, in the one form or the other, to the prejudice of the pure truth held in entire faith. Therefore what Christ here says to his disciples, he says to all: *Take heed*, by looking around you! *beware*, by looking within you!

The disciples were then far from such an

---

trine—just as if Matt. xvi. 12 were also the direct word of Christ! Christ rather meant the "disposition, character, life" of the *hypocrites*, which, as at that time among the Pharisees, may exist along with strict orthodoxy; any other understanding of it would only be the recorded *misunderstanding* of the disciples. Here lies an important principal point for or against the new Lutherans, who are right indeed in rebuking the really false doctrine in the Herodian-political or Sadducee-heretical system, but along with this should not forget also the leaven in the Pharisaic-orthodox, in the proudly hypocritical separatism.

understanding of the wise words of their Master, and thought he meant by the leaven only literal bread belonging to the Pharisees. So soon again had they forgotten what was said in ch. xv. 16–20! They had accidentally, on this occasion, not taken due care to provide themselves with bread according to their usual custom: Mark, who must have very direct information, says quite exactly, that only one loaf was in the ship.* This neglect, which now occurs to them, helps, moreover, to keep their thoughts fixed on the bread, as if the word of Christ were in some way connected with this. They said among themselves (ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, *i. e.*, according to Mark, πρὸς ἀλλήλους)—He must certainly mean that we have not taken bread with us. Strange enough, to bring this into connection with the warning against that leaven? Where, then, might they find a baker who was certainly neither a Pharisee nor Sadducee in any wise? And could it be such as this that the Master meant!

He rebukes their foolishly confused thoughts again, at first, with the friendly word which he is always so ready to speak, and which was indeed in a certain measure always appropriate: *O ye of little faith!* Here it applies first of all (recalling to their minds ch. vi. 30) to their needless concern that such a thing as a want of bread should happen to him, that even he himself should be anxious about this; for it was this that had led to their confused thoughts. Then, however, Christ means in the thoughts of his wisdom precisely the leaven of *unbelief* of which he had spoken; for this, indeed, is already implied in every act of little faith, and then also occasions the hypocrisy of cleaving to what is *external*. By as much as faith is still wanting to us, by so much are we also as yet incapable of grasping the whole truth, and walking in it; that which proceeds not from faith is error, and those who are held captive in error fail also to *perceive* even what is most evident. According to Matthew, Christ simply chid them with a οὔπω νοεῖτε, "Do ye not yet understand?" at the beginning, and a πῶς οὐ νοεῖτε, "How is it that ye do not yet understand?" at the end; according to Mark, however, their want of understanding is brought into prominence in words of severer rebuke, in which *we*, at least, may be allowed to think it impossible that Mark here again "pleasantly and diffusely carries out the words of Christ." Truly there is nothing pleasant in the rebuke proceeding from impatient love, which longed so much to have at length intelligent disciples; still less is there any diffuseness or tautology in these significantly measured expressions. If this Evangelist knew so specially that the disciples had only one loaf, we may be sure also that the strikingly severe address of the Master is truly narrated from a good source, and we shall find not that Mark has diffusely extended the words of Christ, but that Matthew again gives the extracted essence. The innermost ground of all folly, as of that now shown by the disciples, is the unfeeling heart hardened in unbelief and little faith, καρδία πεπωρωμένη, which the Evangelist already, at ch. vi. 52, introduced as a reflection of his own, taking it from the words of Christ on this occasion; although, indeed, this designation is not to be taken in so bad a sense here as at ch. iii. 5, Matt. xiii. 15. If it is true of others that they never see or hear at all, the same is true of the disciples, at least oftentimes; still, and just because they are disciples, it is the more severely to be reprehended in them, and therefore Christ now for the moment places them on a level with those who have eyes and see not, ears and hear not—as if he had said: These thoughts were such as might have occurred to you if you were not at all my disciples! "You have eyes, do ye not then see? You have ears, do ye not then hear?" What follows always when the *heart* is hardened? Of course that we neither *observe* nor *perceive* what truth and wisdom speak to us; where, however, there is no perceiving, there, too, there can be no *understanding*, no intelligence. (Thus in Mark νοεῖτε and συνίετε are distinguished, while Matthew puts only νοεῖτε both times; comp. however, also Matthew ch. xv. 16, 17, as well as ch. xvi. 12, τότε συνῆκαν.) We can by no means say that νοεῖν ("understand") belongs to the ψυχή (soul) συνιέναι ("perceive") to the πνεῦμα (spirit); rather, indeed, inasmuch as we feel and perceive with the believing heart, and the faith-sense is true reason, the νοεῖν contains the ground, lying deeper in the *will*, of the συνιέναι following out of it. (Hence the exhortation, 2 Tim. ii. 7. νόει ἃ λέγω.) Finally, in the case of *disciples* who had already enjoyed for a length of time their Master's company and teaching, and had already passed through and experienced so much with him, although the perceiving and understanding, is always, at first at least, a *seeing* and *hearing*, yet afterwards there may justly have been required of them, a *remembering* of what was before learned, a retaining and working out of what had been already received, so as from this rightly to know any thing new that might be addressed to them. With this last word of rebuke, οὐ μνημονεύετε, "do ye not remember?" the representation of Mark now again becomes one with that of Matthew.*

Christ who, at the second feeding of the multitudes, had only made quite a slight allusion to the first (Matt. xv. 34), now expressly brings before them both of these together, chiefly noticing the supplies that had remained over. What Matthew, with respect to the sense, comprehends in Christ's own discourse,

* The seven baskets full were certainly consumed, for the incidents are by no means so closely connected together.

* On the entire passage compare Beck, *Bibl. Seelenlehre*, p. 56 and 59—with whom I have coincided in the exegesis.

is given by Mark in the form of a thorough catechising of the disciples as to what they had forgotten, so that the shamed disciples are obliged to answer; in Mark, too, it is impressively noted that Christ himself brake the bread among the thousands, and therefore so many fragments remained. So literally historical are these *two* narratives (of which many ἀσύνετοι, "without understanding," are at least for making *one*, if not a fable),* here confirmed by the mouth of Christ, in a discourse which the apostles could hardly have fabricated in order to glorify their Master. On the first occasion, there were twelve smaller baskets (κόφινοι, such as are conveniently carried upon journeys) corresponding to the number of the apostles; on the second, there were seven large σπυρίδες (baskets) corresponding to the seven loaves (see Acts ix. 25)—for they were probably more careful, this time, to take at once vessels sufficiently large for the quantity that remained over.

Christ having thus reminded his disciples of these things, Mark, because he had laid strong emphasis on this at the beginning, now shortens the termination of the discourse into a mere abruptly concluding πῶς οὐ συνίετε, "How is it that ye do not understand?" at which, first of all, there is to be supplied as a middle member—How do ye not understand that with me there should be no anxious care about bread? Then, however, as the proper conclusion which is expressed by Matthew: That I cannot have meant bread in my warning against the leaven! *Not bread*—more, however, the Master himself does not say, and leaves it to the disciples, here also, to find out and to understand (or misunderstand) something besides (comp. Matt. ver. xii. with ch. xvii. 13).

THE CONFESSION OF PETER—CHRIST'S FIRST ANNOUNCEMENT OF HIS SUFFERINGS—TAKING UP THE CROSS AND FOLLOWING CHRIST.

(Matt. xvi. 13–28; Mark viii. 27—ix. 1; Luke ix. 18–27.)

Here begins at all events a last, brief period of the life of Jesus, previous to his sufferings, and in all that Matthew tells us of it there is a regular chronological connection (see ch. xvii. 1, comp. there ver. 22 with Mark ix. 30; Luke ix. 43; further, Matt. xviii. 1, xix. 1; comp. Luke ix. 51). We have no reason for taking Mark ix. 27 in close connection with this, and supposing that "Peter's confession followed close upon the conversation about the leaven of the Pharisees." Rather, as appears from all the other results of the harmony, in forming which we cannot be too careful to include every thing in the general view so as not to go wrong in particulars, there lies a considerable intermediate period between Matthew xvi. vers. 12 and 13, in which we, for our part, lay the journey of Christ to the *feast of Tabernacles*, and his probable stay in Jerusalem till the consecration of the Temple, *i. e.* all the contents of John, ch. vii. on to x. 39.†

In the district of Cesarea Philippi or Paneas (northwards at the source of the Jordan, different from Cesarea Herodis on the Mediterranean Sea), Christ speaks with his disciples what all the three Evangelists narrate in its main substance; Mark says it was spoken ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, *in the way*, Luke, that Christ was engaged in *prayer* immediately before, at which the disciples were either present, or to which they came. We are not to seek for any close reference in this striking question, thus expressed for the first time, as to who or what the people took him to be; by no means is it merely a momentary inquiry about what the disciples had just been hearing of him on the way, or what the *people* here (in Galilee, Trachonitis, etc.) were saying of him; but his object is now, when his public labors have already in a certain sense come to a close, really to inquire after the result of these labors on the whole, in order to pass from this to a second principal part of his discourses with the disciples, which is denoted by the *public intimations of his sufferings* now first begun to be made (ch. xvi. 21; xvii. 9, 22; xx. 17). There is here a great and significant turning-point to be observed. "I am the Christ"—this he now finally confirms and ratifies to his disciples, while he challenges their faith to confess it before him in opposition to the ἄνθρωποι or *men;* immediately however, he adds to this first sentence the second, "And this Christ must suffer and

* Schleiermacher, too, amongst the number—who "could not make up his mind to believe in the second feeding!" Unfortunately even Neander also—we do not, however, retract even in his case the expression we have used above, nor can we sympathize with the two strong eulogies pronounced over the grave of the man who handled the Scripture so unbecomingly. For, leaving aside the Christianity of the heart, all believing science must have neither history nor piety, but the objective *word* for its foundation.

† Bengel: "The gracious year in Galilee was accomplished, and the Saviour in the midst of his career spent a considerable of his time in quiet. He withdrew himself more and more from action, and prepared himself for suffering." Ebrard, rightly rejecting Bengel's external principles, has nevertheless given far too little consideration to his grand internal apprehensions and perceptions. [This, however, is too subjective a basis for the construction of a harmony: the order of the Evangelists does not favor the author's location of the chapters of John in question.—Am. Ed.]

die!" There is in Matthew an unbroken connection in every thing from ch. xvi. 13 onwards: with the confession of Peter in the name of the disciples is connected the promise in reply, addressed to the first apostle, and to all the apostles, to the entire *future Church;* upon this directly follows (see the double τότε, "then," vers. 20, 21), the announcement of his sufferings, and all that the address of Peter, now proceeding from another spirit, gives him occasion to add respecting his followers on the *way of the cross.* It is one connected testimony: That he is the Christ, the founder and highest ruler of the true house of God, the King and Lord of the *kingdom of heaven,* which is *his* kingdom (ver. 28), the future *Church* (which was only prepared and foreshadowed by the עֲדַת יְהוָה, or "the congregation of the Lord," in Israel); but that his way lies through death to the resurrection, consequently also, that the way of all his disciples and of his whole kingdom upon earth, leads to the victory of confirmation and glorification through a conflict of suffering, through a continual cross consisting in a renunciation of life in order to find it again.

Verse 13. What now at last do the people believe, think, say of me, after all that I have hitherto done and taught? The question is thus given with a simple μέ, *me,* in Mark and Luke, while Matthew, certainly more directly exact, replaces this or strengthens (?) it by τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, *the Son of Man.* For the reading wavers as to whether also in Matthew the μέ is to be retained, or (which indeed has only few authorities) whether it is to be cancelled; and there appears here, first of all, to be a great deal depending on this little word in giving a different sense to the entire saying. If we retain it, then it is certainly natural to take the appellation which is added, "Son of Man," already in the Messianic sense. Either with Beza, Piscator, Clericus, to point thus, Τίνα με λέγουσιν εἶναι; τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; Do they indeed know me now to be the Messiah?—or, with Olshausen, to take the words as intimating the truth: Μέ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (ὡς οἴδατε) ὄντα, Me who am (as ye know) the Son of Man. In favor of the former of these readings is the circumstance, that the latter would make Christ to have anticipated his second altogether unassuming question (ver. 15), and to have *prescribed* to them himself what their confessing faith is now to bring to him; thus would the only true, and profoundly significant, sense of his awakening question be disturbed. Further, against the latter reading is the fact that the expression "Son of Man" is never precisely and absolutely equivalent to "Messiah," but while there are pregnant intimations lying behind this appellation, it yet first of all denotes the personal manifestation of this Jesus (now in humiliation, but afterwards also in exaltation). See, especially, ch. viii. 20. Finally, by the latter reading, the antithesis preserved in Matthew is destroyed: Whom do *men* say that the *Son of Man* is? What do they think of this man whom they see and hear with all his works and words—of me, *this Jesus.** This is the simple sense of the question, as Luther's correct feeling has rendered it in German with the omission of μέ. Are we to suppose, then, that the manuscripts in which it is wanting are right, and that it has been inserted here from ver. 15 and the parallel places in Mark and Luke? This, too, is difficult to suppose, and not necessary, if we only understand aright the added clause υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, that in the first place it corresponds to the mere μέ in ver. 15 and the parallel places. If we hold this fast as we ought, then we may, if we please, suppose that there lies behind the word an *intimation* of its deeper sense, its Messianic signification, but only *slight,* such as is suitable to that kind of asking which will draw out the right answer; this, then, is something quite different from the unsuitable anticipation of an openly announced testimony concerning himself: I am the Son of Man, *i. e.,* the Messiah!† It is what might thus be extended: *Ye* know now what I properly mean when I at any time thus designate myself! (And this would be what is true in Olshausen's ὡς οἴδατε, without the too strong ὄντα, which never belongs to this expression.) Such a preparatory intimation lies at all events already on the surface in the Τίνα—not τί—by which Christ asks: *Whom* (not *what*) do they take me for? Do they give me the right predicate? Do they perceive and acknowledge that I am *what I am,* or do they think something else and false concerning me? (with a λέγειν εἶναι, "*say* that I am," to which the εἶναι or reality does not answer, but ἄλλον τινά or some one else—?).

Christ's reason, however, for putting this question, after all that he had done and taught, was, naturally and necessarily, that all his past acting and teaching (Acts i. 1) had no other end and aim than to *manifest who he is,* to awaken and establish faith in his person (John viii. 24). The question here expressed is and remains the great decisive question, which now, with stronger emphasis, is ever being addressed to the world and to Christendom; previous to all obeying of his doctrine (as a hollow rationalism will foolishly speak

* As afterwards, ver. 20, where the predicate ὁ Χριστός is joined to this subject, at least as a quite true *interpretamentum* of what the reading Ἰησοῦς means.

† In which impossibility of the usage: Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου—lies the most decisive refutation of this view. The name "Son of Man" in the mouth of Christ, goes over from the most direct import: "This man here," to the hint which lies behind it: "This one, who now appears as man, who will be only man in humiliation"—which then points farther back to Daniel, and has still more significance, viz.—Representative of humanity, new first man, etc. Comp. Liebner's reference to Dorner in the *Dogmatic* of the former l. i. p. 331, Note.

of this) there must be the knowledge of his *person*. His servants must, in the name of their Master, ask in a way that will admit of no refusal "Who was Jesus? Who is Jesus?" and only the excess of folly and of blindness in the "Friends of light" has recently *put aside* such a cardinal question with the senselessly naive remark—"There the answer is wanting." In another sense may, and ought, the servants as regards their own persons and for their Master's sake also to inquire, what the people say and think of *them*.

Whom do *men* say that I, this Son of Man, am? *i. e.*, first of all the bulk, the majority—what is the prevailing public opinion—which Luke will denote by *οἱ ὄχλοι*, *the multitudes*, less exactly indeed, but right also, in so far as the disciples were in the first place so to understand it. Christ, however, does not say, *the people*, or even Israel (what opinion is held of me in Israel?)—or the like, but *men*; thereby he hints, on the one hand, at the universal importance of his appearance for all mankind (which lies also in *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*), on the other hand, he has thereby in a certain measure expressed what forms an *antithesis* to the following *Ye*—my disciples. How runs the human opinion concerning my person (that proceeding from flesh and blood, ver. 17). Thus at least do the disciples understand him in their answer, which would not be according to truth if its import were what inconsiderate commentators have found in it; viz., They say all manner of things of thee but the one thing, no one any where says of thee that thou art the Messiah himself, all hold thee in too slight estimation for that. Were there not in reality many who called him the *Son of David?* (ch. ix. 27; xii. 23; xv. 22). Might there not be many who, after his testimony upon the occasion of the message sent by John, recognized and confessed that he was the expected one, he that should come? (comp. even at an earlier period John vii. 26, 31, 41). Do we not find such a confession even long before in Samaria, as we read in John iv. 42? Certainly, however, those who thus spoke of him were already also his *disciples*, whom Christ seemed, to his disciples at least, not to include here among the "men," and, therefore, in their reply they only inform him of all the false opinions regarding him. They also do not speak first of the enemies who called him seducer, because this was not the opinion of the people, who rather esteemed him every where to be at least a prophet. They mention first the strangest and newest opinions by which men evaded the truth concerning him (ch. xiv. 2); then follows what was more allied to the truth, the folly which recognized not Elias as already come, and saw in Christ himself the forerunner; finally, those expectations of the return of this or that *prophet*, which had been sought out in order to account for him.*

Verse 15. Now comes the second, properly the chief, question for which the first was merely to prepare the way. The *ὑμεῖς* placed before has strong emphasis: What have *ye*, who have been so long with me, by this time learned? Do ye indeed now know otherwise and better than men? Is it not enough to know what the people say of the Son of Man—this lay already very prominently in the first question as a trial for them. Here it avails not to reckon up opinions and to have no conviction yourselves! True he says, here again, "say" (*λέγετε*, as *λέγουσιν* before), but now coming closer to them in a tone of trial: *Ye* should not merely *say* it, ye should in faith know and *confess* it! The expression of faith is in itself already a strengthening and confirming of it, and, therefore, does Christ require this of them here. Not, what *think* ye of me in secret as opposed to this confusion of opinions? *Speak* it out, frankly, first before me, then, at the proper time, when the Church is built by and upon your confession, also before men. Then answers Simon Peter *τὸ στόμα τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὁ πανταχοῦ θερμός*, "the mouth of the apostles, the one warm on all occasions" (as Chrysostom calls him), quickly and gladly in the name of all the disciples, taking it for granted that none would contradict, by declaring the same confession which (although perhaps not literally the same) he had already made (John vi. 69), and which Nathanael had made at an earlier period (John i. 49). Peter is not only led astray, but is only the more decided and certain, amid all the confused sayings of the people, and the contradiction in Jerusalem (John vii. 27, 41; viii. 48; ix. 22; x. 24), where, just before this question of Christ, it had come to the crisis of decision, whether he is the *Christ* or not. He answers, therefore, the question not as it was put with, I say, we say—but the *πληροφορία* (full persuasion) of his *saying* comes plainly and fully out: *Thou art* the Christ. The *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, *Son of God*,* which in the second confession of the apostle, is added to *Χριστός*, *Christ*, is by no means merely synonymous with it, but the second expression of a deeper knowledge. A Nathanael, indeed (John i. 49), as also a Caiaphas (Matt. xxvi. 63), knew from the old Scriptures, that the promised Christ was to be at the same time the Son of God (which the Scribes, contrary to the Scriptures, overlooked, Matt. xxii. 42), and the report of this had come even among the people (see Matt. xiv. 33). The Baptist also testified of *Christ* as

* Jeremiah, according to a tradition that took its rise from 2 Mac. ii. 5, 14; comp. 4 Esr. ii. 18. In the case of him and the other prophets we are not to think of transmigration of souls, but Luke has the best expression. In like manner it is not to be connected with John i. 21, or Mark vi. 15—on the other hand, John vi. 14 might be meant thus in ignorance.

* While Luke, leaving out the forcible words *σὺ εἶ*, connects *τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ*—Mark gives these words indeed, but for the rest retains only *ὁ Χριστός*. We may see ever anew the preference due to Matthew in the *discourses* of Christ.

the *Son* of the Father, when he explained his *Οὗτός ἐστιν*, "This is He" (John iii. 28, 35). Yet, on the other hand, there was and remained still a difference between a mere recognition of the Messianic dignity of Jesus according to the inferior (Ebionitic) conception of the most of the Jews, and an insight also into his divine nature.* Therefore Peter expresses both together here, he confesses the Son of Man to be the *Son of God* (ver. 13), as he opposes the *Christ* to the Baptist, Elias, and the prophets (ver. 14). Christ himself, indeed, had from the first (since John ii. 16) continually testified of himself as the Son of God, and every where used this name instead of the doubtful name *Christ*, which by itself might have been misunderstood (John ix. 35, x. 36). Peter then answers in his confession (as every confession of faith can and must be only such an answer) with perfect propriety to the assumed testimony of Christ: Thou art what thou *thyself* sayest and testifiest of thyself—we say nothing otherwise—we have understood thy words and works, we have now learned in thy school so much as to pass the examination which thou art now beginning. He makes the expression finally still stronger, inasmuch as he says, "of the *living* God," which can here be neither a mere solemn formula (as *εὐλογητός*, Mark xiv. 61), nor, as before in the Old Testament, a mere antithesis to the false Gods, but what already penetrates into the depths of the testimony at John vi. 57.† The understanding of history from without finds in the Son of Man, Jesus, first of all the *Christ* promised to Israel; the philosophy of faith (the expression will be excused), when it rightly reads, hears, perceives, and understands the words, soon finds in this Christ *the Son of the living God;* the Gospels declare him, by his own testimony and the confession of his disciples, to be both together—the Gospel of Matthew as well as the Gospel of John (ch. xx. 31).

Verse 17. The very remarkable and significant words of Christ to Peter, which now follow, the pronouncing him blessed, and the promise addressed to him first of all, and immediately thereupon the severe rebuke and repelling of his carnal forwardness—all this is entirely passed over by *Luke*, so that the discourse about the cross and the self-denial of his followers thus begins very abruptly. Mark again, in order to confirm this, informs us only of Peter's forwardness, for which he paid so dearly, but leaves out the commendation and the promise that went before. The Holy Spirit thus teaches us plainly enough, that no important and effectively permanent attribute for the Church in all future time, is here ascribed to Peter *personally*, chiefly in that he himself, whose communications Mark follows, has not in any way assumptively given prominence to what is here said to him, although, on the other hand, care has been taken in Matthew to preserve a complete record of these sayings of Christ. If what we read in vers. 18, 19, really had the meaning which the Papists give to it, then surely this appointment of a chief of the apostles, with a continuing caliphate of his successors, must properly be the principal thing with every Evangelist, who in general gives any account of this conversation with the disciples; least of all might it be wanting in the Gospel of Peter. We shall see, however, that in all that is said to Peter according to Matthew, over and above what he, as speaker, in the name of the disciples receives back also in this capacity, there remains only a certain historical temporary preference of his own person.

The very first word, *μακάριος εἶ, Blessed art thou!* although addressed to the quick and frank disciple who uttered the confession, is yet at bottom nothing else but what in ch. xiii. 16 was already addressed to all disciples in common as such (not even merely to the apostles). Christ is perfectly satisfied with the general import of the confession that he is Christ, the Son of God, without missing in this the specially dogmatic speculative acknowledgment, upon which, at a later period, so much weight was laid. (Both in John vi. 69, and again in John xi. 27, in the mouth of Martha this confession is expressly held fast, even when, in other respects, his enigmatic words are not understood.) This is at the first enough for him, so that he can already ascribe blessedness to such faith.* He, however, derives even this simple insight of faith from the revelation of the Father. He does not say, I have now often enough testified this to you both by word and deed, so that you may and must at length apprehend it! For flesh and blood does not yet perceive the open truth—the heart of each individual must open itself to a revelation which it specially appropriates. Let what is said at ch. xi. 25–27 be recalled here, and observe that as there it is the Son who reveals, here the same is humbly attributed to the Father by the Son. And that not *merely* on account of the humility which *here* so becomes him, but at the same time because Christ, inasmuch as he says "My Father," will thus accept and repeat the confession of Peter, confirming and sealing it: as if he said, Yes! I am the Son of God! Further, it is thereby indicated, as indeed Jesus always thus spoke and acted in the presence of his disciples, that with all the fulness and clearness of his testimony respecting himself,

* Just as, in like manner, there is here a difference between that "first enthusiasm" of a Nathanael, and the matured persevering faith of the apostles at this time. In this, Sepp is right, ii. 275, Note.

† From which (ver. 69) the apostle already the first time may have derived his confession, if the genuineness of the reading could be maintained.

* He does not at once press the disciple further with the question: "But in what sense dost thou know me thus, and how dost thou apprehend the union of the Divine and the human in me" (Braune).

he yet left over the last decision, in the νηπίοις or babes who accepted it, to the drawing and illuminating power of his Father. Thus, again, does the first agree in substance with the fourth Gospel (see John vi. 44, 45, 37), and we may reasonably reserve for the discourses in John the more exact interpretation of the fundamental conceptions already indicated here.

But the commendation addressed to Peter in the words, My Father hath revealed it to thee, *i. e.*, certainly alone could reveal it to thee, thou hast heard it and learned it from the Father—must appear at the same time as of a humbling character, by the mention which is made of *flesh and blood*, which cannot properly reveal, but rather only resist. Christ, in the midst of his joy at having brought the disciples now so far, feels sad to think not merely how obstinately and how long the blindness of nature has resisted the light of grace even in them, but at the same time how much of flesh and blood still remains in them (see shortly ver. 22)—therefore he can as yet rejoice over their faith only in this form, and must still connect the commendation which they have deserved with a warning allusion to their old nature. It is spoken *ironically* indeed, amid the earnestness of acknowledging love, when the ἀπεκάλυψε, "revealed," is by *catechresis*, with an οὐκ, "not," said also of σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα, "flesh and blood." Peter has confessed in the name of all; naturally also he receives, in return, in the name of all, the commendation limited by a warning; yet at the same time, Christ has special reason first of all to keep fast hold of him personally, and by no means (as would otherwise have been natural), according to the analogy of ver. 15, to continue thus: Blessed are *ye*, etc., but, Thou *Simon son of Jonas*.* That is as much as to say, Chiefly has *thy* flesh and blood often enough, to speak ironically, revealed something different to thee, and will yet often thus speak out of thee; *this time*, however, thou hast not spoken as the old Simon who came to me at first, and is even still here. *Son of Jonas:* this is the third term which stands between "Son of Man" and "Son of God," vers. 13 and 16, denoting the natural birth and descent, in *contrast with* the new name *Peter*, which is given for the new creature in Christ (hence John xxi. 15-17, where again at last this humbling designation occurs, without the new name)—certainly not, as Olshausen strangely thinks, from its similarity to the commendation: "Thou art also a child of the Spirit" (Ἰωνᾶ being taken by a play on the word for יוֹנָה, *i. e.*, *dove*); for partly, this signification of the name is not even certain, on account of that reading in another place, according to which it might certainly be a contraction for יוֹחָנָן *John*, partly, because at all events the *new* name which follows here, as at John i., notwithstanding its connection with the natural individual character of Peter, yet forms, in the *main point* an antithesis to the old birth in general. To mistake this, is to destroy the deepest significance of the entire saying, either entirely, or else by an etymologically separate play on the word in the bad sense,* in part to deprive it of its penetrating sharpness. *Flesh and blood*—this includes in Christ's thoughts these two things together, namely, the natural *man* Simon as the son of his father, and at the same time a reference back to ver. 13, *men*. (See the same perfect antithesis afterwards again at ver. 23.) "Neither from men without nor from thyself hast thou this revelation." Completely analogous to this explanation is the entire first chapter of the epistle to the Galatians, with the antithesis that pervades it throughout between the human and divine. In ver. 1, Jesus Christ and God the Father, in opposition to the οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, "neither from men nor by man," as, at ver. 10, God and Christ to the ἀνθρώποις, "men"—vers. 11, 12, the ἀποκάλυψις, "revelation," in opposition to the κατὰ ἄνθρωπον and παρὰ ἀνθρώπου, "according to man," and "by man"—vers. 13 to 16 the ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, "to reveal his Son *in me*," pre-ordained indeed, at the same time, from his mother's womb (peculiar to Paul as to Peter) in opposition to the former natural Saul—and then the same antithesis with σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα, "flesh and blood," which here still more evidently includes men without (vers. 1, 10–12) along with the natural man of Saul (vers. 13, 14), nay even comprehends the apostles (ver 17) in a certain sense. This whole chapter, then, so developes itself from the word of Christ to Peter, that it almost sounds as if Paul remembering this, to him well known, saying of the Lord Jesus to Peter, would say: *I am also a Peter*, "my faith and confession is, like his, not of flesh and blood but from divine revelation." This is again an illustration from the Bible which already puts far aside the Romish interpretation of the words that now follow addressed to Peter! So much the more significant, as it is precisely Paul, in whose person is prefigured the immediate validity of every new calling and ordination proceeding from the head of the church, against all historical connection even of apostolical tradition.†

* Which Matthew purposely makes more emphatic by retaining the Aramaic βάρ (see, on the other hand, John i. 43), in order that the *nomen proprium* may appear thoroughly intelligible.

* The sainted Von Meyer wrote to me: "I also suppose in *Jonas* an allusion to the *dove*, but not as Olshausen. John xxi. 15–17 led me to this. The dove is a shy, timid animal, and points there to the denial of Peter from the fear of man." Lange, moreover, plays strangely upon the word: "Before, he was the shy dove of the rock (which seeks refuge in the rock, the church!)—in future he would be the *sheltering* rock of the dove." It is not shelter that is spoken of, but a foundation for building on.

† [The author's fondness for illustration has here

Verse 18. Thou hast said to me σὺ εἶ, *Thou art* (*He*)—in recompense *I say the same also to thee.* This confirmatory repetition of John 43 is at the same time an advance beyond it. There it was in regard to the presence of him who should come. *Thou art* Simon!—but prophetically for the future Thou *shalt be called*, become and be Peter! But here it is very different: *Thou art* now Peter, as thou art called, thou the same Simon son of Jonas, in the personal unity of that which the grace of the Father, revealing the Son in thee, has now already wrought in thy nature through faith. Thou *art*, even now before me, what thou art ordained to be ever more perfectly, in all the future of thy apostolic calling, and therefore art thou called Peter by me; a firm, frank *confessor*, on whose confession and faith something may be built, a strong foundation-stone for the building of God upon earth (as the old temple stood on a foundation of rock—observes Delitzsch on this, in the "*Catechism of the House of God*," p. 6). That *this* now applies to Peter no longer merely in the name of all the apostles, but with a certain preference of his *personality*, the Protestant Church ought never to have denied to its own hurt, by an unnatural explanation of the words. It runs strangely enough in the *Berlenburgh Bible*—"Thou art *a Peter*"—for the meaning of the giving of the name and the calling lies in nothing else than in the circumstance that this name is entirely so appropriate only to this Simon. Against the explanation, "one of the rocks upon which I build my Church, one of the first preachers and founders of the Church"—Sepp by way of ridicule, is right when he says, "Then also by a logical inference backwards, it is only, Thou art Christ, one of the Sons of God! Καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ, *And upon this rock*—in these words undoubtedly the personal reference to Peter is continued, for Πέτρος is explained by πέτρα only according to its etymology: ὁ πέτρος signifies indeed in Greek also *rock*, and was in the Aramaic כֵּיפָא, "Cephas," not to be distinguished from πέτρα (so that Christ, to a certain extent, at the same time really says, And upon thee, this Peter); but, in order to make the sense clear to the *Greek* reader, Matthew must the second time take the *appellative* for the *proper name.* It is not therefore, as well meaning people have artificially sought to make out: And upon myself, the true rock; in which case, in order to take from the ταύτῃ, *this*, the necessary reference to what goes before, Christ must have suddenly pointed to himself with his finger.* And then it would, in this view, be incomprehensible, what in general Peter had to do before with such a saying.* Just as little, although the *most* even of the Church-fathers† understand it thus, are we to explain it: Upon this thy *confession*—this *faith* in me—this conviction of the fundamental truth, firm as a rock in thee and in others. Thiersch is quite right when he says, "The demonstrative can *just as little* have the force of isolating the faith and the confession of Peter from his person, as it would be justifiable to refer the promise to the person of Peter, apart from his faith." Quite recently Alford also observes very strikingly, that according to the whole usage of the New Testament, it is not doctrines, confessions, characters, that are designated as pillars and columns of the building, but men, *persons;* in like manner, he refers us to what the same Peter says of the *living* stones, 1 Peter ii. 5. Simon Peter therefore retains indeed the preference as regards his calling and place in the circle of the apostles, which, already looking triumphantly beyond the intervening denial, is here ascribed to him. On thee as (whom I will make to be) the first confessor, preacher, and chief apostle of Israel (Acts i. 15; ii. 14; Mark xvi. 7), and even of the heathen (Acts x. xv. 7). Thus does Meyer's note comprehend all that must stand here. But now we go on to say, further, with equal justice: Peter is the first and chief ground-stone, *yet not in his human* character as the son of Jonas, but precisely as Peter—not *alone* but with the other apostles—finally, not in himself, which no man can ever be, the proper foundation and rock in the deeper sense.‡ So soon as flesh and blood shall again speak, he shall be repelled as Satan. John also and James are pillars with him (Gal. ii. 9). On the twelve founda-

betrayed him into too great a degree of refinement. Paul's ground idea is doubtless the same as that contained in this address to Peter, but more than this can hardly be maintained.—Am. Ed.]

* Which artifice of Protestant criticism on this passage, bringing little honor to the cause, Thiersch compares with the similar artifice of Carlstadt in reference to the words used at the institution of the Supper.

* Only on a very superficial consideration and as the result of prejudice can any one find the ancient saying of Augustine to be plausible: "Super me ædificabo te, non me super te. Non enim a Petro petra, sed Petrus a petra, sicut Christus non a Christiano, sed Christianus a Christo vocatur."

† Launoy, Doctor of the Sorbonne, out of 77 sayings of the most famous Church-fathers and Church writers, has found only 17 that explain Peter himself as the rock; 44, on the contrary, understand the *faith* and 16 *Christ* himself. Gregory of Nyssa records particularly that "to this day many will not at all admit that it is the *confession* which is here spoken of." Wieseler is especially arbitrary in his exegesis from this point of view (*Chronol. d. Apost. Zeitalt.* 585)—as if the πέτρα must be distinguished from the personal Peter!

‡ For our readers this remark will suffice, with a word or two in addition: On the one hand it is least of all true that he had *successors*, and especially in those who maintain that they are such! Bengel's *Quid haec ad Romam?* is enough. On the other hand, we are not even entitled to say that he had equals. Origen's commentary is not (with Alford) to be pronounced excellent: Christ says this as to that Peter, so likewise πρὸς πάντα τὸν γενόμενον ὁποῖος ὁ Πέτρος ἐκεῖνος. Against this Firmilian rightly protested, that the Romish Stephen would introduce *multas alias petras.*

tions (Rev. xxi. 14), stand twelve names without distinction, as, in like manner, in Matt. xix. 28, twelve seats are promised. Finally (and this is what of truth remains in Augustine's word, which is, however, too sharply applied), upon what then would Peter be built, who does not stand fast in himself, if not upon the one foundation and corner-stone laid by God, of which we read in 1 Cor. iii. 11; Eph. ii. 20; and also in 1 Pet. ii. 4? Christ has significantly said only: On thee will I *build*, οἰκοδομήσω—not *found*, θεμελιώσω. A man can be the first building-stone upon the foundation of God, and *in so far* himself a foundation, but not more. As a section of the church of Christ rests upon a preacher or missionary whose natural qualifications and new nature together were ordained for this, so upon the apostolical labors of Peter was the whole at first built. But such a foundation-stone is for this reason no head, no prince and ruler over the others, or over the entire house, for it is built on his *ministry*, not on his commands (1 Cor. iii. 5).* In the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the entire New Testament, there is no trace to be found of such a supremacy, but the contrary, indeed, every where. In Acts vi., the twelve call together the multitude of the disciples; in Acts x. 47, Peter asks permission from the inferior attendants who were present, as at chap. xi. he vindicates himself before God and man by a "What was I." In chap. xv., he takes the first word, but James gives the judgment which the apostles and elders, together with the whole church, sanction by the Holy Ghost; in 2 Pet. i. 16, iii. 2, he speaks by a *we* with the other apostles, as in 1 Pet. v. 1, he is only a fellow-elder; in Gal. ii., he receives a rebuke from the reformer Paul. Shall we still further show here in a few words, which are not at the present time superfluous, how the Papists with their Peter are overthrown, if they will only read the Bible and let it be read? Already has Christ himself uttered a sharp prophetical word, as against idolatry towards his mother, so against the false father on earth over the equal brethren (Matt. xxiii. 8, 9); afterwards, Peter must needs testify in the Scripture against almost all the principal parts of the Papacy; against lordship over the Church, 1 Pet. v. 3, 4; against a separate priesthood, chap. ii. 5–9; against assumption over the civil magistrate, vers. 13–17; against silver and gold and shameful gain, Acts iii, 6; 1 Pet. v. 2; against unbecoming marks of honor and slipper-kissing, Acts x. 25, 26; against infallibility, ver. 34; against celibacy, 1 Cor. ix. 5; against all righteousness by works, in harmony with Paul, Acts xv. 10, 11; 1 Pet. i. 13, etc.

Upon *this* rock, this true *Peter*, confessing his grace and truth without pride or falsehood proceeding from flesh and blood—on this future Peter, whom he even now sees standing before his far-reaching glance in the great and strong word of confession—will Christ build his *Church*. For a good building must also have a good foundation (ch. vii. 25). Here, for the first time, in the mouth of Christ,* and in general only once again in the Gospels in Matt. xviii. 17, we find this great word ἐκκλησία, *church*, corresponding to the Heb. קָהָל, "congregation," and עֵדָה, "assembly." Although in that second passage the expression obtains at the same time a more special signification, yet, on the other hand, the whole of what is said in ch. xviii. evidently points definitely back to this passage in ch. xvi., so that the fundamental idea can only be the same. In order not to repeat ourselves, we shall therefore postpone the more particular explanation till we come to that passage where Christ himself says several things of the ἐκκλησία. Here we perceive, in the first place, that he *will* set up a church in the future, that at the same time this will correspond to the true *house* of God upon earth, the temple of the old dispensation (which is evident from the expression *build*), that he alone himself builds (Psa. cxxvii. 1; cxlvii. 2), and therefore it is called *his* church (μοῦ placed with emphasis before), consequently once more, that he himself also alone can and will make all stones for the building, and all workmen, (πέτρας and πέτρους) to be what they become (Matt. iv. 19).

Opposed to this building, at this time still lying in the future, for which the promised οἰκοδομήσω, "I will build," from the founding to the finishing is ever being fulfilled (for until the descent of the keystone from heaven, ch. xxi. 44, the building is not finished, Eph. ii. 21, 22; 1 Pet. ii. 5)—opposed to it the prophetic glance of Christ sees, in fierce assault against it and conflict with it, another house or kingdom unhappily already built; against the *kingdom of heaven* upon earth (which, ver. 19, is in a certain measure a synonym for the Church), nothing less than the entire *hell* is at work!† That the gates or doors, πύλαι, are intended to denote‡ a *power*, is already evident from the κατισχύσουσιν, *shall prevail*, which follows; the expression, however, is used in order to put building against building. *Walls* and *gates* mean defence and power (Isa. lx. 18; xxvi. 1); chiefly, however, in oriental usage, as at this day still the high gate, the gate of the royal palace, indicates what we westerns denote by "court"—the

* "By Peter, this representative of the apostles, being called a rock, nothing else is denoted but the essence of *Protestantism*, the power of an ecclesiastical *personality*" (Petersen, *Von der Kirche* ii. 99)—of course a personality actively instrumental in the cause of Christ, filled with the spirit and life of Christ through faith.

* Not before the death of the Baptist—in this many are for finding a special significance, because till then the old economy lasted. Did it not rather last till the death of Christ?

† For αὐτῆς at the end refers of course now to ἐκκλησία, certainly not, as has also been said, to πέτρα.

‡ Least of all a *court of judgment*, the judgment of the dead in the nether world!

throne of the ruler, power and dignity, from which every thing comes forth, and to which all returns in his kingdom (Esth. ii. 19). Thus are the gates of death, Job xxxviii. 17; Psa. ix. 14 (to which at ver. 15 the gates of the daughter of Zion are opposed), Psa. cvii. 18, not merely entrances, but indicate the power of death, seizing on his prey, and then keeping fast hold of it in his province; thus finally we find, just as here, in Isa. xxxviii. 10, שַׁעֲרֵי שְׁאוֹל, Sept., πύλαι ᾅδου, *gates of hell;* comp. again Wisd. xvi. 13, the same thing together with θανάτου ἐξουσία, "*power* of death." When, as usually, the promise of Christ in reference to his firmly built Church is explained of victory and sovereignty over all the power of *sin*, over the *devil* with his enmity as manifested in malice and rage, in cunning and falsehood,* according to what is generally understood by the word *hell*—this is indeed not exact, in so far as the first fundamental idea of the שְׁאוֹל, *Sheol*, or ᾅδης, *Hades*, of the Bible is thereby entirely passed over, although this must be primarily meant here. Christ says, first of all: No power of death, and of the kingdom of death, shall prevail against you, any more than against me, whose death becomes a resurrection—an idea in which he already hastens forward to the second part of the discourse, ver. 21. What is said in Acts ii. 24, iii. 15, is repeated ever onwards in the members of the Head.† But then again, indirectly, that common understanding of the words is indeed quite correct and well founded: for what is the power of death other than the power of sin, which casts down into death, and is properly itself death; what else can aim at destroying the life of the Church but the power, consisting in sin and lies, of him who rules in Sheol, and has the power of death over sinners upon earth, of which the death and resurrection of Christ forcibly deprives him? (Heb. ii. 14). The "kingdom of death," and the "kingdom of Satan," are indeed one and the same.‡ Christ means Satan, without doing him the honor of here naming him; of his own and the Church's certain victory over this strong one he speaks in this strain of humble majesty—even when triumphing beforehand in the promise of it, yet as it were coming down to the arena, and looking at the heat and anxious solicitude of the conflict, so that he only says, The gates of hell shall not prevail *against* it, instead of saying, It shall *prevail* over them!

Verse 19. We reserve the more particular consideration of what is here said also for the place where Christ, repeating the word *church* (which when first uttered to the disciples must have been almost quite a dark word), confirms and explains it. Build upon *thee*—commit to *thee* the keys of the edifice—thus does Christ proceed on purpose, as if this second thing were said of Peter personally and pre-eminently; but really only with the purpose of trying Simon son of Jonas, whether he can bear any such thing without boasting. Thou art certainly become an able and important man in my kingdom: what sayest and thinkest thou of this? Dost thou bear thyself humbly, art thou all the more on thy guard against flesh and blood, or—? We know, indeed, what was soon to follow! Certainly, the expression "on this rock" signified before almost as much as "upon thee," yet we feel that Christ could not, and would not, so express himself as to say, I will build the Church of God upon a man! The man is Simon Bar-Jona the sinner (Luke v. 8): not upon him, therefore, is it to be built, but upon *this Peter* such as grace makes him; upon him, because, and in as far as, he certainly corresponds to this name more than the others. Still for this very reason the co-ordinate πέτραι and στῦλοι, *stones* and *pillars* (see even the promise in its widest enlargement, Rev. iii. 12), are by no means excluded, and even the primacy of Peter himself rests at bottom only upon this, that he is called to begin the preaching of the word as "primus inter pares." So soon, however, as by further inference an actual rule and authority *seems* to connect itself with such a primacy (ver. 19), we then learn upon the second mention of the future Church at chap. xviii. 17–20, that the same authority is immediately given not merely to *all* the apostles in common, but even in the most proper sense to the *Church*, and indeed to every individual church where two or three are met together in the name of Jesus, just because he, the soul-abiding source of all power and rule in this kingdom, is in the midst of them. Only after these connecting words of transition follows then, in John xx. 23, the more particular explanation and reference of the power of the keys to the apostles and their successors in office, which with *Paul*, who in like manner exercises that power, although he was not then present, we must explain according to what is said in 1 Cor. v. 4; 2 Cor. ii. 10.

As the first part of Christ's reply, Thou art Peter! proceeds only from the κἀγὼ δέ σοι λέγω, "and I say unto thee," of Christ (which certainly does not merely contain a confession of what we are, as does our confession to him), as it is only he himself who builds the Church on the πέτρος whom he by his *calling* has made, to be what he is (Rom. iv. 17), so further, all that follows proceeds only from his δώσω σοι, "I will give unto thee." That the *kingdom of heaven* is now evidently "in a certain measure" synonymous with the Church, has already been observed. We can and must still, it is true, make the distinction (for example with Richter): "The *Church* has the

* Already Jerome: Ego portas inferi reor esse vitia et peccata, vel certe haereticorum doctrinas.

† The ἐκκλησία has, according to Ignatius ἀφθαρσία from Christ. It is immortal—"perpetuo mansura," as the *Augustana* says.

‡ Which, in opposition to Neander (p. 470), is said in order to ward off the one-sidedness of a narrow sense.

keys of the *kingdom*, for it is the institution by which we enter into that kingdom; Christ builds upon Peter, not his kingdom but his Church, which, as regards Christianity, is not *the* form, but only *one* form of its manifestation." Still, here at least, in chap. xiii. and xvi. 28, this distinction is preliminarily but not yet more specially brought out; *here* the *keys* belong simply to the *building* spoken of before.* That which Christ will *build* upon earth is God's house or temple, but it is a living house composed of living stones, therefore in the first place an *assembly* of the faithful, built upon him in faith and confession; this ἐκκλησία, however, with all the power and fulness of that which is committed to it, is forthwith a βασιλεία, and that precisely the true kingdom of *heaven upon earth*, hitherto announced and signified in every thing, a kingdom which stands as strongly and victoriously above the opposing power of *hell* from beneath, as, in the type, the fruitful and habitable terrestrial globe (תֵּבֵל) stands above the waters of the abyss and of the first fall (Psa. xciii., xxiv. 2). But, because the kingdom of heaven was represented just before as a house to be built, Christ at the same time continues the figure when he speaks of the *keys* which correspond to the *gates*, the going out and coming in. Also in Job xii. 14, the building and shutting stand together; in Isa. xxii. 21, 22, the key of the house of David signifies the official authority of the householder or administrator, as a burgomaster or commander (of course only as *under* the king) keeps the keys of the city or fortress; which, finally, in Rev. iii. 7, is again represented as the prerogative of the one king and lord, in his house and kingdom, who certainly cannot commit his own supreme power and dignity by transference to substitutes in his name. Here let so much only be observed in general beforehand, that the power of the key is the right and power to determine *who* shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, and who belongs to it, who shall abide in it or not (comp. chap. xxiii. 13, where we read of shutting with a falsely assumed right, and Luke xi. 52, of the key of knowledge); at the same time further in general, *what* is to be held valid in it, the power, namely, of distributing or withholding its goods and graces. When immediately after the keys, Christ goes on to speak of *binding* and *loosing*, this is not properly speaking a transition to another figure, but is just equivalent to "shutting and opening;" for the locks of the ancients had bands which were fastened or unfastened by the simple key-bar (see *Odyss.* δ. 802, Σ. 447, φ. 45, 240)—although, by means of this transition, Christ at the same time refers to the Rabbinical usage which had arisen from the Old Testament, according to which *binding* and *loosing* are equivalent to forbidding and allowing, and already also in the special signification of retaining or remitting sin.* The general meaning recurs again at chap. xviii. 18, without any allusion to the keys. "Key of knowledge" is certainly comprehended in the keys here spoken of, as the first and the starting-point, but we are by no means warranted in saying (with Wieseler) that it is only the keys of knowledge that are here meant, seeing that they involve at the same time an authority to act. Christ says here, indeed, as afterwards, chap. xviii. ὃ ἐάν, ὅσα ἐάν in the neuter: *What* ye shall bind and loose, not properly *whom*. This authority then is exercised, in the first place, by the preaching of reconciliation or condemnation in general, by the true doctrines regarding the conditions valid before God upon which grace is to be received;† but the application, flowing from this, to the *authority* over *persons*, which is so strongly expressed in John xx. 23, must not be excluded. Chap. xviii., in which the saying is repeated, will first make clear to us the full, profound import and emphasis of the assurance, that whatsoever is thus bound and loosed *on earth* in the name of Christ is, as such, to be ratified also in *heaven*. Bengel's *Harmony of the Gospels* contains only the following profound observation on these verses: "Great power of faith in the Son of God. Hell, earth, and heaven are in divers ways conscious of it."

Verses 20, 21. These verses are connected by the repeated τότε, *then*. All that had been announced regarding the future kingdom extends to a period, previous to which the Son of God must first suffer and die. This is the wondrous decree of the Father, the revelation of which the apostles' flesh and blood still kept them from understanding, although it is openly declared to them by him whom they perceive and confess to be the Christ, the Son of the living God. In order that the fulfillment of this purpose may not be hindered—to speak after the manner of men—rather in order not to aggravate the guilt of those who crucify Christ, the great word which had just found expression in the circle of the apostles, "Jesus is the Christ," is not yet to be

* Which, moreover, touches the well-authorized yet subtle determination of the distinction between "kingdom of *God*" and church according to ordinary usage—thus have I since expressed myself on this point in the *Epistle to the Ephesians* (ii. 252).

* In the Old Testament the way is prepared for this when אֱסֹר אֶסֹר (Num. xxx. 3) is a vow or obligation whereby one binds his soul to anything; the corresponding Chald. of Dan. vi. 8 means a prohibition, and in Psa. cv. 21 22, אסר evidently passes over into the signification: Forbid and command, instruct (Vulg. *ut erudiret*). Compare the Arabic חבת and חרם. Afterwards in the Talmud אסר signifies *retare*, אָסוּר or אִיסּוּר *illicitum* in antithesis to הֶיתֵּר *concessum*; in like manner שָׁרָא *solvere* then also *absolvere*, *remittere*, *condonare*.

† According to Maimonides it was spoken thus on the appointment of a teacher: We give thee the power to bind and to loose. It was, indeed a symbol of the Rabbinate actually to deliver a key to the person who received the office.

made the subject matter of public preaching, as it was afterwards to be from the day of Pentecost onwards. It is not to be declared even where the faith that apprehends it may not hitherto have opposed it, and least of all is it to be insisted on before the time, where it would cause opposition and offence, ere the second great word, which must always stand connected with it—viz., "*Christ has suffered for us*," has become a fact for announcement.

Scarcely are the disciples happy in the joy of their confession, and in the great anticipation of the kingdom of heaven upon earth, which Christ had awakened within them by his little understood words, when he again immediately damps their feelings by the still less understood, terribly sounding, word concerning his *sufferings* and *death!* He had already given them (and not them merely) many a hint about this, the most pointed of which we find in ch. x. 38; but from this time forward, he began to speak of it with literal plainness (which Matthew denotes by δεικνύειν, Mark not merely by διδάσκειν but by the additional words καὶ παῤῥησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει—only Luke gives no prominence to this). The significant word δεῖ, *must* (as afterwards, Luke xxiv. 26, the retrospective ἔδει, and Matt. xxvi. 54 the δεῖ again when it was being fulfilled), points beforehand to the divine purpose intimated in the Scriptures (comp. Matt. xxvi. 24, with Luke xxii. 22), and is thus certainly not merely equivalent to μέλλει, *shall*, into which Grotius, for example, would flatten the expression. The last journey *to Jerusalem*, which indeed is as yet in the distance (ch. xx. 18; Luke ix. 51; xvii. 11), stood before him, and all that was there to be fulfilled in him, the first expression of which is here in the words πολλὰ παθεῖν, "suffer *many things*"—in which general expression are comprehended the later special intimations of his being mocked, spit upon, scourged, crucified.* Mark and Luke add, by way of strengthening the expression: *And be rejected*, in which we are all the more to recognize an allusion to Psa. cxviii. 22, as Christ afterwards expressly says this to his enemies (ch. xxi. 42), and here indeed has just been speaking of building, of stones for building, and foundation stones. The same sad ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι or *rejection* lies implicitly also in Matthew in the mere ἀπό, "*of*," as Luke xxiv. 20, in like manner declares. Those who, as builders in Israel, should acknowledge and receive him—from these must he suffer many things, even to the being *killed;* elders, high priests, and Scribes—viz., the most distinguished, most holy, and most learned; the government (or Consistorium, in so far as the Roman government, which the name *Cesarea* Philippi a little before significantly called to mind, permitted this still to exist), clergy, and faculty in Israel. To be condemned to *death* as an outcast by *these*, and actually to *suffer* this with patience—what an announcement respecting the *Messiah* for the ears of the disciples! They do not comprehend it, they are quite dumbfounded (verblüfft) (*sit venia verbo*), and therefore entirely *fail to hear*, as we know, what is said afterwards quite as literally as to his *rising again on the third day*, in which the earlier hints (ch. xii. 40; John ii. 19) now find their clear and direct expression (comp. so on Mark ix. 10).

Verse 23. Simon Peter, however, who had just been placed so high, ventures alone with bold haste, following the impulse of the first and immediate impression, to protest against what Christ has said. We may imagine the different effect which these words of Christ might produce on the other apostles, according to the individual peculiarity of each—the still, astonished, feeling of a John, or a Nathanael, the prostrate sadness of a Thomas: "Is this then the end to which he is to come?"—quite forgetting for the moment perhaps the preceding words about the Church; on the other hand, the crafty listening of a Judas Iscariot; then again the naive questioning of an Andrew or Philip: "What is this that he says? We understand him not?" None of them, however, ventures at once to give expression to his secret thoughts; Peter alone is bold enough to speak without much deliberation, and he comes out indeed with the most foolish reply. To suffer many things and be killed—this has plainly struck upon his still attentively listening ear, and his flesh and blood has immediately a *No* to give to it! As if he had already the promised keys in his hand, he delivers his protest against allowing upon earth what he considers to be unjust, nay more, as the Master takes the pupil to task, so he takes the Master himself, and would rather at once stop up Christ's way to the building of the Church, because he does not understand him. Προσλαβόμενος, *took him*, *i. e.*, he takes hold of him by the arm or garment, draws him aside, and, full of zeal and earnestness, gives him the good confidential counsel, to think better of what he says, and to change his mind! It must have been so bad that Matthew can use the very striking expression ἐπιτιμᾶν, *to rebuke* (which, as directed against Christ, occurs only here), together with an ἤρξατο, *began*, which, in the exalted irony of the simple narrative, corresponds to that ἤρξατο of Christ (ver. 21). Luther's German translation, "Lord, spare thyself,"* does not indeed directly correspond

* Although, as against Nitzch (in Fichte's *Zeitschrift*, 1840, p. 52), we would like to be held so *considerate* as not to deny that the Evangelists, without prejudice to the higher truth, *might* confound words of fulfillment with words of prediction, yet by a like considerateness we see not the slightest ground for the certain supposition that such was actually done. For even Nitzch will certainly not concede to the critics a *not being able* on the part of Christ.

* Or even as the *Berlenburgher Bible:* Have compassion on thyself! Erasmus makes an ill improvement on the Vulg.: *Propitius tibi sis.*

to the first sense and sound of the proverbial expression ἵλεώς σοι, which escapes from Peter, and at which is rather to be supplied εἴη ὁ θεός (God have mercy on thee!). It is parallel to the Heb. חָלִילָה לָךְ, for which the Sept. has, in one place, ἵλεως, in another μὴ γένοιτο, but which is still more properly rendered by the German *Gott bewahre! Gott behüte!* (God forbid!). But as this, in the form of a proverb, loses its proper meaning, and merely signifies *No, No!* with the additional meaning according to circumstances of: Keep or preserve thyself from this—so there certainly lies something of Luther's expression in the exclamation. For, that Christ himself, instead of this μὴ γένοιτο, should do what he tells him—this is the good advice which Peter takes him aside to give him. The κύριε, *Lord*, as a strong re-echo of ver. 6, follows rightly after the first exclamation, and is intended to confirm it. Such a thing must not happen to thee, the Christ, and Son of God! And the good Peter is so confident of his cause, that he, moreover, by way of strengthening and deciding, adds with an almost comical presumption, if it were not tragical on the other side: οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο—which certainly cannot again (according to Winer) signify merely *absit, ne accedat*, but speaks decisively, as if the matter is at the will of Peter—for which therefore the rendering in Luther must be more accurate: That shall not happen to thee, I will not have it so, I know better!*

And the answer of Christ? It strikes, indeed, sharply at Peter before the others as he deserved, but it is still at the same time addressed to the others, as the continuation ver. 24 shows. Peter had taken him apart, Christ answers him in like manner as the words run, but at the same time he turns again to the rest, that they too might hear it, because something of that which in Simon had come out with such prompt candor was in them all. This application and meaning of the words Matthew denotes in his significant brevity by the single word στραφείς, *turned*, Mark not merely strengthens it into ἐπιστραφείς, but describes it more exactly in the words, *and he looked upon his disciples*—finally, he also puts a well-warranted, more than compensatory, ἐπιτιμᾶν, *rebuke*, in the mouth of Christ, in opposition to that of the disciple. Peter's zeal of the flesh is met by a like, or rather an overpowering, zeal of the Spirit, and he who shortly before had been pronounced blessed, endowed with high honors, is now, as the words at first seem to run, almost honored with the title of Satan. Does this mean, perhaps (as many are for understanding it), a Satan, adversary, seducer? Wilt thou become a Satan to me? (as 2 Sam. xix. 22). It seems at first sight as if this were its meaning, and then the foregoing words would signify, Get thee *behind me!* Thou oughtest to *follow me*, instead of putting thyself in my way, and going before with thy advice.* But then the second sentence: Thou art a σκάνδαλον,† "an offence," to me, would be so like the first as to be almost a tautology, which is not suitable to the profound meaning of the words proceeding from deepest emotion. Further, the *Get thee behind me, Satan*, as a repetition of the word in the temptation (chap. iv. 10), is too strong to be thus explained. But then this would be too strong and harsh for poor Peter personally, who, according to the explanation immediately afterwards given by Christ himself and kindly intended to have a softening effect, meant to speak only *humanly*, and did not, therefore, knowingly and designedly speak Satanically. How then are we to explain it? I think (with many others) that Christ actually marks in this temptation Satan lurking behind the flesh and blood of Peter (Eph. vi. 12). The first word is at bottom to be applied to the wicked enemy himself, the second to the instrument of his assault, as appears from the reference of the σκάνδαλον (stumbling block), to πέτρα (stone), which is not merely accidental.‡ The future groundstone now as yet throws himself at the feet of the Master-builder as a stone of stumbling—so little does his fitness consist in any thing else than in what this Master-builder will yet make out of him.

It was, in fact, a severe, and deep-searching *temptation* for Jesus, this word of his dear Peter, springing from a zeal, which at heart, was so well meant; this we perceive likewise from the earnestness and warmth of his reply. He cannot answer here with his usual exalted equanimity, for he is very sensitive on the point of this Δεῖ με πολλὰ παθεῖν, *I must suffer many things*, when any one attacks him upon it—this is the tender, sore point of his own most peculiar and innermost conflict, his own shrinking fear of the baptism of death. The apostle's flesh and blood expresses what the flesh also of the Son of Man, resisting in human weakness, had long previous to Gethsemane begun to say in him: *hence*, this holy zeal of obedience to the Father, of love to sinners, determined denial of self, hence this sharpness towards the apostles, such as we find him showing towards his disciples in con-

* There certainly lies something in this of what Von Ammon so strongly expresses (*L. J.* ii. 298): Peter puts Christ under care as an enthusiast, who occupies himself with melancholy thoughts.

* In this sense what Roos says is true and excellent: "He did *not* therefore bid him entirely away, but behind himself into the place which became a disciple." In no case is it an entire "expulsion from the circle of the disciples," as Von Ammon wilfully presumes, that is here spoken of.

† We would not press the word quite so sharply as Alford, who is for supplying the definite article: Thou art my stone of offence, my πέτρα σκανδάλου! (1 Pet. ii. 7, 8). *This* Judas was to Christ in the circle of the apostles, and in a much deeper sense.

‡ The first puts in opposition to the ἵλεως (εἴη ὁ θεός) an exclamation repelling Satan, the second corresponds to the good intention of Peter personally: That must not happen to thee.

nection with nothing else. Hence his so suddenly detecting and repelling the Satanic cunning which aimed at making him waver! But scarcely has he said this in the first sentence, as he must and could not otherwise say it, and in the second, has come down again to the person of Peter, when his tender, sorrowful love, vindicating itself, so to speak, in order that the poor disciple may not be too much cast down, adds the *third* exculpatory and explanatory sentence. Thou knowest not, indeed, that and how Satan has now spoken to me through thee. Thou art for leading me away from God's decree, thou art doing so, however, not from intentional opposition to it, but from human ignorance, which must serve the enemy. Thou meanest, thinkest, understandest not, now (only now) *τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, the things of God*—thou thinkest and speakest in the manner of all *ἄνθρωποι* or mere men. Thou certainly meanest well, of that I am sure, and thy *ἵλεώς σοι, be it far from thee*, proceeds from a heartfelt love, as the *κύριε, Lord*, from the half faith, which now knows of Christ, but not yet of his cross. Thus does Christ sorrowfully excuse him, although on the other hand it is an earnest warning addressed to him, and shows us here by the most lively example how "the *human* is so often the *profane*," how little men in their *human* feeling can grasp the counsel of God with respect to redemption and his kingdom,* how dangerously the love that springs from the flesh comes in the way of the holy love of the Father and Son. This temptation of Christ by Peter repeats itself in a thousand forms in his followers, and is still more hazardous than the direct temptation in the wilderness, being here also placed after that temptation as a higher degree of it. Those whose intentions towards us are the best, are then most dangerous to us when their intentions are merely human. Then it is necessary to know, and to keep fast hold of, the *things that be of God* against flesh and blood from without, by which Satan would entice our flesh and—in us sinners otherwise than with the Holy One—more than our flesh into unfaithfulness; then it is necessary to hold fast that which the faithful Forerunner immediately after holds forth to all his followers (vers. 24, 25), as the weapon they are to use when placed in the same circumstances.

Finally, there appears in this conflict of the pseudo-Peter with Christ, at least remotely as in a prophetic figure, the presumptive successor of this apostle, in his well-meant human blindness to the mystery of the cross in the kingdom of the cross (thus mildly to interpret the Papacy and the better Papists), on account of which, while he imagines himself to be the representative of the householder, supplying his place, he is really for driving him out of the house. But this is and remains the pseudo-Peter, even with the true confession of the dogma respecting the Son of God, and against his continuing *σκάνδαλον* in the way of Christ with his Church, the words *Get thee away Satan*, proving his power, have long since been spoken once for all.

Verses 24, 25. These verses have already received their explanation at Matt. x. 38, 39, of which Christ here reminds his disciples with a tacit "Have you then quite forgotten these my words? Must I repeat them to you again?" In ver. 26 there follows then, in addition, the clearest, most decisive, explanation of *ψυχὴν σῶσαι, saving one's life*. The repetition also gives prominence to the fact, that with all his invitations, Christ must still leave the matter over to the will of each individual, just because it stands thus: *εἴ τις θέλει, if any man will*. According to Mark he now calls also "with the disciples" the *people* who were standing near, and speaks openly to them also of his *cross*, as before to the disciples, only indicating, however, and pre-supposing his own cross in that of his *followers*. This is a further continuation intended for all who will yet become his disciples, as that which was before said to Peter was spoken with an eye to all who are now his disciples; for in the bearing of the cross, there avails no distinction, no rank or preference, from Peter down to the last and the least who will enter into the kingdom of heaven. Luke also observes at least that *He said to them all*—so that, in this instance, the *τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, to his disciples*, of Matthew receives its correction or rather its explanation from the other Evangelists—to all present and future (whosoever will be my disciple, as ye are). *Deny himself*—of this we have already spoken at chap x.; here let the remark be made, which would there have reached beyond the first development of the sense, namely that in the strictness of this requirement there yet lies, at the same time, a comforting mildness. It

* I cannot forbear adding here a beautiful passage from the profound book (which I would kindly recommend to believing thinkers), Chr. Kapplinger, *Beschreibungen über das Wesen der Gottheit* (Heilbroun, 2d ed. 1846): "It is a spiritual law for the proper revelation of divine qualities and powers, to lay the foundation for the development of these in their perfection under the forms of outward meanness and lowliness. By this process of revealing and unfolding great divine qualities and powers, so opposed to the earthly reason, they, as it were, repel from themselves those qualities and powers that are only earthly and human, so as to reveal themselves according to their original and peculiar divine character, etc. Hence, *Jesus Christ repelled even his disciples from himself*, in order that no foreign and human power might come in to disturb and limit his essentially divine qualities and powers, when revealing them in their perfection. Therefore he had already before said to Peter: Get thee behind me, thou thinkest only what is *human* but not what is *divine*." This is indeed profound exegesis proceeding from a genuine Theosophy of the Cross, and that by a dreamer of Weinsberg. How does it contrast with the shallow treatment of Scripture even by a Schleiermacher, who has nothing more to say than—Christ called the apostle a Satan, one who has not at heart the divine word!

is pre-supposed, and, in the meanwhile, acknowledged that the old self is as yet present in the disciples of Jesus, for otherwise there would be no necessity for their *denying* it. And what else is this denying than *first of all* the λογίζεσθαι, or "reckoning" of faith (Rom. vi. 11), which is not merely allowed but even required of us by the kindly assisting grace? "As Peter said when he denied Christ: I know not the man! So say thou of thyself and act accordingly" (Bengel). Not: Let him kill himself, crucify himself—God will take care that this come about by means of the never-failing *cross*, which offers itself for acceptance. Again, that this means nothing merely coming from without, nothing extraordinary alone, we have already seen from the καθ' ἡμέραν, *daily*, of Luke. If thou hast not now precisely contempt, rejection, enmity, from without for the sake of Christ, still thou hast some suffering of body, some burden arising from the transient nature of the world; or if thou hast not this, thou shalt yet all the more assuredly feel the tribulation and temptation of sin in the evil world, thou shalt and must at all events even now feel something of the inward conflict with thy sin, that which is peculiar to thyself, for the denial and destruction of which all that every moment of life brings, has been given to thee and laid upon thee by God. Without this inward cross all outward suffering in the flesh is profitless and unavailing, for an Indian fakir undergoes the extremest sufferings of this kind which tend rather to the strengthening of his pride, so that they are no real עִנּוֹת נֶפֶשׁ, (affliction of soul). All bearing of burdens on one's self, without self-denial, is not the cross of which Christ speaks to his followers; all sacrifices and surrenders are vain, if they be not done as he says *for my sake*—Mark, for my sake *and the Gospel's*—*i.e.*, in order that we may become partakers of the Gospel, of the kingdom of heaven, which is offered in it (1 Cor. ix. 23). God prepares the cross for thee; cast it not away, but consider it as *thine*, according to the will of obedience, as if thou thyself hadst chosen it. Deny thyself, say to the opposing will of the flesh: Not as I will—this is the first and fundamental thing. Thus is the cross taken up, and now comes the second word in which the necessary strength and perseverance are held forth: *Follow me.*

The train of thought in the remaining part of Christ's words, from v. 24 onwards, is therefore so to be understood as that he first lays down the great motive for his followers, and then gives the *grounds* of this inevitable requirement. The nature of the case demands, first of all, as a *present* necessity, that only the death of the old sinful, selfish, life shall introduce to the new holy and glorious life of Christ (ver. 25). Without this, however, if the man continue in *his own* life, if he continue as he is, the whole world will help him nothing, and he cannot thereby redeem himself or save himself from destruction and judgment (ver. 26). This therefore is required *secondly* (which was already implied in the first), in the *future* trial at the coming of the Son of Man to judgment, which is inevitably certain (ver. 27), the certainty is *pledged* for by a previous, more proximate coming and revelation of his kingdom (ver. 28).

Verse 26. Here again is one of those sayings of which we are wont to observe, that there is much to be said concerning them in the way of preaching, but little in the way of interpretation! He who *will* understand it understands it, and, in thus receiving it, the understanding of it becomes more clear and perfect. Christ evidently refers to Psa. xlix., and not merely in the second half of the saying almost literally to vers. 8, 9; but, in the saying as a whole, he refers to the main import of this entire psalm, in which is declared the nothingness and insufficiency of all earthly good and earthly possessions for the final destiny of the soul at death (see vers. 7, 17–20). Christ alters, however, and strengthens the words of the psalm—which only declares that no one can redeem the soul of his brother—to: How and whereby may a man redeem himself? Ζημία is *hurt*, *loss*, *damage*, in any thing (Acts xxvii. 10, 21; Phil. iii. 7, 8): consequently τὴν ψυχὴν ζημιοῦσθαι is to lose the soul, or *himself*, as Luke has it, thus evidently explaining it.* If, in a general fire raging around thee, thou wert to save and preserve thy great and well-filled palace, and yet be destroyed thyself by the fire—what wouldst thou have gained in comparison with him who, while his goods were burned, has yet escaped with his life? Therefore also conversely: What shall it *damage* a man though he should give up the whole world (which will at one time pass away and be consumed), if only his soul be saved? The true eternal salvation of one human soul is of infinitely more value than the whole world. Thus must we set profit and loss against each other, and he who has not so reckoned will, in the end, find to his eternal loss how terribly he has miscalculated! Then will the bankrupt be forced to cry out, *What shall a man give?* to which the psalm already furnishes the answer: *It must cease for ever!* And though he alone were to possess the world, it would be no ἀντάλλαγμα, no *equivalent* for his soul, as the Zürich translation renders it, nothing that in the exchange could compensate for the lost soul, (Vulg. *commutatio*). But the word expresses still more than this, for it corresponds to the "ransom," or "redemption" of the soul (οὐ δώσει ἐξίλασμα, τὴν τιμὴν τῆς λατρώσεως τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτου, Psa. xlix. 8, 9—Heb. כֹּפֶר and פִּדְיוֹן). That must be οὐ φθαρτά, *not corruptible things* (1 Peter i. 18). Christ at

*Ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθεὶς—"the being lost is here denoted first as a doing, then as a suffering" (Lange).

the same time hereby testifies, that God alone has found out the ἀντάλλαγμα, and λύτρον, *equivalent* and *ransom* (Matt. xx. 28): he who despises this, who makes its power and sufficiency of none effect for himself—what shall he be able to give of that which belongs to another?

Verse 27. The same reason is further given as formerly in chap. x., according to our interpretation of that passage: There lies before us in the judgment a *trial*, in order to be prepared for which, we must now let our soul be redeemed, saved, sanctified, and kept by Christ's cross. Then it will be no loss to have borne the cross, but an eternal gain, while, on the other hand, it will be no gain to have possessed the whole world, but an eternal loss! According to Matthew, Christ has said here by anticipation what he afterwards said (chap. xxiv. 30, xxv. 31). The same Son of Man, concerning whose present appearance in lowliness the discourse began at ver. 13, will appear personally a second time; as the first time he appeared entirely as Son of Man in our weakness, so, although still the Son of Man, he will yet then manifestly appear as the Son of the living God; in the glory of his Father, which is at the same time his own glory (chap. xxv. 31; Luke ix. 26), with *his* angels serving him as Lord (chap. xiii. 41). Mark and Luke have, instead of this, another saying which Matthew, with still further alteration, repeats, and we may well suppose that, on this occasion, Christ used both sayings. It is the only occasion on which we find this expression in the mouth of Christ: Whosoever is *ashamed* of me—which is still sharper and more reprehensory than the denying, spoken of in Matt. x. It cannot, however, signify: Whosoever is ashamed of the *Son of Man*, for this name always denotes the visible presence of Christ, whether in its more lowly or more exalted manifestation—but, quite properly, of me and *my words*, the confession and following of my doctrine and truth, in which I myself am now here for the sake of the world, previous to my coming again to judgment. In Mark what is said before (ver. 35), precisely corresponds to it: For my sake and the *Gospel's* (Rom. i. 16). Mark alone adds besides, in order to bring into full light the criminality and perversity of being thus ashamed: In this adulterous and sinful generation! (Matt. xii. 39).

Verse 28. In the μέλλει, *shall* (ver. 27), Christ has represented his second coming to judgment (which must point to something else than the rising again, ver. 21), as a thing, indeed, perfectly sure (Luther: Will certainly happen), but still as belonging to a more remote future, to a last end which is left quite undefined. But in order that this may not prove too faint and too wide a prospect for the disciples and for us, in order that even from these words we know already, at least in general, how it shall stand with the building of the Church—of course after the resurrection of Christ when the rejected stone has become the corner-stone—how it shall be in regard to the therein valid representation of the Master of the house by means of regularly appointed holders of the keys, nay how, in regard to the conflict, also announced to the Church, of the powers of hell against it—to show this, Christ adds a word which could scarcely have been wanting (as, it is hoped, will be evident) for the complete rounding off of the entire announcement which he here makes. With a here concluding Ἀμήν, *verily* (Luke ἀληθῶς) he again announces a *coming* of the Son of Man, a more mediate, more proximate coming, which is to be the pledge of his coming to judgment. That this latter coming is not what is here spoken of, is incontrovertibly evident from its being said that those who have seen this other and nearer coming are yet afterwards to *die*, which can have no application to the last day.* It is evidently, in the most general conception of it, the same coming of the Son of Man that is here meant as was spoken of chap. x. 23; for Christ points back here, throughout, to what was said there, at the sending out of the apostles. Christ comes in *his kingdom* (comp. Luke xxiii. 42), with his kingdom, when he sets it up, reveals his power in it and by it; and precisely hereby is the coming at first *in his kingdom* to be distinguished from the *visibly personal* coming. Mark and Luke, therefore, as regards the sense, quite correctly change the saying (which Matt. retains in its original form as connected with chap. x.), so as to explain it in opposition to any misunderstanding of it. Luke, indeed, says only, Until they *see* the kingdom of God—where the strongest emphasis rests on the seeing with the eyes what has actually been brought to pass. Mark more distinctly has, in addition to this, the words ἐληλυθυῖαν ἐν δυνάμει, *come with power*, in which the original ἔρχεσθαι or "coming," spoken of Christ himself, is applied to his kingdom, but quite correctly so, in as far as the δυναμις or "power" of the coming King, the efficacious power of his invisible presence, displays itself in the establishment and maintenance of the kingdom (see in Rom. i. 4, and 2 Cor. xiii. 3, 4, the interpretation of this ἐν δυνάμει). *His kingdom* is his Church, as also in Matt. xiii. 41. He assures his apostles, then, that the setting up of his Church, announced ver. 18, sha'l be accomplished even in this generation, and he expresses this by the striking words which all the three Evangelists have preserved: that *some* of those *standing here* (among whom are by all means to be understood those also of the people who were standing around, although at the most only secondarily) would not taste or experience death (which can only be meant

* The confusion in Hofmann (*Weissagung und Erfüllung*, ii. 272)—according to which Christ is represented as having actually expected the last judgment before a generation should pass away—takes its rise from this, that men, despising the genuine tradition of the *fundamental conceptions* of the *Bible*, are ever for building their exegesis upon their own self-wisdom.

here as at John viii. 52) until his kingdom, and therein his power and presence, be as clearly displayed to their view as if they saw Christ himself already come. Consequently he can least of all mean by this, the transfiguration which immediately follows ver. 17,* nay, not even merely the building and continuance of his Church, in general, beginning with the day of Pentecost; for how then would he, thus selecting, speak of *some?* And, although we may not strain this expression, so as to make it mean that only two or three of the apostles should survive, what he announces there still remains a τινές μέν, *some*, to which corresponds a τινές δέ, *others, who shall taste of death before they see.* We therefore rightly understand this, as at chap. x. 23, of the great catastrophe of the destruction of Jerusalem, the setting up of the New Testament Church, which was then first fully ratified and manifestly loosed from Jewish entanglements, of that ἐκκλησία which, in Rom. ix. 24, is already described with believing anticipation. Then also did Christ *come* in his power to *judgment*, foreshadowing the judgment of the world, so that all who believed in his power to save, and who have since become his people (Rom. ix. 25, 26), have before their eyes in that event a pledge, equally consoling as it is warning, of that which is testified of as in the remote future in the words μέλλει ἔρχεσθαι, ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν αὐτοῦ, "he shall come—and reward every man according to his works" (comp. Deut. xxxii. 36 with Heb. x. 30). John xxi. 22 also belongs to this as an appropriate parallel passage; how many even of the apostles may, with Peter (and Paul) have tasted of death previous to this event, we know not.

THE TRANSFIGURATION—THE FUTURE ELIAS.

(Matt. xvii. 7, 9, 11, 12; Mark ix. 9, 12, 13.)

Luke ix. 28 points, in the expression, μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους, "after these sayings," at the inner connection between the transfiguration and the first announcement of suffering on the part of Christ, even more strongly than the two other Evangelists, who mention the number of days that intervened. It will be difficult, in this instance, to adhere to our plan of interpreting the *sayings* of Christ, and not the narratives, and it may here also be said with special truth, that only the perfect understanding of the whole occurrence can open our ears for perceiving the innermost, peculiar force of the word of Jesus: *Arise and be not afraid!*

On the day at least, on which he takes† with him up to the high mountain the three disciples, who had already been the selected witnesses of the first miracle of raising from the dead, the sons of thunder, and the man of rock, Christ knew that something was now to happen to him, and in general what that was. That question, six days before, which denoted that the turning-point in his course was now reached, from which the Son of God approximated ever nearer to his sufferings, was already a presentiment of this testimony that was now to be given by the Father, and which was to seal the confession of the disciples. The innermost reference to Christ himself of this voice sounding at the middle-point between Matt. iii. 17 and John xii. 28, with all that accompanies it, the parallelism between this *consecration to his suffering*, and the first inauguration at his baptism, is now more distinctly acknowledged by the more recent orthodox theologians than it ever was by the ancients; it is no longer deemed enough to find in it merely a testimony for the disciples who *beheld his glory* (2 Pet. i. 16, as also Luke ix. 32), but it is now explained of the new anointing for the knowing and doing of his work, which was here given from above, especially to the Son himself.* He who for us is to enter by a voluntary death into glorification, in order that he may fulfill all righteousness, must first learn and actually experience in regard to himself otherwise than by the knowledge arising from faith, that the δόξα, *glory*, of light and life is already present in his humanity, that it *can* break forth in him, and radiate from him, even without his passing through death—in order that thus anticipating the Father's good pleasure, he may be prepared to deny this self, and to empty himself of this glory even to the cross. He who thus fulfills the law and the prophets, must now already beyond the limits of death hold a secret council with the personal representatives of the *law* and of *prophecy*, who have beforehand some participation in the fruit of

* A curious idea of many commentators, beneath which there lies only thus much of truth, namely, that this transfiguration was again a very natural figurative pledge of all future glorification.

† Already in the unusual expression ἀναφέρει there is something that indicates how he took them up with himself, brought them before God (compare Luke xxiv. 51).

* We may refer chiefly to the profound expressions in Beck, *Christliche Lehrwissenschaft*, i. 512, and following. With wilful ignorance, Schleiermacher says: "In vain do we take pains definitely to represent to ourselves an aim for this mysterious occurrence."

his resurrection,* who at Mal. iv. 4, 5, appeared together as closing the old covenant,† and now, in the heavenly imperial council before the throne of the μεγαλοπρεπὴς δόξα, "excellent glory," stand upon the threshold of the new covenant, as the *Baptist* in the character of the typical Elias did upon earth for the people. Μετ' αὐτοῦ ὁυλλαλοῦντες, "*talking with* him"—by this one well-chosen word (which Mark and Luke also retain), does Matthew veil from us the wondrous words of the symphony, in those higher regions yet concealed from us by the cloud of the ascension, where the Son receives from the Father *honor and glory* in the words, This is, etc. Luke is permitted to lift the veil a little, and plainly to show us (what we might of ourselves guess and perceive) the sufferings of Christ, announced to the disciples a week before, as the centre-point of these heavenly words, from the sanctuary of which, the supreme Præses of the council then again refers us to the earthly words of Christ. They spoke of his *decease*, which (now near at hand) he should accomplish at Jerusalem, to accomplish which he now, a second time, more especially consecrates himself to the Father, devotes and fortifies himself, as the first time at the εἴσοδος, or "coming" (literally *entrance*), Acts xiii. 24. Ἔξοδος (literally *exit*) here certainly does not signify (according to Schleiermacher) the "calling" to be fulfilled (δρόμος, Acts xiii. 25; xx. 24), but evidently, in the first place, the end of life, as in Wis. vii. 6; 2 Pet. i. 15; still not without a prospective glance at the turning of death into life, so that the "rising again" (ch. xvi. 21, xvi. 9, 23), is at all events included—the victorious accomplishment, result, and issue of this death, which for him and us is at the same time ἡ εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν, "the entrance into the everlasting kingdom" (2 Pet. i. 11; just as at Heb. xiii. 7). Let it be considered what the apostle (2 Pet. i 16), means by δύναμις καὶ παρουσία, "power and coming." Those who have prepared the way for him to this *from of old* (מִקֶּדֶם), and are, therefore, well acquainted with it, now speak with him and to him concerning it, but still more he to them,* putting himself in the position of one ready to answer their questions, in order that they may rejoice before him in his glory with more perfect understanding and clearer view than the disciples, who are as yet heavy with the sleep of earth —also, indeed (as Roos mentioned), that they may now bear to the invisible world tidings of Christ's willingness to undergo the redeeming death now near at hand.

Then the light-cloud becomes to the earthly eyes the blinding, overshadowing darkness of the sanctuary; the two are already entered into it, the three are terrified without, for it is not yet time to build the eternal tabernacles of glory on the earth, which must first receive for its purification the blood of Christ from the hands of sinners. *Jesus alone* remains before their eyes, and the supremely decisive *voice* of the eternal Father in the inaccessible light which no man hath seen nor can see, comes from out the cloud. Even when the vail of the heaven is for a moment withdrawn, we are only referred back to earth, to the Son of Man and of God struggling in lowliness, passing by suffering into glory. The second voice of the Father, which directs to the *words of the Lord Jesus*, as the first did to his person, speaks in the words of Scripture, of Psalms, Prophets, and Law (Psa. ii. 7; Isa. xlii. 1, 4; Deut. xviii. 15, 18), and invests him with the *honor* of *king* because he is the Son (Psa. ii. 6), of *priest* as making an atonement with which God is well pleased, of *prophet*, who is to be heard along with and above the law and the prophets, inasmuch as he bears testimony of himself and the Father's purpose in him.

The disciples fall in great fear on their face; he, however, in most exalted dignity, calmness, and might, *touches them*, as once Gabriel did the prophet (Dan. viii. 18, ix. 21, x. 10), and speaks to them his old familiar words "*Arise and be not afraid*," with a new and peculiar significance at this moment—not yet as afterwards, Rev. i. 17, 18, and yet already as the same one.

Verse 9. Christ calls it a ὅραμα, *vision*, *i. e.*, ἃ εἶδον, *what things they had seen*, as Mark says, in Luke ἃ ἑωρακασιν, *which they had seen*, and includes in this the whole manifestation and revelation, together with the voice which they heard; for certainly this was no ordinary seeing and hearing, but a perceiving with the opened eyes of a faculty of percep-

* In the bodies of both we find a wonderful exception to the general fate of death, although the lawgiver actually died beforehand on account of sin, while the prophet was already lifted up nearer to the victory over death. Not that they were actually, before the resurrection of Christ, the first-fruits, clothed with the final resurrection body, but their death and state after death has yet something in it specially mysterious. Here lies still another secret: if already at that time, as the Talmudical Tract. שְׁקָלִים (*Shekalim*) teaches, the half shekel for the temple was collected in the month Adar, and if there was ground for the tradition in Josephus of Moses' death having happened on the first of Adar, then was Christ transfigured, perhaps, on the anniversary of the Lawgiver's death.

† Therefore not merely (according to Von Gerlach): The *Founder* and the *Restorer* of the kingdom of God in the Old Testament. ...

* As, in this instance, Ebrard, who in other respects with good apologetical intention is for remaining as much as possible on the surface, cannot refrain from saying here finely: "In the transfiguration, Jesus had given to the fathers of the old covenant the blessed knowledge of his willingness to redeem them by his death, and, at the same time, to the publishers of the new covenant the unity of that covenant with the old, and Christ as the Fulfiller of the law and the prophets, was visibly manifested." Only, in order not to go against the ἔλεγον of Luke, we must not exclude the joint-witness already proceeding from them.

tion which is ordinarily closed, and which was partly brought about in the disciples by their falling into sleep, through the divinely inverted reaction against the influences from beneath (Num. xxiv. 3, 4.) But there is a great mistake in supposing that this sleep-waking seeing and hearing, to which we have only a remote analogy in somnambulism, and in the vision of Balaam* is something inferior and uncertain, and not rather a waking, to which the common form of waking stands in the same relation as does the state of dreaming. Christ speaks here truly, not according to that usage of men, which puts the ὅραμα βλέπειν, "to see a vision" (Acts xii. 9), in opposition to the reality of a thing that has actually taken place. To begin by proving this, appears to us as needless for believing readers, as it would be vain for unbelieving ones. True, indeed, a preacher in the open pulpit in Görliz, on the 6th Sunday in Epiphany, has even recently ventured to explain the whole occurrence as a dream-vision;† this preacher must certainly also hold the second epistle of Peter to be apocryphal! But, in answer to all critics who take this epistle, which seals the evangelical record, to be not genuine, we only exclaim with the most perfect confidence, in place of adducing any external grounds: O ye psychologists, O ye Christian psychologists! the supposition that words, doctrines, testimonies, such as are to be found in the second epistle of Peter, from the beginning to the end of it, have proceeded from a forger's own invention, that such strength, such enlightenment, such confidence of speech, could exist in one and the same mind along with a pious fraud—that this μυθολόγος (legend-speaker), when, in a "second epistle," he designedly counterfeits the person of the apostle, still exhorting, confessing, and prophesying before his death, has had the impudence expressly to renounce σεσοφισμένοι μύθοι, "cunningly devised fables," and with this impudence at the same time has such gifts of knowledge and of boldly original discourse—this hypothesis contradicts all the psychology of Christian feeling, and this the true defenders of the genuineness of the epistle should not be ashamed openly to confess as the dictate of their Christian feeling.* Truly when Peter then wrote, he *knew not what he was doing*.

So much concerning the word ὅραμα, "*vision*," in the mouth of Jesus, whom we are to hear, and with him, those of whom he has said: Whosoever heareth you heareth me! and whom he indirectly commands to make known this ὅραμα afterwards, in that he forbids them to do so till after the resurrection. He includes the testimony concerning his glory as Son, now seen and experienced, in the first prohibition (chap. xvi. 20, 21), and thereby points once more to the "rising again" which was then not heard. Now, indeed, the disciples must take up this *word*, and retain it for a while, but they rather take it in some figurative sense than in the proper sense, and make out of the clearest letter a dark question, because they would not understand the death spoken of before (Mark, ver. 10). You are to tell it to *no one*, not even to your fellow-apostles. How hard may it have been for them to obey this command, with their habit, otherwise laudable and amiable, of repeating and communicating to one another all that happened to the Master! But in order that they may not be vain of this preference shown to them in being selected as eye-witnesses, and that the others may not in their present folly envy them on this account, in order that the whole thing may remain what it is and should be, not a spectacle for eyes that are intent on seeing wonders, but a testimony afterwards to be transferred by the Spirit to the word so as to be believed, a voice of the Father—for this end Christ has admitted only three to the knowledge of it, and now forbids even these to speak of it before the time. They must also obtain their honor in the matter by denying themselves. First: Can ye be silent? are ye worthy to meditate on, and to keep holy mysteries? Then shall ye at one time tell them before the world!

And his disciples, of course the three who now descend with him from the mountain (see more exactly Mark, ver. 9, 14), embrace the opportunity, ere they are compelled to be silent, now when they are coming down to put to him one of the many questions which perplex their minds. They do not venture to come out with the great cardinal question about the *rising again* (of course not the resurrection in general as believed among the Jews, but the rising again of *Christ*, of whose death they will hear nothing); but, next to

* It is difficult to explain in Luke διαγρηγορήσαντες, "when they were awake." If it were taken to signify watching the whole time through (as πάσης τῆς νυκτὸς διαγρ, Herodian, iii. 4, 8), this would be a complete contradiction to βεβαρημένοι ὕπνῳ. Better certainly: Watching *in the intervals*, as in diseased sleep.

† J. L. Haupt in Nehmiz and Sonntag's *Predigtsammlung*: "Christ himself calls it a vision, and seems to guard his disciples against the delusion that they had actually seen Moses and Elias, inasmuch as he afterwards explained to them that Elias is already come"—namely in John the Baptist, and nothing farther! Neander also unfortunately finds it to be a *dream* (the disciples having dreamt of the impending event at Jerusalem!)—yet mentions himself, indeed, the strong objection that then the three had the same dream—he solves it, however, still worse by the supposition that after all it was only Peter; and speaks, moreover, of John's not mentioning it in a manner which we must pronounce foolish and unjustifiable. Thus does Neander place himself on a level with Hennel, who reduces the whole to a dream of Peter.

* Very beautifully has Bonnet, in his excellent writing, *La Parole et la Foi* (Geneva and Paris, 1851, directed against Scherer), thus adduced the argument for the second epistle of Peter, p. 27, 30.

this, it was most natural for them to ask about the appearing of *Elias*. That Elias must come before the Messiah, had perhaps already before this suggested itself as a matter of secret doubt to their minds; in Matt. chap. xi. 14, Christ had already explained this of the Baptist, and their *ears* indeed had heard what was then said; now, however, another Elias, the personal Elias, has just appeared to them, and scarcely have they seen and heard what then appeared to them, when it has vanished again, and they are to tell it to no one! All this brings powerfully to their minds the saying of the scribes, and the question how all this perplexing appearance, which has just been presented to their eyes, stands related to that saying. *Not* that the meaning of their question could be: It is certainly only a saying of the Scribes—but: Wherefore has he again disappeared, and are we not to make it known? What avails it that he is come? and in what way hast thou meant that John also is the future Elias? They do not, however, speak out clearly all these questions, as indeed in the confusion of the moment, they must have been complicated in their own minds; but, in the manner of men who are shy in putting a question, and who never speak clearly out, they ask generally: What then do the Scribes say? *i. e., what dost thou say to this*, that they say and teach? Inform us of this matter, and give us the solution of it! (This is the sense of the ὅτι, *that*, in Mark, which puts the question indirectly; it is not equivalent to διότι or διατί, *wherefore*, afterwards in ver. 28, as in the Sept., in Josephus, and also in the profane writers, but to be supplemented thus: How does it therewith stand related that—?) And if we only ask *him* concerning all that the Scribes say, he gives willingly the right information, as much as we can bear.

Verses 11, 12. Whoever, in this answer of Christ, would explain away the manifest and striking confirmation of the fact, that a coming of Elias was yet to take place, must do great violence to the words, and will never be able to strain the future ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα, "*shall* restore all things," in form and import, so as to be applicable also to John the Baptist. In Mark, the first clause stands as plain, though not so precise, with ἀποκαθιστᾷ, "restoreth," in the present, as in Matthew there is only the directly confirmatory ἔρχεται, *cometh* ("shall come"). Christ cannot possibly have intended to say any thing else, as the words run, than quite decidedly: By all means the Scribes are right; Elias comes or *must* come *first*, ere the entire setting up of the Messiah's kingdom, in the most proper and final sense, takes place. He does not, indeed, hereby confirm the errors and fables which the earlier or later Scribes connected with it, he only confirms in general the doctrine and expectation, not as a saying of the commentators, but as a simply to be read γέγραπται, "it is written." For as has been already said, by אֵת אֵלִיָּה הַנָּבִיא, "Elijah the prophet," with the article, the sacred text in Malachi can only mean the historical person; so much the more certainly as, immediately before, Moses is designated by a like *nomen proprium*, hence the Sept. has rendered it precisely by τὸν Θεσβίτην, "the Tishbite." The Christian Scribes of the present day, indeed, easily settle such matters—"they rough-plane it very cleverly, and say, It is a Jewish representation—though they are not well acquainted even with Jewish representations."* But the Church fathers teach, with the Jews, a future return of Elias, because Christ has here confirmed it as it stands written. Justin, for example, acknowledges this to Trypho; Augustine connects Israel's conversion, and their final true and spiritual understanding of the law as fulfilled in Christ, with the labors of this prophet (*de civ. Dei*, lib. 20, c. 29). The more particular investigation of all this, and the question whether Elias is also one of the two witnesses in the Apocalypse, does not belong to this place, where we have only to establish the clear statement of Christ.

Ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα, *shall restore all things*—this connects well with the expression of the Sept., ὃς ἀποκαταστήσει καρδίαν (who will restore the heart) for לֵב הֵשִׁיב, but, by the πάντα, *all things*, conjoined with it, the idea is so much extended as to become almost something different from the bringing back of the hearts of the fathers to the children, which is there said. Καθιστάναι, means to *set up*, to restore—compounded with ἀπό, it is intensified so as to mean: Perfectly or entirely to set up, to bring any thing to pass, so as to be what and how it should be.† Yet there lies here in the πρῶτον, *first*, a necessary limitation of the πάντα, implying that the forerunner does not already set up the kingdom (Acts i. 16)—for what then would remain to be done by Christ himself? Consequently: He will *put every thing in order* for the kingdom, will completely accomplish the work of *making ready a people prepared for the Lord* (Luke i. 17), committed to him as his office, in a wider and more proper sense of its fulfillment than John preliminarily and typically did. It is not a *restitutio omnium rerum in integrum* (restoration of all things to their entireness) that is spoken of here, any more than afterwards at Acts iii. 21, where, moreover, this manifoldly significant word is differently applied, so as to refer to the presentation of *all that has been prophesied of* in its fulfilled reality. What Elias agreeably to his character did at first in the kingdom of God, by pointing powerfully to the Lord in a period of most melancholy degeneracy, and as a reforming prophet repairing the altar of the Lord that was broken down (1 Kings xviii. 30), in order that the fire from heaven might

* To apply the words used by Meyer in connection with another subject.

† A much stronger idea than merely to "bring back to the right track," as Neander makes it.

come down upon it—the same is represented as being done by him, also at his return, and that with abundantly more effect. This he *shall* do—how could Christ mean *by this* the work of the Baptist, who had already come (ἤδη ἦλθε), which remained for the most part fruitless, whose coming together with his rejection, and his being given over to the will of the unrighteous, forms rather the sharpest antithesis to the first ἔρχεται or "cometh?"

And yet in the words, *But I say unto you*, Christ certainly says in addition to this that, in a certain sense, the person of John was also meant by the prophecy respecting Elias. We see, therefore, that this prophecy, according to Christ's manner of interpretation, which affords a rule for many others, fulfills itself twice, and his present statement is in perfect harmony with what he said before at ch. xi. 14 (as we there explained it). Every half fulfilled prophecy will, at one time, be entirely fulfilled, so that not an iota of its word shall fail of fulfillment; many, even by far the most of prophecies again, have their typical before their final fulfillment. They knew not the first Elias—would not take him for what he was (ch. xi. 14),* but did to him *whatsoever they listed*—and yet only what was at the same time already foreseen, ordained, and written (comp. Matt. xxvi. 24 with Luke xxii. 22). *They* have done what happened to him; for Christ imputes not merely to Herod and Herodias, what they did according to the mind and in the name of many, and reckons in the ἐποίησαν, "have done," all that the people collectively did against him, which proceeded from the οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν, "they knew not," the natural result of which was the martyrdom of the preacher of repentance, who was as it were left in the lurch by the nation.† In like manner it awaits the Son of Man (now in the immediate future) also to suffer from them! This simple extract of the principal thing in Matthew is explained by the fuller and more exact statement in Mark, where, by a striking turn, the *question* immediately follows—properly a convictive counter-question to the disciples: How then (if there be only one coming of the Messiah and Elias) can it be written of the Son of Man, that he must suffer many things and be set at naught? (ἵνα for ὅτι, ver. 30, and the strong expression ἐξουδενωθῇ, not without reference to Isa. liii. 3 נִבְזֶה וְלֹא חָשָׁב, Dan. ix. 26 וְאֵין לוֹ, in both of which passages the Sept. has quite mistaken the meaning). Inasmuch as the scribes do not read and understand *this*, their saying about the coming of Elias is one-sidedly false; rightly understood, however, the two things are quite compatible, for there is a first and second Elias, just as there is a first and second coming of the Son of Man. That *the Scribes* have derived their saying, *Elias must first come*, in general truly from the *Scripture*, although they do not understand what this specially means, is finally denoted again by the words *as it is written of him*, in which it is maintained that the sufferings of the first Elias, as well as those of the Messiah, were the subject of prophecy. For it will not do to supply here merely, in general, that he is to come; yet our interpretation is still too dim-sighted to discover with certainty, where the prophecy of John's fate is to be found. Some have said that from the foretold sufferings of Christ an inference may be made impliedly to those of his forerunner, or that the record of the Tishbite's life shows us the antitype in the type.* Both of these conjectures, however, are insufficient, the latter also, whatever truth belongs to it, does not go the full length, as the agreement fails precisely in the death of Elias; it is reasonable, therefore, in us to wait for a future opening up of the Scripture. He who, in regard to the prophetical word, cannot bring his proud, learned heart to this, as in many places it is proper to do, is not qualified for attaining by humble investigation to an understanding of prophecy. He, in fine, who "is not ashamed"† to declare that it is *preposterous* "to find in the Old Testament the Christian idea of the suffering Messiah," and who, in the character of a Christian scribe, is so bold as to contradict the Lord Jesus to his transfigured face—such a one we should in vain ask to read and hear how Christ again, in all that he says, points back to his *sufferings*, of which it stands *written*, how he "manifestly distinguishes between his first and second coming, and thus alone gives *the key to the understanding of all the Old Testament prophets.*"

* "Thus is many a great man not known during his lifetime, even supposing that he also were prophesied of in the Bible!" (Roos).

† Sepp, strange to say, finds here the first information and discovery made by Christ to his disciples, that John the Baptist was killed.

* So Hengstenberg: Christ considers the history of Elias as a prophecy of the history of John; he shows how even John *cannot* at all be Elias if he did not experience contradiction of sinners, rejection and suffering.

† De Wette, *Practical explanation of the Psalms*, p. 18, 19—a scarcely credible specimen of confused statements with bold assertions is this little work as a whole, to be abused in which, I reckon an honor. Should not the author, now dead, have been himself a little ashamed of *this* opposition, in his last and better days?

THE LUNATIC, THE UNBELIEVING AND PERVERSE GENERATION.

(Matt. xvii. 17, 20, 21; Mark ix. 16, 19, 21–29; Luke ix. 41.)

What a change, to which we find nothing similar in the life of Christ! From the Mount of Transfiguration, out of the opened heaven, he comes down to the vale of tears, and finds the distress of a more than ordinary fearful case of demoniacal possession, finds the mockery of the Scribes directed against the disciples who were left behind, finds the unbelief in Israel, unbelief also in his own disciples, and his difficult work with this generation begins forthwith anew. From the sanctuary, into which *his* perfect faith has introduced him, he comes forth—and what a spectacle meets his view! Nothing more natural than that all he now says should bear the stamp of holy passion and zeal coming from the depths of his bosom, as well as that the ground-tone of it all continues to be a complaint against their unbelief, and the overpoweringly pressing invitation to faith. Matthew gives prominence to the two principal sayings in which this is expressed, giving only so much of the narrative as is necessarily connected with these; Mark is able, again from good sources, vividly to paint the whole occurrence, and, besides, he preserves important words spoken by Christ in conversation with the father of the lunatic, as also at the healing of the latter; Luke alone adds at least the circumstance, that it was an only son.

The disciples, who remained below, should have cast out the devil in the absence of their Master, for to them in the meantime the demoniac had been brought; but they could not, although Luke has recorded at the beginning of the same chapter, that Christ had given them authority and power over all devils.* This caused a pressing of the people around the poor disciples to their shame, a reasoning among the Scribes certainly not friendly to them, and thus the Master finds them when he returns to them! All the *people* are "struck with fear" at his presence suddenly appearing in these circumstances, they are moved with something more than accustomed reverence,† and hasten to him, humbly saluting him: it is hereby indicated, however, that the Scribes did not join with them. And he immediately begins by inquiring what is the matter, and where help is wanted. He *asked*—not the Scribes (which is a reading arising from a false interpretation), probably also not merely the people who ran to him, but, as was very natural, *all in common*, including *his disciples* as the principal persons to whom he had come: *Why dispute ye with one another?** What are you about, that I should find you in such commotion? But the ashamed disciples are silent, nor do the Scribes think proper to acknowledge before the Master what they have been saying against the disciples. Instead of them, the man about whose case the question was, the agitated and sadly disappointed father of the possessed, takes up the word, and relates the case with a terrible description of the malady, and a melancholy charge against the disciples: *They could not—they were not able.* The first answer of Christ, however, is a strongly vented word of grief, an accusation of unbelief against the whole race in common, into whose midst he must thus again enter; *this* word has very strikingly been preserved almost literally the same by all the three Evangelists.

Verse 17. An expression of holy impatience, to reach the goal which he had just been so near on the Mount; the vehement indignation of warm love, which seeks only *faith* to call forth the helping power and glory of God (Luke ver. 43; John xi. 40); the inward grief of him who was holy and righteous in the truth of God, and to whom the perversity of men is so hard to *bear!* It is with him a different zeal from that of Moses (Num. xx. 10), which was sinful, because it becomes no one, who is himself a sinner, to rebuke in his own might. *How long* shall I continue *with you*, labor almost in vain among you, who even yet do not *believe?* How long shall I still *suffer* you? Only he can speak thus who, as the holy One among sinners, bore the burden of all (Gal. vi. 2), and whose whole life was in the innermost sense, from the very first, a profound *suffering* through the feeling and enduring of sin. Thus according to the Father's counsel it was necessary in this word, which

* According to Lange, this loss of former power was "probably a consequence of the great depression, which the communication of Christ regarding his impending sufferings had produced in them."

† This may be sufficiently explained also without supposing, as many do, an after-lustre of the transfiguration. What was proper for Moses was *beneath* the dignity of Christ; besides *here* the miraculous sight was not meant as an after-lustre for *his people.*

* I do not retract this, although Alford has contradicted me, and I read Mark ix. 16 with many now: ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοῖς (which here almost recurs to the αὐτούς and αὐτοῖς, ver. 14, but takes in, however, the ὄχλος named ver. 15)—as also with the received text and several: συζητεῖτε πρὸς αὐτούς (Cod. A. ἑαυτούς). Quite naturally, inasmuch as all were gathered round the disciples when Christ came to them, he does not immediately single out the disciples alone (as Alford has misunderstood me), but puts them in this first address, as afterwards (ver. 16), together with the entire unbelieving generation. It is his first impression which here finds the expression: What have you sons of men already again found to dispute and be in distress about?

was drawn from the usually closed depths of his heart, immediately after the revelation of his glory, to manifest the glory also of his human endurance, the pain of divine love in his human nature, which was alike strongly susceptible of this on account of meekness and purity. If we had not this word, and that other in Luke xii. 50, we should want the true, entire insight into the self-denying, atoning nature even of his whole earthly course in our flesh and blood. What complainings, known only to the Father, does this single expression, which he neither can nor will restrain, pre-suppose? He takes, however, this expression also of most immediately personal feeling—so entirely do all his thoughts continually move in the sphere of Holy Writ—directly from that first complaint of God against his people in Deut. xxxii. 5, 20 (where the Sept. has in the first of these verses γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη, in the second ἐξεστραμμένη. There also follows at ver. 20, οὐκ ἔστι πίστις ἐν αὐτοῖς, as the right rendering of לֹא אֱמֻן בָּם*, *in whom is no faith*—this, however, Christ puts with emphasis before in his ἄπιστος). This rebuking complaint then applies again to *all in common*, to whom he has now come,† in whose *unbelief* he sees represented mankind, especially all Israel as it is, the perverse generation by nature and from of old; nay, the repetition of that word of the Spirit in the mouth of Christ already points beforehand to the rejection of this people on account of their unbelief, which is further prophesied of in Deut. xxxii. *First of all*, however, the words apply to the hastily judging people, as also to the scribes, who were malignantly rejoicing at the impotency of the disciples, *then*, in particular, to the father of the demoniac, as we shall immediately see; *finally*, also in no less measure to the disciples, who were bringing shame upon him below, when he was receiving honor above—they certainly deserve on this occasion to be classed with the multitude.‡ Still the rebuking complaint is by no means to be regarded as a repulse, implying that he now ceased to bear and to love (already in the ἕως πότε, *how long*, he represents himself as obediently waiting with patience), but with all the more effect on this account does the majestically brief command of the Helper follow: Bring *him* hither to me, him who is in need of help!—as in every thing there is ever again the one thing: Bring him only to *Me!*

What Matthew hastily sums up in ver. 18, in order to connect with it the other *word* concerning unbelief, is given by Mark in full detail. The evil spirit, at the look of Jesus, immediately raises the frightful paroxysm in the person who had been brought to him. But without any trace or tincture of that horror which had restrained the faith of the disciples, with a calmness which is at the same time a feeling of deep sympathy with the wretchedness before him, Christ looks on the tearing, rolling, and foaming child, wisely delays the help in order that all who were agitated might be tranquilized and prepared for the salutary impression, and kindly asks the father how long it is since *this* happened to the poor boy; τοῦτο, with full and hearty sympathy and consideration—as much as to say, This is indeed very bad and melancholy! The father, as if it were necessary to keep up this sympathy, begins anew to describe the case in stronger terms than before, and as he before complained that the disciples could not help him, so now, in his anguish, he speaks very unbelievingly indeed (differently from the leper in Matt. viii. 2) the bold word: *But if thou canst do any thing*, more than the disciples in thy name—help us, have compassion on us! This *us*, proceeding from paternal love, this cry for pity would in ordinary circumstances, notwithstanding all the boldness of the *if*, have moved Christ immediately to say: Be whole!—Now, however, his mind is so full of thoughts about faith and unbelief, that the bodily malady, bad as it is, falls into the background; he delays still the help which will certainly come, and must first speak and testify of faith. One feels the sublimity of this single interest and zeal with which Christ here speaks and acts, as opposed to the last impotent raging of the spirit that is to be cast out. The poor father almost doubts whether he can do any thing; in the reply which he gives, Christ leads him into his own heart: If thou couldst *believe!* This is the principal thing—my power will then certainly show itself.* If he spoke so doubtingly to Christ with this "If," with what doubts is he likely to have gone at first to the disciples, when the Master whom he wanted was not there. *His* faith could and must first of all do the most, as the Son appears almost passively incapable; his *unbelief*, next to the power of the malady, had

* Which the more recent commentators without reason deny, see Isa. xxvi. 2 3, 4; Hab. ii. 4.

† In Mark ver. 19, αὐτοῖς and ὑμᾶς are connected exactly with ver. 16.

‡ Schleiermacher finds such a reference to the disciples, although certainly unwarranted, yet, in the connection, very natural. (According to him the whole story of the transfiguration, and what belongs to it in Matthew, has undergone "a transformation into something strange and odd, an unfortunate complication.") On the other hand, Neander will not at all admit that the "harsh rebuke" was intended for the weak apostles, whom on other occasions Christ treats so gently; they would not, in that case, he thinks, have asked him as afterwards follows. The word according to him, was spoken *chiefly* to the father of the possessed, and with him to all who should at any time desire merely *bodily* help.

* On the neuter τό, before entire clauses, see Winer, § 20. Others construe: As regards this (that *thou saidst*): εἰ δύνασαι,—know that all is possible, etc. (in which πιστεῦσαι must fall out as not genuine). Others again artificially construe, by reading the imper. mid. πίστευσαι, as if it meant: Only believe *that* εἰ δύνασαι!

been to the disciples the obstacle that had put out their little spark of faith. He who does not believe can do nothing, and he who can, is yet not able to show the unbeliever any thing within the sphere of the operations of this miraculous power of God over nature, and that, moreover against the power of hell. *But all things are possible to him that believeth!* Who needs an interpretation of this word in order to understand it? And who can fathom its immeasurable depth of meaning, who can exhaust it in thought and feeling? Christ repeats the *All things are possible* to the disciples, with a *Nothing shall be impossible to you* (ver. 20); we will speak of it when we come to that verse.

It is not our plan to interpret the words of men to Jesus, otherwise there would be much to say upon the ingenuous exclamation of the man (Mark, ver. 24), which, amid all his unbelief, the Holy Ghost puts into his lips, in order that it might afterwards have a place in the Gospel for the instruction of the whole world. We only say here again, that we deeply pity any one who does not feel constrained to acknowledge such narratives and sayings, as Mark here gives, to be *unsearchable*, the origin of which was *possible* only as *facts* in the living conflict of the Son of God with the children of men. Where do we read the like? Where has the like been done? Into whose mind could such things come if they did not actually take place? Perhaps even yet Christ would have *spoken* further of faith and unbelief, but the press of the people around the person who was ill, and the talk about him, increased, and this at length moves him (as Mark, exact even to the last feature, observes) to speak his word of power as Helper, and, on account of the unbelief which was there, where faith must needs co-operate in order to the exertion of his power, he speaks here in a greater number of words than we have an example of any where else. He addresses the spirit at some length, puts his *I command thee* in opposition to the command of the disciples, which had been powerless, and which had made the devil so bold, and, in order to give the most perfect assurance to the father and son and all the hearers, he adds the command, which occurs only here, that it should depart from him for ever, never again to enter into him. What condescension here marks the work and faithfulness of Christ, in the regard which he shows to every circumstance! Now the deaf spirit must hear the command addressed to him, now the evil spirit departs after venting his rage for the last time.

The disciples, however, have not yet heard aright the Master's word to the unbelieving generation, and from their great slowness to hear, it has never occurred to them, at least not come home to them as the principal thing, to apply it also to themselves! This Matthew records of himself along with the others, and lets us see, at the same time, only by this, what he has no where expressly told us, namely, that the disciples hitherto from the time that Christ gave them power, *had been able* to cast out devils, and that the present was the first astonishing case of failure. Many and various may have been their thoughts and conjectures as to wherein the cause of this failure lay: too many spirits in the diseased person, or one that was too powerful for them? his own great sin, or that of his father? their own sinfulness? perhaps the dispute about precedency which had already been raised by the separation of the three disciples, and which soon came to light? or some other secret ban lay in the midst of them? The Master, however, says it, and comprises it in one word: *Because of your unbelief!*

Verse 20. This is also a general and fundamental answer, brought to us from the Mount of Transfiguration, to all our inability both past and present. It is, at the same time, a most friendly rebuke, as afterwards it is said of the Comforter, that he shall reprove the world of sin, in that they believe not. Three times, so far as we know, has Christ in almost the same words, attributed so great effects to *faith*, or rather this greatest one of all, that nothing is to be impossible to it; we find a repetition of it, not merely in Matt. xxi. 21, but also previous to this in Luke xvii. 6. When Christ spoke with the father of the demoniac, he disclosed his unbelief to him as the obstacle that stood in the way; now, however, he lays the blame on the disciples. Let each have his own! Let every one seek and find out his own sin! The disciples ought certainly to have been able with their strong faith to overcome even the unbelief of the man (because it was not complete unbelief), and to remove it as a mountain; this is evidently implied in the words of Christ. This is the first and only occasion (besides Mark xvi. 14; John xx. 27, after the resurrection), on which Christ so literally applies to the disciples this word of severe rebuke, "unbelief;" instead of this he usually, when reproving their unbelief, kindly addresses them by, "O ye of little faith!" The expression in Mark iv. 40, however, borders upon it: How is it that ye have no faith? namely, now in readiness, as the other way of taking it runs: Where is your faith? Thus and no otherwise is here to be understood the expression "If *ye have* faith"—not merely, if ye possess faith in general, but if ye have it ready, and hold it fast for the moment when ye are called to use it, and to prove it. Then, however, all distinction between little and much, small and great faith, properly speaking, falls to the ground, the *smallest* measure of real, living power of faith, disturbed at the moment by no unbelief and doubt, is sufficient to accomplish the *greatest* things, just as a small spark actually burning kindles an entire ὕλη ("matter," James iii. 5). For either, on the one hand, faith remains faith, or, on the other, unbelief remains unbelief! It is precisely *this mountain* before their eyes—therefore does Christ take the similitude from it, and again

speak biblically and proverbially at the same time. Mountains are obstacles which are to be removed out of the way; as in Isa. xl. 4, out of the way of the coming Lord; Zech. iv. 7, the hindrances to the building of the temple. As with us it is quite common to say (although, since the period of railways, this expression has almost lost its force) that there is still many a hill to be surmounted, that one has not yet got over all the mountains in the way. Among the Jews an eloquent teacher is called עֹקֵר הָרִים, *one who tears up mountains.* This, now, Christ takes as a figure and example of any miraculously powerful effect of faith, when he immediately goes on to say in general: Mountains shall remove out of their place if ye bid them, all things will be obedient to what you say, *nothing will be impossible to you!** to you even as to God (ch. xix. 26; Luke i. 37). Thus does Christ put the omnipotence of God into our hand of faith. Thus he says to us that faith, because it lays hold on the omnipotence of God, can, in virtue of this, work miracles—but how and to what purpose does he mean this? He speaks of the wonders of God's power in the sphere of external nature, in order to awaken and strengthen our faith in the miracles of grace wrought in the hearts of men.† He, in the first place, rebukes that unbelief, so deeply-rooted in man (since Satan's first lie, which separated the world from God) and to this day so prevalent in Christendom, which looks upon nature with its objects and laws as if the supreme free will of the living God had not remained immanent in it from the creation onwards (Heb. xi. 3). Not as the scoffers who, speaking scoffingly even of a *creation*, affirm *that all things remain as they were from the beginning of the creation.* As if the one original law of the power of freedom, of spirit and will, is not to be reckoned as a living, penetrating element in all "laws," and to be received as a never failing pre-supposition. God does as he will with the powers of heaven and of earth (Dan. iv. 32)—can still always make what he will, can create also something new in the old creation (Psa. cxv. 3; Num. xvi. 30). Whatsoever he will, he does, in heaven and on the earth, in the sea and in all deep places (Psa. cxxxv. 6). He *removes mountains* ere they are aware of it, moves the earth out of its place; speaks to the sun and it riseth not, and seals up the stars; he alone spreads out the heaven and walks on the waves of the sea. To this simplicity of Job (ch. ix. 5–8) must all the learning of natural science return in the spirit of a little child, if, as an idolatrous illusion, it would not rest in mediate causes, and in that which in itself is nothing. Nothing stands so fast, not even the granite of the original mountains,* as not to be subject every moment to the mighty hand of God; and this puts such power into the hand of our faith, into the word of our confidence: Ye shall point out to the mountain its place, saying ἐντεῦθεν ἐκεῖ, "Hence to yonder place," and it will obey! Nothing therefore is said at all, and one knows not of what one speaks, if these promised miracles in external nature are cast aside, and only the *similitude* left over; this were to forget the simple proposition, that every similitude must first be true and real in its substratum, in order that with this any thing may reasonably be compared; otherwise the promise cancels itself, and becomes its opposite. If we might answer: But really to remove actual hills, this certainly cannot be, Lord—then would his word to us rather mean: It is equally impossible for your faith to remove many an obstacle! It is here, just as at Ezek. xxxvii., where, in the figurative resurrection, the literal must also be guaranteed, for otherwise the meaning and answer of the Son of Man to the question of God would be quite just: Lord, as little as these dead bones can become again alive, so little also can these dry bones of the house of Israel. We will not here relate and examine, as regards the actual removing of mountains, the sayings and stories to which Bengel alludes in his *Factum tamen est aliquando* (it has sometimes taken place nevertheless);† that faith has wrought miracles in the outer world, and still sometimes works them, is disputed only by those fools who think that, with their unbelief, they can blow away all the *Facta* of history, and when such a work is wrought, it is at bottom all one whether it be a seed-corn or a mountain that miraculously gives place to faith. Finally, however, which is the more real and actual, the sphere of spirit, or that of *matter*, which latter Heinroth, for example, has declared to be a "hypothesis?" Which is more difficult (to speak with Christ truly in place of our folly, Matt. ix. 5), to remove a mountain, or to tear out a root of sin from the heart, to remove a σκάνδαλον of unbelief, so that faith may have free course, moreover, to show the way to the spirits of hell, who do not merely lie like the mountains in the place

* Which ὑμῖν abundantly refutes that cunning refinement that timidly turns away from the words by reading the foregoing word in Mark ix. 23: Πάντα δυνατά, omnia effici possunt, *a Deo scilicet*; τῷ πιστεύοντι, in usum confidentium!

† Others, indeed, less in harmony with the proverbial usage, are for finding an allusion to those passages where *mountains* are also kingdoms, powers of the world—nay "*this mountain*" (which, however, would not at all be suitable) is said precisely to be the power of the heathen world—as elsewhere the fig-tree is Judaism! (*Evang. Kirchenz.* 1847, p. 948).

* Not even the equilibrium of the heavenly bodies, which it is reckoned would compensate for all permanent disturbance (for example, in the solar system, balancing Jupiter by Saturn!).

† Nor the lauded act of Father Rodinger in behalf of the holy Elizabeth of Marburgh, whose doubts he removed by transplanting trees (Luke xvii. 6) from one shore of the river to the other (Sepp, iii. 241).

where God has created them? To create a new heart is more than to create a new heaven and new earth; when God shall have prepared his chosen ones by the work of thousands of years, he will then, by the word of his power, transform the earth for them, in one day. *In this* lies the reason why faith which can do all things has yet seldom (or perhaps never) removed mountains; for the same faith knows also that such things render no service to the kingdom of God, and it will work only for the kingdom of God. The difficult mountains for faith lie elsewhere, the greater miracles are the miracles of grace in the heart of man. It is true, indeed, since even grace does not compel, that our faith also, however strong, cannot bid away the sin of another; but our own sin will yield to faith, which brings the omnipotence of God into its will, and our own faith can work much good, can overcome much opposing unbelief, can so suffer and love a whole unbelieving and perverse generation, that something may be made of it which can be made only thus. To this the word of Christ points, and gives us, in the bosom of a sharp rebuke, a most cheering consolation, inasmuch as he attributes such great power even to the small grain of mustard seed. It is our duty then when we have any faith, as it were by a second potency, to believe in the right and might of our faith,* not to let it fall aside, but by watching, praying, fasting, to keep the mustard seed in growth and exercise, so that, when the occasion comes, we may have faith to remove precisely *this* mountain which is now in our way, if only another unbelief do not keep it fixed by the root.

Verse 21. Christ says two things in the *But* here: first, that he had meant the casting out of devils by the similitude of removing mountains; and, secondly, that to control spirits, to break the evil will, the wicked power in the kingdom of sin and of rebellion against the Almighty, who tolerates it according to the law of freedom, and even removes it only thus, is indeed another and greater thing than the simple working of miracles in helpless nature. *This* may perhaps be the deepest meaning of the expression *This kind* —this kind of mountains in the way, of things to be removed for the kingdom of God—or somewhat more nearly as a certain Bible glosses it: This kind of enemies of man, the devils. In so far we could not insist on maintaining precisely, that here (as at ch. xii. 45) Christ speaks of a particular kind of worse, or stronger devils; and yet, on the other hand, the ἐκπορεύεται seems to point to others which *go out* more easily, and we have nothing to say against its being so understood at the same time, so much the less that Mark gives *only* this word, which, by itself and without the foregoing antithesis, must be so understood. Probably the disciples also had been thinking of specially obstinate spirits; Christ then would in the second place confirm this thought of theirs, after having in the first place particularly spoken of unbelief. Instead of the strong and ever prepared faith, to which even the worse sort also must yield, he calls it now very significantly *praying* and *fasting;** he thereby goes still a step deeper into the matter, and gives unasked an answer to the second question which the disciples should have put: Why, then, had we not our faith now, but unbelief? You have not carefully enough kept and exercised your faith. This is done by *prayer;* he who lives in prayer lives in faith, and if we are found praying in connection with any work we have to do, it will then be seen how much the earnest prayer of faith can do. Finally, *fasting* is a help to prayer, sobriety and temperance in what pertains to the bodily life, the opposite of which can only strengthen the flesh against the spirit. Fasting, then, when joined with prayer, and used as a help to it, is also of great value; this Christ would not have to be forgotten, and he speaks it out on this opportunity, in order to put it as a counterpoise to the misunderstanding of what he had formerly said, ch. ix. 15. What he says in the first place, of quite literal bodily fasting, may indeed be further understood of the *turning away* from the world and nature in general, which will assist in *turning to* God (prayer). Whether, as Oetinger thinks, the disciples in general or immediately before, to speak very plainly, "ate and drank too much"—we leave undetermined; that they, however, at all events deserved and needed this hint, is quite as certain as that we all have great reason to observe what Christ has here said, and diligently to apply the means here prescribed when we have any thing in hand that will not go on so easily or so speedily as we would wish.

* As Trahndorff most recently (*Der welthistor. Zweifel*, p. 35, 39) concedes the victory only to this "faith in the power of faith."

* Whereby he certainly does not mean, as rationalistic folly has perverted it: They should in future cause *such a diseased person* to pray and fast more!

SECOND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUFFERINGS.

(Matt. xvii. 22, 23; Mark ix. 31; Luke ix. 44.)

This had already been said before the transfiguration (ch. xvi.), and is now repeated after it, stronger emphasis being laid in the repetition on the *killing* and *rising again* (Mark καὶ ἀποκταν θείς): It remains so; the μέλλει, *shall*, is not taken back, although I should still walk with you a while in Galilee. The new addition, which Luke alone therefore gives, at the beginning of ver. 44, is an echo of what Christ said to the three disciples (vers. 12, 13): The Son of Man shall be betrayed *into the hands of men*, that they may do to him likewise what they will, as they did to John. The hands of men, to whom the heavenly Son of Man is, notwithstanding the likeness thus denoted, here opposed, as he was before to the whole unbelieving and perverse generation —are wicked hands, for their will and intention is wicked; this David already knew right well (1 Chron. xxii. 13).* But by whom is the παραδίδοσθαι or betrayal performed? Who delivers him up? Afterwards, at ch. xx. 18, 19, mention is made of his being delivered up to the Gentiles, which indeed is an important, and therefore also a predicted element in the sufferings of Christ; but there also this παραδώσουσιν, "shall deliver up," is preceded by a παραδοθήσεται, "he shall be betrayed." There the traitor is specially included in the first delivering up (John vi. 64, xiii. 11, 21), here, however, all *men* are viewed as opposed to the παραδιδούς or betrayer. Christ, therefore, speaks here of the counsel of God (as in Acts ii. 23; Rom. viii. 32), whose hand gives over his Son, as the Son of Man, to men from one hand to another, first to Judas, who delivers him up to the high priests, and these to the Gentiles and the unjust.

In Luke we have beforehand the words: *Let these sayings sink down into your ears!* and Von Meyer's note, with which many agree, refers this to the foregoing: "This praise and testimony of God's miraculous power for your future confirmation"—for you will need it when my sufferings begin. This, certainly, yields a good sense, but then there are no *words* of praise and astonishment at the μεγαλειότης τοῦ θεοῦ, "mighty power of God," noticed, and therefore Luke could scarcely denote this by, *these sayings;* the expression appears to us rather to be parallel with the immediately following τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο, "this saying," and is perhaps a resumption of ver. 28, the Evangelist unconsciously taking up the expression there.* Only thus does the ὑμεῖς, *you*, form a proper antithesis to the people, who are again intent on seeing outward signs of glory and power: Ye know better now what immediately awaits me; let it sink, if not into your hearts, yet into your ears, hear and retain at least the λόγοι, *words*, that have been already said and must ever again be said! (*For*, etc.) Consequently, it is just inversely as regards the foregoing interpretation: Forget not in your joy that I must suffer and die, so that you may continue humble, and not neglect prayer and fasting for the removal of the great mountains which still lie in the way to glory! The faith of Christ did not say to Golgotha, Be thou removed. His prayers and fastings did not cast the devil out of Judas, nor the devil Judas out of the circle of the apostles. He *endured* the cross, and thus removed out of the way the mountain of the world's sin and the world's guilt, so that now *salvation* is made possible to every one that *believes* (ch. xix. 25, 26). Thus ever and ever again does the word concerning the sufferings of Christ afford the true understanding, the true limitation and fulfillment, of all his other words; this is the purpose of God who delivers up the Son, the only key to all his ways, showing how, and how far, the sin which had its origin in freedom can, by his hand and the hand of men, be alone abolished in freedom.

* It would, however, be too harsh to say (with Richter's *House Bible*), that in the term "man," Christ always understands what is worst.

* Hence Alford quite correctly understands it still more exactly as if it meant: These my (for some time past) repeated words to you about suffering and dying—you are forthwith to *hear again* what you have almost forgotten, scarcely heard!

THE TRIBUTE PENNY AND STATER

(MATT. XVII. 25–27.)

The seventeenth chapter is a principal chapter, quite complete in itself—not merely in the Gospel of Matthew, but in the life of Christ himself. First, there is the transfiguration above on the heights of assured victory, obtained by faith, which already actually takes beforehand something from sight, the second sealing by the Father (John vi. 27), with the accordant testimony of Scripture and nature, of this and of the invisible world; the Son of Man standing upon the threshold between life and death, almost as if there were here no gates, and becoming conscious of the fact that in him indeed is the life and the light of men; even here, however, the *μέλλει παθόχειν ὑπ' αὐτῶν*, "he shall suffer of them," is confirmed and prepared. And now, in the contrast which is yet at the same time no contrast, we find the same Son of Man below carrying on his painful work against the power of death and the grave, bearing the burden of the unbelieving generation, which is laid on him alone (Acts xiii. 18, *ἐτροποφό-ρησεν*—Deut. xxxii. 11; Num. xi. 11, 12; Isa. xlvi. 3, lxiii. 8, 9) to remove in his faith —the word of his mouth, which also lifts the veil a little from the inner sanctuary, where this holy one of God prays and fasts in most willing, self-emptying love to sinners. Finally, in the third place, in order that this chapter may be complete, there is also a testimony to his *outward* subjection to law and tribute, although he is the free Son; how he turns even his kingly power only to the purpose of obedience, such as is proper to the subject!* All these things in this connection are no *cunningly devised fables* invented by a Gospel writer, no phantasmagoria of a dreaming Church which has been built upon no corner-stone, whose dreams (contrary to all psychology of the human race) had produced unheard-of results in the actual world up till then, and (contrary to all the history of the human race) had, in addition to this, transformed the actual word in the subsequent time, as is evident at this day in the Church which is not yet overcome by the gates of hell, in the kingdom which ever continues to come with power. Who then can with "reason," *i. e.*, at least, with consistency, deny the actual truth of these narratives and testimonies, except those to whom the whole history of the world and their own personal life has become a phantasmagoria, an illusion! But those people whom another has made so wise to choose Blocksberg* for Tabor,† should yet, if they thoroughly examine their own self-consciousness and that of the world, be afraid of the *future* weighty dreams of their poor souls, and should give a little more study to Hamlet's soliloquy. If they can make easy work of the first part, "To be, or not to be, that is the question" in the *idea*, still the *conscience* does not comprehend it; the fear of death (Heb. ii. 15), shows ever again only a sleeping instead of a not-being, and—"What in that sleep of death, for dreams may come"—*that is the question!* "Is it not thus," the Lord God asks also Cain. Oh ye poor ones, who wilfully deny the *Redeemer with your feigned words* (2 Pet. ii. 3), which even now every breath of morning air that blows from the great day of the Lord into your souls, scatters like chaff before the wind!

Already from the profound connection of the incident of the tribute money with the whole chapter to which it belongs, enough will appear to warrant our not calling this "the most difficult miraculous story in the Gospel record," with a believing commentator who, in the love of his faith, inclined a little *too much* to the men of the idealistic school, and who now that he has gone to his rest, understands all better. We ask wherein lies this difficulty, if only we keep to that central point from which alone the entire life and labors of Jesus can be understood! Already Bengel, who for the exegesis of the Scripture must ever anew be revived, has expressed almost every thing in the words: "In medio actu submissionis emicat majestas;" only we might still more aptly invert the expression: In the midst of the majesty, to which the fishes of the sea when it is necessary are subservient, submission maintains itself.

The tax which is here indicated by the article *τὰ δίδραχμα* as well-known to Jewish readers was certainly the half shekel of the temple tribute (2 Kings xii. 4: 2 Chron. xxiv. 6, 9; comp. Neh. x. 32), which had its origin as in Exod. xxx. 13, and was afterwards kept up.‡ (Although the Sept., reckoning accord-

* The remark that Matthew alone, the former tax-gatherer, has preserved the account of the *stater* goes to substitute what is merely human in the place of much deeper motives in the Evangelist for the connection.

* Namely of the *Idealist* who quite correctly says: "In truth, if I am all that, then am I mad to-day!" Goethe's *Faust* is their Bible.

† We abide by the usual *name*, although Robinson has refuted it.

‡ True, indeed, even Wieseler recently understands the civil tax to the Roman emperor, but we protest against this explanation. It greatly weak-

ing to Alexandrine double *drachms*, puts δίδραχμον for שֶׁקֶל, Gen. xxiii. 15, 16; Exod. xxi. 32, xxx. 13, 15, &c., and for מַחֲצִית הַשֶּׁקֶל, בֶּקַע מִשְׁקָל, Gen. xxiv. 22; Exod. xxxviii. 26, puts δραχμή, nay at Exod. xxx. 13 ἥμισυ τοῦ δίδραχμου; yet Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vii. 26, and Philo have the Attic reckoning as here, in like manner Aquila, Exod. xxxviii. 26, δίδραχμον.) According to the Talmudical Tract שְׁקָלִים (*Shekalim*), the payment was not a thing of compulsion, but a voluntary work of legal piety; hence, the modest question of the tribute-gatherers here, which yet at the same time, has something odious in it: Does *your Master* pay this tax? or does he omit this, in the exercise of his well-known freedom?* They avoid the Master himself, as they always do, and address themselves to the spokesman Peter, who was settled in Capernaum, as Jesus himself was to a certain extent. Peter says, of course, Yes, because he knew what to say, from what had taken place on a former occasion; but his prompt answer is immediately followed by embarrassment, on finding that there is no money in the bag. For this is presupposed in the account, as otherwise Christ would not have devised means of providing in another way.

Christ foreknew all this, because it was ordained that he should now know it, in the Father's counsel, according to which the conclusion of the seventeenth chapter of Matthew was ordained to be just what it is, and not otherwise; he anticipates the embarrassed question with an explanation, which (to remove this mistake beforehand) is certainly not meant to find fault with Peter's Yes, as if it had been too rashly and inconsiderately spoken.† Such an idea seems to us to shift the entire meaning of the thing, and to be itself inconsiderate. What other answer should Peter have given than the historical truth which was known to him, and concerning which he was asked? Should he have said something to this effect: He has been in the general habit of paying, but whether he will do so on this occasion, I know not? Or, what he was *forbidden* to say: He is God's Son, and free from the temple tribute? Christ then does not mean this, nor is there in what he says the slightest censure of Peter. His question, *What thinkest thou, Simon?* also anticipates the thoughts of Simon only in this, that the latter might afterwards have deemed it to be strange, and properly speaking, unjust that the Son of God should be put into embarrassment by this tax, paid by subjects to the house of his Father! These after-thoughts were quite as natural and right as the first answer; the προέφθασεν, "prevented," means in general that Christ, in all that he said, *anticipated* the thoughts of Peter, and met these with a distinct solution of the difficulty. Christ, in order to demonstrate by general analogy the truth of the claim, according to which he would certainly be exempt from this tax, now compares the *great King* in Jerusalem, the God of Israel, with *the kings of the earth*, into whose ranks he has actually entered by the theocratical constitution. The kings of *the earth* take neither τέλη (of things), nor κῆνσον (of the person), neither *tax nor custom* of any kind whatever, from the princes, their own sons—thus says the heavenly One, over whom the Voice from heaven bore testimony shortly before that *He is the Son*. Peter, when again asked, must give an answer which is quite right, and yet contradicts his former Yes. Christ first brings this contradiction between his right and his conduct into full prominence in the expressed inference: Then are *the children*, properly the *sons*, free. Was the half shekel originally a ransom for the person, (אִישׁ כֹּפֶר נַפְשׁוֹ), as afterwards, at ver. 27, ἀντί indicates, it follows that the Redeemer himself was as free from this, as from that in Luke ii. 23. But that in the application of what he has said he still retains the *plural*, which before was quite proper, instead of saying, Then am *I* as the Son of God, free—in this lies one of the most striking expressions of condescension which he ever made. The paying of tribute being in itself something outward, belonging to this world, he might, indeed, as he was ever ready to do in such cases, rank himself along with them: That *we*

ens the idea of the *viós* (vers. 25, 26), removes the equally clear and significant connection with the transfiguration, and rejects the profound meaning lying precisely therein. We agree in this instance with Neander, who, in like manner against Wieseler, observes: "The entire significance of the account rests precisely on this, that it is no common political, but a Temple tax." When the Church fathers (Clemens, Origen, Augustine, Jerome), understand it of the imperial tax, they have thereby certainly missed the import of the entire incident—as the English writer Trench has, by a thorough investigation, made out. That Wieseler attempted "so forced an interpretation" as this only for the sake of his harmony has with truth been represented to him also in Tholuck's *Litt. Anzeiger*.

* Whether, according to *Pirke Aboth*, c. 4, §. 5, Rabbis were actually exempt from taxation, is uncertain, and so far as regards that period may rather be doubted from this account. Others think that, because Jesus had for a long time been away from Capernaum, this made the tribute-gatherer uncertain. Perhaps it may also (with Braune) be understood as if the question, "Does your Master pay?" was nothing more than a *polite* way of asking payment.

† Peter could and durst not on his part answer otherwise. It is mere trifling in Lange, when he makes this Yes of Peter, mistakenly described as "inconsiderate," to be typical again of the error of the Catholic Church, in fettering the freedom of Christ by the Temple-obligations of the old covenant! By such a mode of interpretation one may disguise the most natural things. Seeing that I myself, as is well-known, must bear to have a false profoundness objected to me, I am all the more inclined and bound to protest wherever I really find the proper limit transgressed.

may not offend, give it *for me and thee*. But here the external closely and profoundly borders upon the internal, and even here he assigns at the same time to his disciples as *sons* the right of *freedom*, which yet belongs to him alone as the Son! He says this with the same prospective glance, as we find at Mark ii. 27, 28, the Son of Man brings to all men in him, new freedom and dominion; see our earlier interpretation at Matt. xii. 8. He kindly looks forward and sees, as in Simon the future Peter, so in his disciples and the members of his family collectively, the future sons of God, and as is indeed right, predicates of them on account of their calling, the same claim which he in person inalienably possesses.

Christ might have borrowed or begged the *stater* from many a one to whom it would have been the greatest honor and joy to give it to him, but *this* certainly would not have been consistent with what is due to the honor of the Son, who might indeed *accept* such gifts of love for his earthly wants, but not *ask* them.* Then must *Peter*, as *fisher*, render service, in order to fetch what was needed from God's treasury, and, by an act quite in the way of his calling as a fisher, learn how this treasury stands ever open to the faith of God's children. A miracle, in many respects great, is performed in a small thing, on account of the great significance belonging to it. With a foreknowledge, which is at the same time more than a foreknowledge, the assurance namely that it has been ordained and commanded in the Father's counsel and might, Christ says every thing to Simon beforehand ere it takes place. He will immediately catch something with his hook, the first fish will bring money —and that in its dumb, but here loudly-speaking mouth (Job. xii. 8)—finally, just so much as is necessary for the moment, neither more nor less, a *stater* or four *drachms*.† *The same* take,* and give to *them*, the tax-gatherers, who are asking it, *for me and thee*. Thus does Christ separate again the *we* who had just been united, not without a hint that it was a condescension. For the others no payment is to be made in Capernaum, because the tax was gathered from every one only in the place where he lived; according to the symbolical sense, however, Peter is the representative of all for whom Christ himself pays, inasmuch as he bids them pay in his fellowship and as his followers.

We now return to what was said at the beginning. Even the miraculous power which proves his dignity and freedom as a Son, He makes use of in a way of humble self-denial. And wherefore? *But that we may not offend!* Hear, hear ye proud ones among the disciples of the lowly One, ye champions of faith who are apt to forget the love, ye Quakers with the hat of self-will upon your head, to whom, with all your good intention, the true Spirit has not yet shown the true relation of Christ and his New Testament theocracy to the kingdom of this world! True, if ye are sons in the Son, ye are all *free*—free however, not *from*, but *to*, the fulfilling of all righteousness. Consider, moreover, that the *kings of the earth* do not know you as such, in your heavenly sonship, that ye are rather to abide here as *strangers*—and give no offence. Child of God in the faith which removes mountains, use this thy very power as a son in the humility of faith, by submission to the hands of men. Thou shouldst sooner and rather procure by thy faith the tribute pence, than needlessly remove the mountains out of the way; rather work a miracle *for this* than give any *offence* by thy power and freedom, laying down σκάνδαλα (stumbling-blocks) instead of removing them.

* He could say to no one: Be so good as *give* the tax *for me!* The remark of Hess, however, reaches somewhat too far: "It appears, he would in this case on purpose not pay the temple tax with another's money"—if by this is to be understood: Not even with the contributions of his followers that were then in the purse. Whence, then, did he pay before? There was therefore at that time certainly nothing in the purse.

† In Stilling's *Heimweh* is related how the fish snatched away the shining piece of money dropped by a man on the shore, and as being too large to swallow, had kept it in its throat until Peter soon after came with the hook. Thus must some one have lost it, for the service of the Master. This is possible, but not necessary, and it is better not to add any stories of ours to that which is given us, by going farther back into the depths of the sea.

* Observe here, Christ says, Take the *stater*, and not the *fish*, which yet Lange makes Peter to have brought to the tax-gatherers as payment *in natura* (worth a stater), after having opened its mouth, *i. e.*, in *poetical expression*, loosened it from the hook! Lange thinks at least that the apostle at all events delivered what was required to the tax-gatherers in a miraculous form—either that he gave the fish as caught at Christ's word, or that he related to them the miracle with the money. We think, however, that the testimony of the power of Jesus here belonged only to the disciples and not at all to the tax-gatherers; otherwise we should lose the principal point of the whole, namely, the humility that would not offend.

THE TRUE GREATNESS OF THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST—THE POWER OF THE CHURCH TO BIND AND TO LOOSE.

(Matt. xviii. 3–20; Mark xi. 33–50; Luke ix. 48–50.)

It is self-evident that *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ*, "at the same time," is not literally to be strained, as expressing immediate connection, but (although it is certainly more than merely *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*, "on that day,") it leaves room, at all events, for the return of Peter from procuring the tribute money; for afterwards (ver. 21), he is present, and has heard every thing along with the rest. The dispute as to precedency had already broken out before on the way to Capernaum, while, in addition to the internal grounds for such questioning, which already lay of necessity in the thoughts and inquiries of the disciples respecting the mysterious advent of the *kingdom of heaven*, and their personal position in that kingdom, outward occasions also had now come in rapid succession (ch. xvi. 19, 28; xvii. 1). Whether Peter was destined to occupy a place above the others, and what that was, what besides was meant by Christ in the repeated separation of the three disciples from the twelve—this was more directly interesting and important to them than the dying and rising again of the Son of Man! At least their thoughts soon turn from the one to the other, and only the latter gives rise to a warm and lengthy discussion, because it concerns *their* persons. The question in dispute, which Matthew states in the uncaptiously general form *τίς ἄρα μείζων ἐστίν*, "Who [then] is the greatest," has yet another personal motive lying behind it: Which of *us* shall receive special precedence, and the place of honor (ch. xx. 21), or rather *is* already destined to this by Christ?* Mark, with his more concise *τίς μείζων*, expresses this in his connection still more strongly. Luke most distinctly *τό, τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν*—*i. e.*, of course not greater than them, but which *of us* shall be *greater than the rest* (comp. Luke xxii. 24). Not, however, altogether, as Winer also understands this passage: that they were thinking of a single *major ceteris* or *princeps* (as in other places the comparative is thus put for the superlative, Matt. xiii. 32, *μεῖζον τῶν λαχάνων*), they were rather thinking, as the occasion led them to do, of several who might receive precedence; although Christ afterwards, in his answer, very strikingly makes a proper superlative of it, in order to place in opposition to it his *μικρότερος ἐν πᾶσιν*, *least one among all.* That Peter was not the speaker on this occasion we take to be quite as natural as that he afterwards again comes prominently forward (Matt. ver. 21); properly considered, however, the *προσῆλθον λέγοντες*, "came saying," of Matt. is to be taken not literally but in the higher truth, according to the manner of this Evangelist in other places (comp. ch. viii. 5, 6), for according to Mark Christ *asked* what they had been disputing about on the way, *but they held their peace*, being ashamed. Or must we suppose that they *afterwards* spoke out? *This mode* of reconciling the Evangelists can hardly be the right one, and might rather impair the truth as well of Matthew's as of Mark's account.* What Luke, in an expression intermediate between the two, says: *ἰδὼν τὸν διαλογισμὸν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν*, *perceiving the thought of their heart*—rightly shows, that Matthew has concisely represented the silent confession of the disciples before him who knew their thoughts, as a *λέγειν* or "said," in instructive contradiction to our registering exactness in regard to what is merely external.

We have now, however, in the first place again to show, that the whole answer of Christ, which Matthew gives without interruption on to ver. 20, was actually spoken then by him (*ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ*), and that nothing foreign is added from any other place; that is, not that no pause, interruption, or digression may have taken place—for Mark and Luke have introduced in the course of it the question of John respecting the exorcist in the name of Jesus, who had not been called, and several other sayings of Christ; but that Christ actually at that time spake all this in close succession. As Christ does not let himself be driven by those digressions from pursuing the course of his thoughts, until the question of the disciples has been completely answered and despatched, so also does Matthew here, as it were, not let himself be hindered from laying before us in one whole the profound and grand connection of his words spoken upon this occasion. We will therefore

* Of course, as the clause "in the kingdom of heaven" clearly shows, the entire question refers to the *future* position, by no means only (as Neander says): Who among them is now already by zeal in the service of Christ, in virtue of his personal qualities and services the greater? The disciples will certainly anticipate the future a little—so much is true in this; but that only present worthiness qualifies for the kingdom of heaven—this is precisely what the answer of Christ opens up to them.

* In which case Roos, for example, is for bringing out, that the subsequent question was put in a more generalized, less faulty form, than the first dispute, "who *among them* is the greatest!" We think that this "among them" is self-evident also in Matthew and Mark (Mark, *πρὸς ἀλλήλους*).

here also do him justice, and reserve the consideration of the sayings in Mark and Luke, although they are historically parallel, for our commentary on those places. We also leave aside, in the meantime, the immediately following parable addressed to Peter (although Matthew includes it, ch. xix. 1, rightly in the *these sayings*) as a corollary, which it only is in reality, and look only at the profound connection in which Christ, according to Matt. vers. 3–20, gives answer and instruction *as to the true greatness of his disciples in relation to one another*. This is and remains truly the grand theme, the leading idea, which every thing follows in consecutive order.

Christ does not satisfy himself with saying what lay on the surface as the most immediate answer, namely, *wherein* this true greatness of his disciples *consists*, but takes a deeper and wider view of it, and discusses the important point thus raised so completely for his disciples in all future time, that he shows besides *whereon it is founded*, and finally, *how it expresses itself*. These are the three principal parts of the whole. It consists in humility first of all, but at the same time also in the love which naturally flows from humility, and is given with it, which despises or neglects no other person as *little* (whereby, already at the beginning, the foundation is laid for the inference which points out the expression of such love). In *humility:* without which no one can in any wise be a disciple, can in any wise enter into the kingdom of heaven, or belong to it (ver. 3)—with which *every* humble disciple stands on one and the same level of greatness (ver. 4). In *love:* which here is positively a δέχεσθαι, an acknowledging, helping, reception of every other little one, as standing on the same level with myself (ver. 5)—negatively, a *not offending* (ver. 6). This latter (because, as we shall see, occasion was given for this in the circumstances) is farther carried out in an emphatic admonition respecting offences: the "Wo to the world!" begins from without (ver. 7)—what is said as to the unavoidableness and yet the criminality of offences goes deeper into the thing (ver. 7)—and finally, the way pointed out to self-denial, to the slaying of inward offences in themselves, completes the information for the disciples if they would not fall into the "Wo to the world!" and "Wo to the man!" (vers. 8, 9). For this is the only way by which the disciples of Jesus can attain to, or maintain humility, which in relation to others becomes love; thus alone is offence avoided and destroyed in the root.

But after Christ has thus represented the matter to his disciples in so severe and difficult a light, after he has thus plainly shown them that the return to a childlike state here required of them is truly no child's play, but can be attained only by the manliest internal struggles with the members of the old man, which unhappily have already grown strong—he does not stop here, but comforts them again by kindly opening up to them, how the greatness of the little ones, whom we are not to despise and offend but love (consequently, which also lies behind this: the loving patience of Christ towards the other little ones, who, alas! as yet offend in their weakness), *is founded* on the great *salvation through the Son of Man*. If already, at ver. 5, preparing the way for this, it was said that a little child is to be so highly esteemed *because Christ is in him*—Christ now first, at ver. 10, comprises it in one weighty and mysterious proposition: the greatness of the little ones (*i. e.*, as the interpretation will show, the dignity of those who are as yet indeed weak, but who are, precisely on this account, disciples of child-like humility) rests on this, that *they are highly honored before God*. And wherefore, whence is this? The more particular development of this follows immediately: *For* the Son of Man is come to save the children of men! (ver. 11). To this literal statement is added the parable of the seeking love of the shepherd (vers. 12, 13), a parable which puts to shame every proud thought that goes against the love of Christ, and which exhorts to the imitation of his example in *going forth* to seek others. Then follows, in conclusion, as the highest step in the ascent, the gracious good pleasure of the *Father* towards the little ones (ver. 14). In this love of the Father, manifested in the redeeming Son, must the genuine humility and love of all his genuine children be *founded*, and must seek to know naught else but this: I myself am not lost only from such love, and no other must be lost from my want of love.

Christ might now have stopped here, but he has yet more to say. The dispute of the twelve about precedence has again opened up to his inner view the entire future of his Church, which is to proceed from these disciples. It is natural that he should specially refer this dispute to that word which was given to Peter before the others (ch. xvi. 18, 19), in order now, at the same time, to exhibit its true meaning in opposition to any misunderstanding of it. Accordingly, in order thoroughly to exhaust this theme, so as to be understood in all future time, he shows how *one day* the greatness of his disciples (according to which there is no μείζων, *prae ceteris*, but only a common rivalry of love, on the part of every little one who will be great *in Christ*, towards every other little one who also belongs to Christ), how this greatness *should and will express itself* in the *fellowship* of all the redeemed who believe on him. If the first two parts of the discourse spoke of individuals, we have now, in the third part, a term expressive of union; hitherto it has been, παιδίον τοῦτο, ὃς ἐάν, τοιοῦτον ἕν, εἷς τῶν μικρῶν τούτων, "this little child," "whosoever," "one such," "one of these little ones"—now, however, it is ἀδελφός, "*brother*," now the children are represented as brothers and sisters in the household of God, who, in their intercourse with one another, are neither to give nor to take offence, but in the power of Christ, who is with them and in them, to

manifest the love that seeks and saves. If the second part contained a *retrospective glance* at the first and innermost ground of all this new order of love and humility, which is henceforward to be the true order of precedence (the "house-law of humility" for the family of God), at the coming of the Son of Man into the world for its salvation—there follows now, on the other hand, a *prospective glance* at the future state of his kingdom. The true greatness of the disciples of Christ expresses itself in the *unity* and *power* of his Church; unity, namely, in the *love*, and power in the *truth* of God (which latter will certainly not be wanting in genuine love). The unity of love is, according to the connection with what goes before, necessarily represented in the well-regulated *conduct* of the individual, as a member of the Church, in the *case of offences* (vers. 15, 17). It shows itself, in the first place, always as unity of *love*, in the censure of the brother who sins, which is to be administered in a manner equally sparing, and seeking, by successive steps, to remove the offence; but if the sin yields not to love, it must certainly become also unity in the *truth*, inasmuch as the Church (not the individual!) at last excludes, and meanwhile drives out the impenitent person from its pale. This, again, as the transition to what follows—The Church has *power* in Christ who has invested it with his own power! What it does upon earth in the name of Christ, that does Christ in it as being also valid in heaven, and this is finally the true common greatness reaching to heaven of the united disciples of Christ, in which even every μείζονες, "greater ones," of the twelve disappears, and, therefore, certainly every precedence of any kind on the part of a Peter, John, and James. Vers. 18–20 speak of the power of the Church, so that the *power* first comes into prominence, and then in the conclusion, which points backwards, it is declared what and where this *Church* is. It is a power (and the way was prepared for this by what goes before), to *bind* also with judgment, as to loose with forgiveness (with friendly rebuke which aims at forgiveness and reconciliation), therefore, the severe power of *truth;* in and along with all this, however, it is a power to *pray*, the more excellent power of unceasing *love*, which with its faith penetrates into the love and gifts of the heavenly Father. And, finally, who has this power? The *Church!* Where is the Church? Wherever there is a living part of its great whole, an outgoing of its unity, which cannot be separated by place or by number, where even two or three are met together in the name of Jesus! And the ground? Because *he himself* is among them and in them, as already in every individual little one who believes on him, ver. 5.

Verses 2, 3. All heathen antiquity *knew* almost nothing of the dignity and honor of *humility*, and could not even find a word which clearly expresses this; the Roman *modestia* does not suffice for this, while the Greek ταπεινόφρων, ταπεινοφροσύνη only struggles to free itself from censure, so as to be regarded as praiseworthy.* In the *Holy Scriptures* of the Old Testament alone do we find preparatory intimations of that which the first great ταπεινῶν ἑαυτόν, "He that humbleth himself," can alone fully express. He, however, speaks the new great word as simply and unpretendingly as if it had always been self-evident. Every child had spoken it, and shown it to those who were grown up; a presentiment of it lay certainly in every *puero debeter reverentia* (to the very boy reverence is due) that found expression, in every unexpressed receptivity for childlike feeling and childlike ways: yet this presentiment in all its forms waited until *Jesus* placed the child in the midst, and with his word unloosed that word which assigns its due praise to humility, and which had hitherto been fast bound by pride in the breast of man. In this most profound and general reference of his doctrine to the symbol of it and prophetic testimony to it, as yet present in man, lies the deepest reason why Christ here does not speak but *show;* by no means merely with the purpose (with which the most superficial view is wont to stop short) of vividly impressing his disciples, then present, with a lasting memorial of this important lesson. This child still stands ever in the midst of us, where we see it, and now looking on it, think of the words of the Master! That there was at that time a child near at hand, had been provided for by the Father for this occasion. Christ called it to him—consequently it could already understand a call, and could walk; he not merely placed it in the midst, but took it up also in his arms (according to Mark), in order to give expression by action to his love for such little ones—it was, therefore, certainly as yet a παιδίον of tender age. At all events it was no ill-bred child, not one that would not come on being called, that cried or made resistance, not one that stood still when the strange, friendly man called, but a genuine, true *child*, such as is meant by the word.† Christ, indeed, as Mark portrays the scene, had first *sat down*, as it were on the seat of judgment, for the solemn determination of this certainly most important question, had called to him the council of the twelve, to whom now a grand fundamental principle of the kingdom is to be opened up in presence of the rest of the people who stood by, both great and small, as we see from

---

* Tholuck cites from Plutarch (*de prefectibus in virtute*, cap. 10) "one of those few passages where ταπεινός stands in an honorable signification," and compares Plato, *de legg.* lib. iv. p. 15, Bipont.

† Which, moreover, received no injury or offence from being thus set up before others—so that Weisse might spare the objection: Against such conduct of Jesus an intelligent pedagogue would have much to say!

the child being there,* and then (after having given expression to another word against the ambition of θέλειν πρῶτος εἶναι), he forcibly and unexpectedly puts them all to shame by this little child before all the bystanders, and yet in such a way, as could only appeal with amiable truth to the pure human feeling. What a majesty of love and truth in *this*, Verily I say unto you! *As children*—he thereby says, at the same time, that it is not the child personally that is meant, but that it only stands there as a child in general. Ye should, all of you, *be children*, who, properly speaking, know nothing either of comparative or of superlative in their innocently positive existence, who have no questioning one with another as to *who shall be greater* in their paradise and kingdom of heaven; but if, unhappily, ye are otherwise—then must ye now *be converted*, and again *become* so! You *apostles* also, even you, if, and because, ye would be the greater! That they themselves, the twelve, were chosen to something special in the kingdom of heaven was, not indeed without reason, a settled matter with them beforehand; the question therefore now was, who among them is greater. But here Christ cuts away that first ground from beneath their feet, and plainly announces to them: If ye do not become quite different from, quite the reverse of what ye have now shown yourselves to be, ye shall *not at all* (οὐ μή) enter into the kingdom of heaven. A terribly unexpected word for these servants of the kingdom, who had thought such a thing as this next to impossible, who had learned hitherto with their Lord to use the word "*in the kingdom of heaven*" as a great thing already done and determined for them! What is of the first importance is, to *enter into* that kingdom; that is already a great thing, nay, the alone great thing without distinction, which is reserved only for the humble. To be called an apostle, and not to be in the kingdom of heaven? We know well that this, alas! turned out to be true in the case of one of the disciples.

Here the natural understanding in us all is ready to revolt—here the blind folly of the proud takes offence: Is this then what is called *advancing* and becoming something, if one must *turn round*, go backwards, and become a little child? But whoever puts the question of Nicodemus to the Master πῶς δύναται, "How can it be?" has already the answer just such as he there gave it, namely, that he does not mean here certainly a literal turning back and beginning anew in the bodily sense, but a being born again of the Spirit to a new, spiritual, and truly childlike state which even children have not, properly speaking, with respect to their bodily age, but only show it in the figure: ὡς τὰ παιδία, *as little children*. Although the entire analogy between this requirement of Christ and that which has respect to the *new birth* retains its essential truth (for στραφῆτε does not merely stand adverbially related to γένησθε, as שׁוּב, but expresses beforehand more than this, and contains the proper leading idea)—yet, along with the strictness, there is something comforting in the expression "as children," and in the "*become*," which leaves much time for patience. God trains his children to be small as we do ours to be great, and the growth of the internal man is a continual growing downwards to this humility and simplicity. Christ here again calls to mind the τέκνα and νήπιοι, *children* and *babes* (chap. xi. 19–25), which ought, indeed, already to have occurred to Peter at chap. xvi. 17. What is the *tertium comparationis* for this *as*, on which it all hinges? Scarcely can it be altogether expressed by any other single word than just *childlike;* yet there are two principal ideas which directly after appear prominently in the words of Christ himself, and which point to all that is implied in that expression, namely, *humility*, in which a man humbles himself (ver. 4), and then (what is implied therein), *trust* on the part of those who believe on him (ver. 6.)* "As this child"—only look at it, and observe how it has now shown itself, and stands before your eyes. A child is called, and comes; is placed, and lets itself be placed; is embraced, and lets itself be embraced; it follows, obeys, receives (Mark x. 15), mistrusts not, resists not, is prepared and tractable for every one greater than itself, just because it knows this: I am a child, and that is a friendly man! Such *humble trust* in receiving and obeying, simply yielding up of ourselves to the love and power of God, which embraces us in Christ, and seeks to lift us up from earth to heaven—such is the childlike state which conducts into the kingdom of heaven. "As a child always believes itself to be safe when it has laid itself in its mother's lap, or when the mother holds out her hand to it"—so it is with the childlike faith in the gracious word of the heavenly Father, revealed in his Son.

Verse 4. The general principle is now repeated with a view to its application to the individual. *Every one* who has become like such a child, is always, in relation to others, and in proportion as this is wanting in them, *the greater* and greatest in the kingdom of heaven. Here Christ actually makes a superlative of the comparative, but immediately again cancels it by ὅστις, *whoever*, in order without distinction to attribute the same greatness to every humble one (hence in Luke οὗτος ἔσται μέγας, "*the same* shall be great"). Erasmus is excellent here: *Quisquis igitur demiserit semetipsum, hic est ille maximus* in regno cœlorum (*whoever* therefore shall

* So that Nitzsch not quite exactly says, only his disciples were present.

* Roos: "Wherein consists the lowliness of a child? Therein, that it allows itself to be taught, guided, led, and cared for," etc. To the same effect, Jul. Müller: "These sayings point to the ingenuous trust and inward capacity of union in the childlike spirit."

humble himself, he is *that greatest one* in the kingdom of heaven). In like manner he is equally striking in bringing out a delicate shade of the thought not to be overlooked, which the original text does not express: "Demiserit semetipsum, sicut *est* puer iste;" for, taken strictly, this child needed not to *humble itself*, so as to be converted and become as a child; it is so already, and Christ can only have meant to say: He who humbles himself to *become* (in a higher sense) such as this child is.* Happy he in whom this is fulfilled, so that Christ may set him, on account of his humility, before others, with the testimony and commendation: Ye must become as this childlike person, who is the great one before me! But whence and wherefore this greatness of the little ones? Truly only from the goodness and grace of him, who takes such a child in his arms and blesses it, who alone exalts those who humble themselves (chap. xxiii. 12), who imparts himself and his highest glory, won by the deepest humiliation, to all his believing followers. This is said in what immediately follows.

Verse 5. The connection with what goes before is twofold, so that the discourse, which is in the utmost degree compressed, already begins something new, while it finishes what goes before. The little one who altogether unassumingly yields himself up to me, is and becomes great, for I bend myself down to him, and turn in to him. This important leading point, here indicated (as a glance forward to the second principal part, vers. 10, 14), being as it were the still hidden key for the solution of the enigmatic saying respecting the *greatness of the little ones*,† is, however, only expressed as the ground of a second discourse, in which a further advance is made. The first was: Whosoever shall himself be as this child! Now, the other is: Whosoever receives such a child! There can be no question that Christ now, in the first τοιοῦτον, "*such* an one" (after τὰ παιδία and τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο), passes from the figure to its application, from children to childlike *men* (comp. afterwards chap. xix. 14, τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων). Certainly not merely: *Such* a child as this well-behaved one here, for oftentimes even children are at an early age corrupted; but, now onwards, Christ means *his disciples*, if and in so far as they resemble children, and may even be so called (as, at ver. 6, the evident explanation follows). The *little ones* who believe on him are the same as those of whom he spoke in chap. x. 40–42; all the more certainly, as the promise to him who *receives* such (*he receiveth me*) is only a repetition of what is there said, and this repetition (according to Mark. ver. 41, and Luke, 48), was expressed still more fully. If, at ver. 6, the offending follows as the direct antithesis to the receiving (ὃς ἐάν, ὃς δ' ἄν), then Christ certainly uses the two expressions *such children* and *such little ones as believe on me*, synonymously. Those commentators, however, on the other hand, who exclude *children* in the proper sense, are not less erring than those who understand them alone; for the full and true sense of what Christ thus expresses comprehends both in one: such as are truly childlike children are in reality the first among the "children of God," and heirs of the kingdom of heaven (otherwise there would be no ground for the application, Mark x. 14). Hence also Luke, ver. 48, although not exactly, yet not wrongly, has put τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον, *this little child*. The whole of what is said in vers. 5 and 6 as also in vers. 10, 11, 14 in Matthew is, at the same time, rightly to be understood and used of the little child, although the *fides implicita* of baptized children is not, as some have confidently maintained, to be demonstrated from ver. 6.

One child receives another, and makes no evil distinctions, of which in its simplicity it knows nothing; *humility* uprightly honors its equal; he who is little in his own eyes esteems the little one beside him as worthy of the acknowledgment that he should do to him as to himself—consequently as worthy of *love*. To *take up* or receive is the opposite of proud rejection, of unloving neglect, it is precisely as the προσλαμβάνεσθαι, or "receiving," of Rom. xv. 7; to love, to do good to, as we also say, *to interest oneself in any one* (literally to receive any one to oneself). Comp. again Mark ix. 41, where the doing a kindness to a disciple, which is expressed in terms taken from Matt. x. 42, forms the same antithesis to σκανδαλίζειν or "offend," as here the δέχεσθαι or "receiving." (The ἔσχατος, Mark ver. 35, corresponds to the παιδίον τοιοῦτον ἕν of Matthew, the διάκονος εἶναι to the δέχεσθαι.) Now Christ says, promising in quite a general form: *Whoso* from his own humility despises not one of my children, one of those who believe on me, be he even the lowest and least whom one might easily despise, but lovingly receives him *for my name's sake*, because I have received him, and because I will that he be received! This *whoso* is then in the first place to be applied to those who are as yet standing without, to whom, however, Christ himself now comes in him who is to be received, and receives them also into the kingdom of heaven, inasmuch as he is received by them. A spiritual child has in a certain sense quite as much, nay more, that is fitted to awaken favor and to call forth love than a child in the bodily sense. Whoso is capable of perceiving this, and acknowledging it in action, thereby proves himself to be equally childlike and worthy of the kingdom of heaven. Whoso brings himself down to

* Already Laur. Valla: Iste parvulus non se humiliat, sed humilis est.

† For Christ maintains not merely at first, ver. 3, that humility, consciousness of our own littleness, poverty, and impotence is the condition of *entering* into the kingdom of heaven, but he goes on to say (ver. 4), that always every one who humbles himself, is and remains the greater in the kingdom of heaven.

the lowly, humbly receives the humble, becomes by the very act one of them: thus the door of the kingdom of heaven stands wide open for those who love (chap. xxv. 40), as, in the first ὅστις οὖν, "whosoever, therefore" (ver. 4), for those who are humble. So much the more does it *follow* as a matter of course, that one child of God should receive another, that one who is already in the kingdom of heaven should receive all who enter by the right door. Since *every one* who is least is at the same time the greatest, why should not every one prove his humility in love towards every other, and hold him in respect as in the place of Christ?

Verse 6. Between vers. 5 and 6 now comes, according to Mark and Luke, the question of John respecting the unknown disciple who did not as yet belong to the fellowship of Christ's followers, who, notwithstanding, cast out devils in the name of Jesus, and whom the apostles had forbidden to do so. To this then, at the same time, the warning of Christ refers: Whoso shall offend, hurt, despise, not acknowledge, one of those who believe on me, in his retired and separate faith as a beginner, does what is wrong. This, however, is by no means the sole reference, but only one which comes unsought for in addition to the other. Matthew rightly lets Christ proceed, without giving this incident as the occasion of his words, for even without this occasion he would actually have continued his discourse in the connection of the principal thoughts such as we have noticed above. And even although precisely at the moment no such offence had occurred, Christ might, and must indeed, following out the antithesis, warn against it; but an offence had actually already occurred, inasmuch as (according to Mark ver. 35, ἐφώνησε τοὺς δώδεκα), besides the little child whom he called to him (which can hardly have been there alone), there were others standing by, other disciples also, and beginners in the faith, with respect to whom the warm dispute of the twelve must certainly have caused an offence. These others over whom the disciples exalted themselves, while yet at the same time setting a bad example before them, Christ in his wisdom indirectly permits to hear his whole discourse to the apostles, and he compensates for the offence by placing the little child between the two parties—this is to be carefully observed, in order again to mark the tenderness of his manner of acting, which is always suitable to the occasion.

We are to offend no believer, the *little one* or *neophyte* all the less because he is the most easily offended and hurt. *Whoso* does this—again, first of all, one who still belongs to the world without, a proud and unloving one, who has no mind to acknowledge the little ones in the kingdom of heaven, who are yet the great ones. In so far *this* offending forms the contrast to that word in chap. xvii. 27, according to which the children of God are not to offend the world. If however Christ meant this alone, then he would again have added, *for my name's sake*, for this would most directly express the ground upon which the world offends those who believe. But the words, *who believe on me*, which are added instead, include the still heavier offence of those who themselves believe, and who ought, therefore, certainly to acknowledge the faith of every other *little one*, to despise and offend no fellow-believer. Wo to him who gives offence! This Christ expresses, first of all—before he once and again literally utters it—by a proverb which describes one of the rarest forms of capital punishment, namely the καταποντίζεσθαι, or being drowned, as it was practiced among the heathen, and hence probably had, in Galilee, given rise to a proverb. Christ will speak very strongly and emphatically, he therefore represents the proverbial case in the strongest form; not merely by πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης, *the depth of the sea* (πέλαγος, the main sea, the middle where the sea is deep, as opposed to the shallow water near the shore, Acts xxvii. 4, 5), but in addition to this by the very concrete expression μύλος ὀνικός, *an* [*ass's*] *mill-stone*. According to the ancient custom, which extended even to more modern times (comp. Wetstein on this), a weight—most naturally a stone (Jer. li. 63)—was suspended round those who were thus to be drowned, in order to ensure their sinking, and as a mark of disgrace, as we may well suppose, it was hung round the neck of the criminal. Now "millstone" is farther proverbial for a heavy stone (Rev. xviii. 21), and Christ makes this still stronger (perhaps of himself, perhaps the proverb already ran thus) by the very special form μύλος ὀνικός.* He will say then that such a fearful and ignominious corporeal punishment were *better* for a man—than what? In the first place, and most directly: better than that (or before that) *he should do this*, and thus become himself a stone of stumbling to his brother! And thus the words are literally repeated in Luke xvii. 2. But there, as also here, follows the further sense when ever we ask, *Why so? Better* than the wo (ver. 7) which he incurs by such conduct, than the eternal fire (vers 8, 9)—better than this, any merely temporal punishment of death in the deepest *water*.† O thou tender love, how sharply dost thou speak against the

* For, which is a secondary thing, neither according to some is the *nether* mill-stone as bearer, nor, according to others, the *upper* as worker, compared to an ὄνος or "ass." That would be strange, and does not admit of being proved, nor does the fact of its being precisely the upper or the nether serve to strengthen the saying. But it is the stone of a mill turned by an ass, *mola asinaria*, as we distinguish *jumentarias molas* from *manuariis*, *i. e.*, a mill driven by asses, not a hand-mill, in which case it denotes the largest and heaviest kind of stone.

† In the water all flesh drowns, but the fire judges the spirits. Thus might the flood, by the destruction of the flesh, save the spirits from the last judgment (1 Pet. iii. 19; iv. 1, 6).

offending of thy beloved little ones, and yet how is thy holy anger against those who are destitute of love, itself nothing but burning love, which would ward off sin and its condemnation!

For the rest, it is self-evident, which we would here further only indicate for reflection, that all that is said in vers. 3–6, is with great compression and profound penetration, put in so decided a form, because Christ every where comprehends in the first beginning the entire consequence and development. He who only begins with the "being converted and becoming," already enters into the kingdom of heaven, and must then, indeed, remain in it and go on. The μείζων, μέγας, "greatest," "great," is already attributed to the first self-abasement, because it is the first step on the right way; but in it the whole way and course is further included. It is the same with the receiving (ver. 5), the same with the offending (ver. 6), in which not every individual act of *offence* (for who is not guilty of this?) but the continuing in such a disposition, receives so terrible a threatening.

Verse 7. Wo to the *world!* This now expresses the open opposition of those who are without, and unhappily continue without, to all who are *in the kingdom*, as μικροί and μεγάλοι, "least" and "great," to whom, in vers. 8, 9, the "*thy*" applies. Wo to the world *because of* the offences, more exactly ἀπό, *from* or *out of* the offences, which it gives and takes out of its own evil will; thus does it prepare for itself the wo which is not ordained for it. That offences come, that men in the world will offend one another and be offended—ἀνάγκη ἐστίν, Luke xvii. 1, ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστι, this is indeed, alas! *inevitable*, as the world and man are; this is not so quickly to be done away with, and that for a twofold reason. First, with respect to their origin, they are a necessary consequence of the natural corruption in which men cannot, indeed, be or do otherwise; so long as the world remains and chooses to remain the *world*, it cannot be otherwise in it. But secondly, also, with respect to their end or design, these offences, tolerated by the long-suffering and wisdom of God, are themselves a necessary means also to the coming of his kingdom, and are used for the trial and confirmation of believers, as those who continue in them must serve for its manifestation and its development for the judgment—meanwhile, also, for giving the salutary experience of sin to many who shall afterwards become believers. The fundamental idea is the same as at 1 Cor. xi. 19. God would indeed otherwise suspend the *freedom* of men, which he never does, and would hinder a free development in the recovery of the lost, in so far as such will let themselves be recovered from the world. He must then, instead of patiently bearing with men, rather at once drown them all, which in the absolute sense would not really be *better* for the individual and the whole, as was affirmed in the proverb before only in a relative sense. There is then a necessity for these offences, yet not an absolute necessity any where; for the world can also *receive* the children of Christ in his name, Christ is sent to it himself, and in his followers, for blessing and not for wo. Already, before pronouncing the wo, he has first exclaimed: *Blessed* is he whosoever shall *not* be offended in me!* Therefore only *take* thou no offence in a world full of offences, and thus wilt thou be helped. And above all things, give none thyself as much as in thee lies, *i. e.*, no evil, culpable offence; for that the truth and love of Christ shall and must always itself be the greatest offence to the world, and that the wo arising from this rests only upon *its* head, we have already seen at chap. xv. 12–14. *Wo to the man* through whose own fault, contrary to the will of God, the offence *comes*, *i. e.*, is given or received! This second exclamation is not quite the same as the first, Wo to the *world!* but again (as in these sayings the word is ever capable of a two-sided application) makes the transition to those who no longer belong to the world, and yet are guilty of an offence. Wo to the *man* without distinction and exception, who, as man, and following the bent of his natural corruption, acts in the same way as the evil world; for all that offends, whatsoever it be, is still the *world*, although within the kingdom of heaven, although in a disciple of Christ. Wo to the same man when, instead of a pure turning from such an offence, he continues and goes on in it; the wo of the offence shall remain upon his head notwithstanding the divine counsel, according to which offences are permitted and in so far ordained. This is expressed here precisely as it is afterwards at chap. xxvi. 24, and may even here have been intended to carry a secret hint and terror to the conscience of Judas. Wo to the man, even were he an apostle, he is yet himself an *offence* and a *devil* among the twelve. *Perhaps*, as was the case at other times, as at the anointing of Christ by the woman in Bethany, this Judas may even have been the originator, or at least the promoter, of the evil thoughts connected with this unhappy dispute among the disciples. This, however, is only conjecture and uncertain; with more certainty we now apply the word of Christ with most perfect justice to another: Wo to the φιλοπρωτεύων (ambitious) in the Church, the pseudo-Peter and haughty *servus servorum Dei*, who with false key shuts the kingdom of heaven, offends and corrupts the faithful, nay, builds up a world full of offences (which yet is held to be the true Church), as the Babylon which is afterwards to be thrown down as a millstone is cast into the sea! (Rev. xviii. 21).

Verses 8, 9. If Christ, who cites the word

* Rud. Matthai says here quite correctly: The *wo* is the consequence not of the fact that offences *must* come, but that they *are* come, the consequence not of the necessity but the actuality of offences. The *second* clause confirms not the *wo*, but the *offences* of the first clause.

of God in the Old Testament Scripture, puts his own new word on a level of authority with it, seals this with, "Verily I say unto you," summons his contemporaries, and not these alone, to hear, whosoever among them has ears—who assures us that his words shall survive heaven and earth, and declares that the office of the future Comforter, who is to reprove the world and to lead believers into all truth, is to interpret his words, and to bring them to the understanding—if Christ, who, as the risen one, himself brings to the remembrance of his disciples the words which he spoke when he was yet with them, so that thereby they begin now to understand these words and the Scripture—if he had not also before this at times *cited and repeated his own words*, there would be wanting what is more appropriate to him—the highest Prophet, over whom the Father himself cites the prophecy "Him shall ye hear,"—than to the former prophets who already did the same. But he did this, and so we find it in the Scripture, in which his words are now embodied by the Spirit. And when he repeats the same sayings in a different connection, he will thereby teach those who hear and who interpret them, not merely that we have not yet enough heard and understood them, but also that their deep-searching import has been expressed, and finds its application in more than one immediate connection. Thus he cites here a word which he had already spoken in the Sermon on the Mount (chap. v. 29, 30), where we have interpreted it. There, as here, to *offend* means to give occasion to sin, to tempt; there it was the adulterous lust of the flesh that was immediately spoken of, here it is every incentive to sin in general that is meant, and is comprehended in the great sum-total of all the offences in the world that come from men, or rather the inner offence, which comes to every one from his own flesh, is disclosed as their original ground and root, which is to be cut away. Wouldst thou not give offence without, so that the wo may not fall upon thee? Guard then against the offence within, and that with all severity! Slay the old *man*, from which it comes, with the salutary death that issues in life. In the words "thy hand or foot," Christ now again turns from the world to *his disciples*, and addresses every one who either is such or would like to become such; for only in reference to them does he use the familiar and confidential "thou" since the Sermon on the Mount, others he addresses invariably by "you." (He could not say, for example, John viii. 24: If thou believest not, thou shalt die in thy sins.) In addition to this, the fact that I am offended by my own members, by myself, here pre-supposes the internal conflict of the old man with the new; the world knows not and feels not this, he who feels it is already no longer of the world. And yet, on the other hand, the offending world is still in him, and to overcome it *there*, is not a thing that calls for soft measures. Observe here the great difference between being like a child in the natural and in the spiritual sense, the manful struggle implied in the constant turning so as to become as children! Children play in innocent delight with themselves, with their hands and feet, but a spiritual child, because he is always in the process of becoming (*i. e.*, of ceasing to be), cuts them off and plucks them out. In the Sermon on the Mount, Christ, following the order according to which there is first the looking upon with desire, and then the lusting to commit the deed, puts the eye before the hand: now, looking still deeper into the matter, he inverts this order because the offence ever arises anew, and, even after the cutting off of hand *and foot* (which latter is here added by way of amplification), the eye yet comes after. It might, so to speak, be thought that the acting and walking being suppressed, the secret desire is now harmless; but if thou art not on thy guard against this, it will soon get hand and foot for itself again. The eye must not be spared, because the members are cut off! Here stands the emphatic word, *It is better for thee!* (καλόν σοι, another expression for συμφέρει γάρ σοι, chap. 5), which corresponds to the συμφέρει before, ver. 6; comp. the closer connection (Mark ix. 42, 43). On the at once sharply ironical and severely rebuking sense in which the *entering* into life as a cripple is to be understood, we have already spoken at the other place where it occurs; here the εἰσελθεῖν is quite parallel to the first εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν from which the discourse set out. We have already given our opinion also as to the further application of this to the casting away of all that might be near and dear to us, as hand or eye, whenever it offends us; here it is again evident that this cannot be the most immediate, or the sole meaning, but, most properly, the internal offence in ourselves stands opposed to every offence of an outward kind. And yet it is not to be connected merely with incitements to sin against the law of love and truth, with anger, lust, and lies in the grosser sense, but the flesh which is to be slain must be detected and pursued, even in those spiritual forms which it assumes; the eye of criticism and asceticism must also be plucked out, and the hand of industrious zeal for public good, and the foot of all our own ways of virtue, must be cut off; or, to speak with Lange, also the talents of penetration—progress—energy.

Finally, observe that here Christ says not merely εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός, "into hell fire," instead of εἰς γέενναν, "into hell" (chap. v.), but now, *for the first time* εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον, into the eternal fire—which predicate is not connected with the word at chap. xiii. 42. Here it is already as at chap. xxv. 41, and it is a return to the ἄσβεστον, "unquenchable" of the Baptist (chap. iii. 12) which is therefore, in Mark ix., put in place of the expression here used, and to which are added the explanatory words concerning the unquenchable fire here omitted by Matthew

and concerning the salutary salt of the other fire, which is not yet the unquenchable, the eternal, fire in the proper sense; of which we shall speak when we come to the interpretation of Mark.

Verse 10. We know who *these little ones* are: not merely children, but also such as are childlike, in humility and weakness—believers on him; although it is not again exclusively these latter, but, in a certain measure, actual children also to whom they are compared, and beside whom they are placed. The child set in the midst stands always there, although it is only by carrying out the fundamental view of the whole subject, that the discourse can further apply to it. The offending proceeds from a *despising* and proud overlooking; therefore, in the words, "*Take heed*," Christ most directly addresses the disciples who wished to be the greater. But the plural, which again occurs after the singular, includes the world along with the disciples, as both have been comprehended together since ver. 7. What all-embracing transitions in the incomparable discourse of Christ! From one child which must preach humility to the apostles, he passes to the entire great world full of offences, and the wo proceeding therefrom! from the eternal fire of hell, to the angels in heaven before the face and throne of God! from the sharpest wo back to the tenderest love, which will have no human child to be despised! Before Christ fully expresses the ground-idea of this *second* part of his discourse, namely, that the greatness which is graciously ascribed to the little ones is founded on his redeeming grace, according to the Father's good pleasure, he first prepares the way for this, by representing the angels* as an intermediate rank between God and man, related to both. The whole doctrine of Scripture concerning angels represents them thus: they are indeed above us with respect to our present position; but yet with respect to our calling to the glory of Christ, and renewal after the image of God, they serve us. Their very name, *angels* or messengers, represents these heavenly spirits as united to the earth and us. So highly is man honored before God, so highly honored is every individual of these little ones! The world as such enjoys indeed, somewhat, the protection and service of the angels, but only remotely and indirectly, not in the personal appropriation which is here denoted by *their* angels. This αὐτῶν, "their," standing together with ἑνός, "one," has certainly a specializing force, and does not again merge into an absorbing generality the prominence given to every individual; it points therefore, indeed, although only by way of allusion, to special guardian-angels of persons, in regard to which the unanimous doctrine of the Church fathers* had no doubt, since Christ had said "I say unto you." Yet not so that *every* man as such has his guardian-angel, and keeps him all his life long; this is a privilege of those little ones, *i. e.*, as well of the natural as the spiritual children, inasmuch as the former, before the outbreak of corruption, the latter after this, as being on the way to blessedness, are capable of such guidance, and (by their humility) are worthy of it. Every child has his angel until sin drives him out, as we may yet trace it in the reflection of the angelic appearance on the countenance and in the form of children; children as such belong as yet to the "children of God," until the offence from within and without causes them to be lost. Every believer again, who may be saved through the grace of redemption, gets, as a new spiritual child, his angel again, and especially needs him in his weakness as a beginner now for protection and for monitions of a deeper kind, than the weak, foolish children in bodily danger. We forget the angels far too much, although Christ reminds us of them in the daily prayer (in the third petition); we speak in particular to our children far too little about their angels, and we ourselves as believers do not think enough of ours. This is at the same time a sinful despising of these exalted servants of the Most High, who yet so faithfully stoop down to us; it is also a despising of him who sends them. The angels are in *heaven*, and yet occupied at the same time in service and business on earth about their wards; for the heaven is not closed in space over the earth, but is ever open to us in every thing which it sends: where the angels of God go and stand, there also is heaven, and the face of God, which they *at all times*, διαπαντός, without interruption from any thing else, *behold*. I cannot at all find in this expression, as most commentators do, a special designation "of distinguished throne angels," (according to the analogy of those who stood nearest to the oriental kings, Esth. i. 4, comp. elsewhere, Tob. xii. 15, which I do not despise as apocryphal, for see Luke i. 19); if such a high angel were given to every little one, where then would remain the rest, and how could this be demonstrated?† But it is a general designation of these *pure spirits*, who are not like men separated from God; it signifies that even those who always and every where behold the face of God, yet at the same time, like the Father himself, look lovingly on the children and little ones (Psa. cxiii. 5, 6). Thus much only may lie in the expression, which connects the high rank and

* Out of which Lange, against all certainty of the letter, here frames the "life-images, light-images," "*genii*," of men! Only, at Acts xii. 15 "his angel," might, according to the popular belief, signify something *similar*, the "announcement" or "appearance" of Peter.

* See the citation of passages in J. F. Von Meyer's *Blätter für höhere Wahrheit*, i. 183—in part after Fr. Schmidt's treatise in Illgen's *Denkschrift*, with an interesting supplement from the *occulta philosophia* of Corn. Agrippa.

† The sainted Von Meyer also certified to me that he did not mean his note (which I can not but so understand) to be understood of special angels of a higher class.

glory of the servants precisely with the littleness of those who are served, namely that the less, and the more needful of help, the protege is, so much the mightier is the protector who is given to him; although again it is not this alone that can determine the selection and arrangement in these things, which a vail hides from our eyes, for then we might scarcely be mistaken if we supposed that Gabriel was the guardian angel of the child Jesus. We do not see all this, and yet Christ calls to us in an awakening voice, *See to it!* Let the eye of faith be thoroughly open for what I say unto you! Wherever there is a *child* of God (in every sense), there the heaven is opened and let down to it, there is Bethel. Enter in, offend not thyself and the child, but go in, and share in the grace. This grace, however, is that which comes from the Father through the one only Son of Man. Therefore he does not say here at first: The face of *their* Father (namely, the Father of the *little ones*, since for the angels, God is certainly not Father), but of *my* Father!

Verse 11. *For*—not because the children of men have deserved it, nor because the children, before the outbreak of corruption, already carried it within them, and could enter into the kingdom of heaven by their own actual innocence. Oh no! They are all the lost, but I am come to save and to bless the lost (Luke xix. 10). What an immeasurable word again so simply spoken! There stands the ladder of Jacob before our eyes: below are the *little ones*, then their *angels*, then the heavenly *Son of Man*, he who comes as the original angel from the presence and from the bosom of the Father—and then above him (ver. 14) the *Father* himself, and his good pleasure.

Verses 12—14. We will not now enter particularly into this parable, but reserve it for Luke xv., where, with strengthened repetition, it opens up the grand profound connection of a series of parables. Instead of ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, "in the desert," there, we have here ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη, "into the mountains," which certainly at first sight appears to be the same, and yet is not so. There ἔρημος (מִדְבָּר) is not so much the *desert* where they have gone astray, as the pasturage, the heath, where the ninety and nine graze, well cared for; here, however, Christ alludes to such passages as Jer. l. 6; Isa. xxxiv. 6, 11, 12; here therefore, as appears also grammatically, the ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη, "into the mountains," is to be construed with πορευθείς, "goeth," not with the foregoing ἀφείς, "leaveth." Oh how faithfully and earnestly does this love of the Shepherd *seek*! and yet it *finds* not every lost one; hence the *joy* even of the Son of God himself upon every discovery—"as if he had found a new heaven." Bengel rightly says on the ἐὰν γένηται εὑρεῖν, "*if so be that he find it*," what is warranted by the expression: *Inventio peccatoris est coram oculis Dei quiddam quasi contingens; ergo gratia non est irresistibilis* (the finding of the sinner is in the eyes of God as it were something contingent; therefore grace is not irresistible). We do not shrink even from leaving out the *quasi* (as it were), which a feeling of reverence has dictated. For if the *finding* comes altogether and alone from the power of God, why then does it not take place at once, but only after a long previous *seeking* through the entire history of man and of the world? The faithfulness of the seeking love of Christ is, however, in such a parable, held up at the same time before his disciples as an admonition to follow his example; this lies in the question that stands before: *What think ye?* ye proud ones, who are so ready to despise and offend the little ones? The ὕπαγε, "go" (ver. 15), is to be done in the sense of the πορευθείς, "goeth" (ver. 12), which comes into finer prominence when, as in our language, the same rendering can be given to both words: Go with the same faithfulness of love as thy Master *goes* after the lost one! Herein is given, at the same time, the connecting link between the *third* principal part which follows at ver. 15, and the second; the second concludes at ver. 14 with what it began, inasmuch as the *Father in heaven* wills not that *one of these little ones* be lost (ver. 10), therefore also that they be not offended by you. Although by the shepherd in the parable is certainly meant the Son (as appears more prominently in Luke xv.), yet it is worthy of notice that Christ here uses another οὕτως, "so," for explanation, and thus rises higher—not: So am I, and do I—but: So is the love of *the Father*, of course in the Son. "Oh how very different is the great God from us little men! For we little men in our pride look on what is great, but the great God in his compassion looks on what is little, and is great in the little" (Hofacker). Now also when the children of God are viewed in common, Christ says significantly, *Your Father* (as at ver. 10, *My Father*)—he will thereby at the same time say: Ye other children of God, who are therefore to resemble your Father in loving the little ones.* It is not the will or the good pleasure literally *before* the holy wisdom, before the graciously shining face of the Father (רָצוֹן לִפְנֵי יְהוָה), that one should be lost. This mode of expression as a whole (which Peter has well preserved, 2 Pet. iii. 9), is taken from Isa. xviii. 23, xxxiii. 11, and the *verily I say unto you* (ver. 13), already corresponded to the oath of Jehovah by himself in that passage. Here a sermon is preached to us on the worth of every single human soul before God, here we are comforted against what the appearance of things in the world might otherwise suggest, namely, that the lost one is left to wander about unsought and forgotten. We are to believe that the Father

* Which Alford has now expressed still more pointedly thus: When he assures of the dignity of the little ones it is "My Father"—when he gives the motive for the conduct of Christians, on the other hand, it is "Your Father."

forgets no one, but in this faith we are also diligently to exercise the love that seeks along with him.

Verses 15—17. The full and clear understanding of this entire passage is only to be obtained from the connection with the foregoing, as we have traced it above. Christ speaks here for the *future* of his Church, quite as naturally and unwarrantably as (at chap. x), he connected the prophetic glance into the future with the sending out of the disciples. His starting-point, indeed, was the immediate present, where the warning applies still to the disciples: Otherwise, even ye are not at all in the kingdom of heaven! How they must become children in spirit, and only as such little ones, are to possess in humility, and to manifest in love, the true greatness which belongs to them in common with every other little one—of this he has already plainly spoken. How such love *receives*, how it does *not offend*, how it does not *despise* or neglect any one who, according to the will of the Father, is redeemed by the Son—all this has already been spoken of, in so far as it must follow from the designation, and confirmation of the true greatness of the disciples. But it yet remains now specially to show how the love that proceeds from the seeking shepherd-love of God, and is implanted by the heavenly Father in all his children in the new birth, *would express itself in future*, when once the kingdom of heaven was founded upon earth and set in order; how the greatness and dignity of every individual in whom Christ is, and lives, and loves, in order to save him and through him others, shall then be joined together into compact *unity* as a *power* of his *Church*, which it exercises so as to *prevent* the offence of sin (which will still have a place in the midst of it), as strongly as with loving forgiveness it *bears* such offence. Hitherto the idea has occupied the foreground that love, as it gives no offence itself outwardly, and, moreover, slays the offence within itself, first of all takes no offence from the weakness and sin of a brother, but loves him in the forgiving and reconciling love of the Father's will; now, however, the other side must follow—seeing that yet all sin is and remains an offence—namely, that this love, notwithstanding, cannot against the truth call evil good, cannot in particular softly spare the brother who lays claim to the name of Christ, but must *rebuke* him with all the severity of seeking love, until he is again found, and restored from the error of his ways. Hitherto it was: Sin not thou against thy brother and partner with thee in redemption! Now it is naturally the other case: But if *thy brother* sin against thee—how then art thou to prove the love as a holy power given to thee as a member of the great society consisting of all who believe in me? In this way every thing perfectly harmonizes, and only thus can we rightly understand how Christ here further supplements what was already said (at chap. xvi.) respecting his Church, and lays down a fundamental principle for its guidance in regard to offences in the midst of it. Every true theory respecting Church-discipline finds here its twofold and yet single principle, as it were the formal and the material: to remove the offence in truth, to seek the lost one in love (also by rebuke).

Brotherly rebuke is already (Lev. xix. 17, 18) declared to be a duty of love, because we are to love our neighbor *as ourselves*. As I judge my own sin in myself in order to my satisfaction before God, so also am I to judge that of others, in order that their guilt may not become mine through neglect of this service of love (the complement and extension of what is said in the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. vii. 1–5). Frank rebuke, ἀληθεύειν ἐν ἀγάπῃ, is opposed to the cherishing of hatred or contempt in the heart, and also to that grosser species of falsehood in which one makes an evil report of his neighbor behind his back (Prov. xxvii. 5, 6; Sir. xix. 13–19: Speak, therefore, to thy neighbor, etc., Sir. xx. 2). Let brotherly rebuke first of all be real *rebuke*, let it be, therefore, honest and true: Thou hast sinned! But then and therein let it be also *brotherly*, speaking the truth in love, in order to recovery. Not: *Judge* him, nor even *chide* him—but ἔλεγξον αὐτόν, *convince*, *convict* him of his sin, help him to *repent*, beseech him to do so with all the power of the reconciling love of God which has already forgiven while it rebukes, and which would fain bring forgiveness to him (Luke xvii. 3, 4). Strive to gain thy brother, to help him again into the right way, to restore him from his *fault* (Gal. vi. 1): then will be fulfilled either at once Psa. cxli. 5; Prov. xxv. 12, at least afterwards Prov. xxviii. 23, or—thou hast, on thy part, fulfilled thy duty and shalt not incur sin on his account. From this follows further, quite as naturally, that *brotherly* rebuke, mindful of human weakness, in order lovingly and sparingly to deal with one who in his pride will be easily provoked and offended, by no means goes all at once to him armed with the full public power, but begins quietly and gently before God, and only in the event of being unsuccessful, *rises by gradual steps* to ever increasing severity.

In denoting these steps for the future praxis of his Church, Christ can now naturally, as he is ever ready to do, connect what he says with the practice already enjoined* and in use in Israel, as in general afterwards, in the entire formation and constitution of the apostolic Church, the Spirit transferred all the pure and available elements of the synagogue. If thy brother sin *against thee:* this certainly limits my duty and my right to rebuke him, in the first place, to those more immediate cases in which I might rather be tempted to be angry with him, and either privately or publicly to bring unloving complaints against him; still it would be very wrong to understand all

* Almost precisely as here stands the rule for ex. in *Mishar happeninim* in Buxtorf's *Florileg. hebr.* p. 297.

that is here said only "of personal grievances and offences."* Rather, in the further application, nay, in the proper and deeper sense of this, it is by no means to be excluded that I, as a child and member of the Church, feel myself to be injured by *every* sin of a brother, and that in *love* to him I can and ought to receive and treat every sin of his, that becomes known to me, as committed *against me*. The genuine brother says then to his brother: Do not injure *me* by acting thus! What thou hast done has grieved me! Go (ὕπαγε, as at chap. v. 24), wait not till he comes, but go first in a friendly and zealous spirit to him. *Rebuke* him in the truth indeed, yet also in humility and love as an unselfish child of God, taking care that the beam is not in thine own eye when thou wilt take the splinter out of his; not so much thou, in thine own power, as in the name and authority of him in whose sight ye are brethren, as a serving member of the society of all the brethren. Between thee and him *alone*,† without the presence of any others to disturb you, whose presence might only hinder the first impression of love by stirring up his pride; yet ye are not alone, for *I* am present when any thing of this kind is being transacted between two in my name (ver. 20)—your secret meeting is already a Church, thy rebuke is already the first exercise of the power which is given to it in all its members (ver. 18). If happily—and thou shouldst always hope for such a result with the "love that hopeth all things"—he shall hear thee, then hast thou *gained* thy brother, gained him for God (ver. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 19), for the Church as a brother, for thyself as *thy* brother! But if not, do not all at once give him up because *thy* wisdom and love have accomplished nothing, do not rush to the conclusion: He hears not and will not hear, because he has not heard *me!* Take with thee one or two, of course not the first best, but such as are nearest as regards their knowledge of the case and love to you both; such as in a brotherly spirit can say with you: Thou hast sinned before us and against us—whom he can also honor as brethren, if he will honor any one. This already lies first of all in the expression *witnesses;* who can witness his sin against him in this interview, which has now more formally constituted itself into a court for deciding a question of peace. At the same time, however, and if there should be no farther witnesses of his sin, they are at least witnesses of his conduct under the rebuke, and in the case of further disobedience, witnesses *against* him before the Church. This is more than the *alone* of the first step, but it is not yet the *publicity* which follows, and which needs no special witnesses; the advance to this further step is, however, already held up to him by way of warning: If thou hearest not us, then we will tell it farther! Here Christ, in order to show that the order of his Church is founded on the justice of God, adduces the Mosaic rule of law, which was always to be observed (Num. xix. 15), of which he also (John viii. 17), makes the highest application to his own person, and here in the next place to his followers. He however counts, of course, the brother who had first entered on the office of brotherly judgment as one of the witnesses, and means therefore *one or two* in addition to him, that the matter may have *two or three* witnesses.

As it was before charitably taken for granted that he would *hear*, so now it is *more probable*, that if he refused to hear at the first stage, he will continue to do so at the second. Now, but not sooner, although now without sparing, which at this stage would be wrong: Tell it to the *Church!* What has the Church to do with a sin which thy brother has committed against thee? Certainly he has sinned also against the Church, a member of which he professes to be, he has *given an offence* which must be removed; the Church, so much as in it lies, may not tolerate and acknowledge in the midst of it impenitent sinners, who will not let the Spirit of God kindly rebuke them in order to their recovery. This her dignity as the Church of God does not permit; thus does Christ here plainly enunciate the principle of all Church-discipline at present understood by so few, in so far as it must advance from admonition to *exclusion*. This latter is had recourse to, *in the first place*, not to make better, nor even (in another sense) to rebuke the person excluded, but chiefly to guard the unity and purity of the Church against the obstinate sinner.

Tell it to the *Church*—thus again does Christ speak quite definitely, and thereby certainly reverts to his first words in chap. xvi. 18: I will build my *Church;* so much the more certainly, as the whole dispute about rank among the twelve stands in such connection with the word then addressed to Peter, that Christ now finds it necessary for their full information to explain himself on this point. We were heartily sorry to find such a man as Sack* saying: "The opinion that Christ here

* As the Lutheran Francke (*Rudelb. Zeitschrift*, 1849, 4) does, and now in order to refine away every thing that goes against his Lutheranism, finds in the ἐκκλησία here only a "court of arbitration."

† For with Fritzsche violently to connect μόνου with what follows, contrary to all usage of the New Testament, is not only superfluous, but disturbs the simple emphasis of the legislation as denoting the successive steps.

* *Monatschrift für die evangelische Kirche der Rheinprovinz und Westphalens*, March, 1843. To this we have now to add, that unhappily even Delitzsch (*von der Kirche*, p. 9) still repeats such misinterpretation! On the other hand, Nitzsch (*Prakt. Theol.* i. 236) has acknowledged with assent my statement, that Christ can only have spoken here of his future Church, and besides has himself given some fine observations for the understanding of the entire chapter. Chiefly in support also of a former assertion of ours, he says, that the "rebuker is to bring the matter before the Church, not as the in-

actually speaks of the future Christian Church, must certainly be rejected; he speaks of present and not of future relations, ἐκκλησία is equivalent to the synagogue then existing in every larger town with its judicial usages; the whole, therefore admits only of an indirect application to the Christian Church!" Of what such a synagogue did, then, Christ could go on to say: *Ye* shall do it! Could Christ seriously have referred his disciples, the brethren in his name, to a court of those Pharisees whom yet, in the Sermon on the Mount, he himself had declared to be heathen and publicans, and say of it: Whoso heareth not these, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican? Already Pfenninger, in his very unbiased philosophical lectures on the New Testament, says against this: "If Jesus says: He that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad, and, he that heareth not your word, shake off the dust of your feet against him—so by the Church he certainly means not a Church of Jews, of whom the greater number hate and deny him, and the few love and believe on him, but must speak these words of a Church of his disciples. Of course! for others would receive no rules of conduct prescribed by him for their churches." We say still further: At that time there was as yet no Church of his disciples; *consequently*, he speaks of the future Church, of which he has said that he will build it.* It is hoped that the reader has so understood our whole interpretation of this discourse hitherto, from ver. 3, that it appears to him only natural and necessary when now, again, the *kingdom of heaven* in which the children of God are united as brethren, which was put in opposition to the *world* full of offences, at last appears as the future *Church;* it is hoped that we have already learned at chap. x., how Christ is wont in the continuation of his discourses to prophesy, and to make regulations for the future. We do not, however, need all this in order to show what is meant by the Church, but have at ver. 20 the most literally authentic definition from Christ himself in the closest connection: The ἐκκλησία is, where are συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα, persons "gathered together in my name;" it will continue to exist upon earth, in its power so to act as I now prescribe to it, if *I am in the midst of it.* This surely is spoken of his spiritual presence *for the future.*

The Church is the society, called together in unity of faith and love, of those who believe on him, who are united in his name; a society in which is carried out, and exercised *upon earth*, what is valid *in heaven* (before its exalted Lord and Head). This is the simple fundamental idea here clearly expressed. It is at the same time certified here with equal clearness, that it cannot be without sin and offence in the midst of it; for it happens that a brother sins, and must be admonished. It is rather precisely the institution of divine faith and love, the design of which, as it is to call the sinners of all the world to repentance, and to receive every one for the sake of Christ who only begins to humble himself, and to admit him into the ever open gates of the kingdom of heaven—so also to admonish those who already belong to it, and to carry this out in the exercise of long suffering and severity, until those who are entirely disobedient shall be again separated from it. It is, after and beside that first συναγωγή (gathering together, synagogue) of the Jews, the true, really united ἐπισυναγωγή ("assembling together") in which one takes care of the other, in which the *exhorting one another* (Heb. x. 24, 25) finds its living, progressive exemplification. That the injunction: Tell it to the Church! can in the first place mean only the Church in the place where thou art, the nearest united society of believers to which you belong, is clear—but the Church of every place represents again the entire Church, as is evident from ver. 20, and this also is the basis given in the apostolic constitution which represents in many ἐκκλησίαις (congregations) the one ἐκκλησία (Church). Only thus is the manifestation of the Church in the world at any time possible. True, according to circumstances, in so far as this can be done in truth, the *Tell it to the Church!* is even in the case of sinning churches to be further applied by bringing it before the greater society; still every little individual society retains its right in the name of the whole, so long as it truly exercises it in *his name*, in the name of *Christ.*

The power of rebuke which the individual brother exercised in private, at the first stage, was not only his duty but his *right*, a right which emanates from the Church to every member of it. But if now further the sinner is rebuked in vain *by many* (2 Cor. ii 6), *before all* (1 Tim. v. 20), in the name of Christ—then let him be to *thee*—who broughtest his case before this court of jurisdiction, and art now discharged of thy brotherly obligation—because he must now be to the whole Church, *as the heathen and the publican!* (The article has here the force of the plural, denoting the class by the individual example.) The "*to thee*" is now said to every one. Heathen are those *without*, not belonging to the people of God; *publicans* those who, although within, are yet to be reckoned with the heathen; the typical expression taken from the relation and usage then existing, implies the corresponding truth in the future. He has in the first place forfeited his name as a brother, and his right as a brother to be exhorted, for it has become manifest that there is no principle of brotherly feeling in him upon which to take hold; no one in the Church owes any further duty to him as a brother. It is altogether self-evident that, on the further development of the

---

jured private person, but as the first witness, and first receiver of the injury"—inasmuch as "in and along with that brother the Church was already injured."

*Thus also Löhe quite correctly, *Aphorismen über die neutestamentl. Aemter*, p. 3.

relations involved in the Church, this implies the denial of Church privileges, exclusion from the sacrament, etc. Here then is no respect of persons, here then is no other sort of judgment appointed beyond that of the Church; as even Pope Sylvester II. himself (*Epist. ad Seguin.* in Maimburgh and Baronius) has said: "If the Pope of Rome were to sin against a brother, and after repeated admonition would not hear the Church, he should, according to the commandment of Christ, be held as a heathen and publican!" Here, however, we ask in sadness with Wesley, not merely in reference to the Church which must hear when Rome has spoken, but to every degenerate Church of the present time in common: "But if so, in what land do the Christians live?" Christ gives the answer: The gates of hell shall not prevail against it! His Church is still there, if not in the many, yet in the few; their power is still shown, their right exercised, if not in visibly arranged forms, yet silently; and even were the key for binding and loosing to be withdrawn, and lodged in the secret prayer of two or three, it would still be present there, and efficacious for actual binding and loosing, as we shall soon see in what follows.

Verse 18. That by this *binding* and *loosing* even here, where the keys are not again expressly mentioned, Christ understands, in the widest scope of the terms, *all expression of power and exercise of authority* on the part of his Church, which he will one day (if the Church thus acts upon earth in his name) ratify also in heaven—this is not less clear than that the expression still refers most directly to what was said before, consequently to the denial of grace, the withholding of forgiveness, from the heathen and publicans who are shut out, as in the other case to the assurance of grace to penitents. That in this decisive word all precedence of any Peter whatsoever disappears, and that every exercise of any power upon earth, relating to the things of heaven, is represented as an emanation of that *power* which the Church possesses in its *unity*, every member of it (were he even an earthly head) only in virtue of his union with the body—this has already been repeatedly said, and yet cannot be enough considered. The Church possesses the word of *truth* (and with it the Spirit of truth), which it rightly interprets in itself, and by consequence *validly* applies to those cases that occur, therefore is its binding and loosing, forbidding and permitting, denying and affirming by this word, true and valid, in the whole, and in particular cases. The Church is the body upon earth filled from the heavenly Head with all the fulness of God, *i. e.*, with the holy *love* of the Father in the Son; therefore, if it has loved as God and with God, so as to seek the lost brother, it may and ought to *pass judgment* with God upon every one who will not let himself be found and restored. Let us now again connect together the beginning and conclusion of Christ's discourse upon this occasion, let us attentively consider to what a height it has risen from that word with which it began—viz., Become as children, only thus can ye belong to the kingdom of heaven! This is the ruling conquering power which the Father prepares for himself in the little ones. Over the door of the Church it is written, He who comes not hither as a child, where only children alike great and alike little dwell together, let him stay without! But within, these children are sovereign in their sphere against, and over, all that would disturb the holy and blessed fellowship. Christ who builds this Church for himself, and indeed alone governs it, from whose supreme prerogative alone all prerogative and all power that are valid in it must proceed—yet says not: I will keep the keys by me, I will myself on every occasion give the decision directly from the throne! But according to his manner of acting in all his works upon earth, in the kingdom of grace as of nature, he appoints an *intermediate agency*, in which he transfers the keys to his followers, and yet at the same time keeps them himself. It is said: I in them, as thou in me! (John xvii. 23). For whatever his followers do that is valid, is so only in his name, *i. e.*, because he is in the midst of them, ver. 20. The case then is not at all possible, that they should bind upon earth what he looses in heaven, or loose upon earth what he binds in heaven; whenever such a case occurs, then they are no longer the persons to whom the "Verily I say unto you" applies. The ὅσα ἐάν, *whatsoever things*, is indeed an exceptionless πάντα, *all things*, as the words here stand in conjunction with the certain promise expressed in the ἔσται δεδεμένα, λελυμένα, *shall be bound, loosed*—yet this is far from being true conversely, as if Christ might have said: Whatsoever I bind or loose in heaven, will be bound or loosed by you upon earth. For, in particular, the discipline of the Church exercised in the way of receiving or excluding, the application of the Gospel upon earth in the way of forgiving or retaining sin, can never certainly be quite adequate to that which Christ himself does from heaven; he retains to himself *reservata*, to bind many things which the eye of the earthly administrator does not reach, and in like manner he has again already loosed many things ere they are recognized or expressed upon earth. Consequently in those cases in which the sentence, valid in heaven, is executed upon earth, the ἔσται, *shall be*, is rather recognized as an already existing ἐστί, *is*, and the Church only says: We *see* and *testify* that thou art bound in heaven (Acts viii. 21, 23)—we see and testify that Christ hath again loosed thee. *Again* loosed? Certainly, for precisely on this account does Christ put the binding first, and yet make a loosing to follow. The two are by no means contemporaneously parallel, nor is the first mentioned first only because in it the *power* of the Church is most strongly evinced when it *judges*. An irrevocable, irredeemable ban, is far from being spoken of here; in its highest exercise of power the Church *looses* again precisely what it has bound; it has, however, only bound in order that it may be able again to loose when this is possible. Tho

final exclusion of the incorrigible, in virtue of which they are accounted as heathen and publicans, as it is requisite on its own account, so at the same time it is only the last and strongest expression of that love which seeks their recovery; for the heathen and publicans are certainly not excluded from the preaching of the Gospel, which is to be continued in all the world until the end,* and if in this instance brotherly love has come to an end, there yet remains general love, nay, more than this, the love that weeps and intercedes for the *lost brother*. All this might already be found in ver. 18, did it not come into still clearer prominence in what follows.

Verse 19. In the πάλιν λέγω ὑμῖν, "*Again* I say unto you," Christ, who here prophesies in a very condensed style respecting the future development of the Church, expresses much by indication. The πάλιν is first of all not properly equivalent to "further," as if something now followed quite different from what goes before, but here also it is the same power that is spoken of as was spoken of there. It happens with the binding and loosing just as with the hearing of prayer; it is valid in heaven only because it is the witness of what was already valid in heaven, just as prayer is heard because by the impulse of the spirit in faith it has already come forth from the supreme counsel and will. All binding and loosing is accomplished *by* prayer, for the admonition is given in the love of praying faith, and the excluding rebuke is administered in the same love. The Church is only in prayer united, so as to exercise its power, and it, like every individual of its members, performs all its works of authority only as the Son of Man upon earth performed his miracles, namely, as being heard of the Father. Therefore Basilius is quite right when he, here also, specially notices the prayer for forgiveness of sin in behalf of others. It might, indeed, with a certain measure of truth be said in opposition to this: Surely not prayer for him who has just been excluded, for in him the love that seeks the sinner has already so far exhausted itself in rebuke and final judgment, that he must be given up for lost; if all this has been done to him in vain, what can now help him? But viewed strictly, this is valid only *ad interim*, only with the *reservation* of the power of God which can yet again restore the lost one (Rom. xi. 23). The last thing which the Church does in its binding, and neither can nor should *cease* to do, is the same thing which it remains for the individual to do for his enemies, namely, to intercede for him (chap. v. 44). Or, is the Church which prays for all men (1 Tim. ii. 1), to shut out their lost brethren alone from this benefit? Oh! if this were a settled principle in Church discipline, that the lost brother should yet be prayed for, what a power would *such* binding much oftener evince towards loosing again! Although, of course, the general term γενήσεται, *it shall be done*, is assigned as a *promise* to be an inducement to every believing prayer, it yet no where promises an unconditional fulfillment, least of all where it concerns the faith or unbelief of another, which lies as little in our power as in the power of God. It is as we have said on chap. xvii. 20. Finally, the *Berleub. Bible* (whose grains of gold amid the rubbish let no one despise) is right here also, when it says on vers. 19, 20: "If now, however, things should come to such a strait, that the Church could not exercise this prerogative (of an officially acknowledged binding and loosing), Christ gives the farther assurance, that if only two or three unite together in spirit and in truth in the prayer of faith, these may yet act with effect in the matter, although the world does not acknowledge it. This points to a more straitened state of the Church, and says that we are not to withdraw the hand on this account." Very right and true indeed, for Christ had certainly such thoughts in his mind when, instead of the wide and comprehensive "you" of the entire Church, he says *two or three*, and at the same time, as the ground of this, substitutes for the testimony without, the private prayer before God. He has here in prospect that state of the Church in which the powerful exercise of the key of office by those who are called "the Church" before the world must be suspended, and when, in place of this, there comes the handful, who are united in true fellowship, praying in secret. In such a prospect he could not and would not say: Where thousands are united—but where two or three are united! It may be questioned whether what is written in Acts iv. 32 has ever been fully realized since the apostolic Church, and whether a larger assembly of the Church has ever been able to determine so perfectly as the first: *It seemed good to us, being assembled with one accord*, and *therefore* also: *It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us.* When it is remembered that unity in prayer, the innermost unity of believers before God, and the uniting, the agreeing together (συμψωνεῖν), even of two suppliants, for some definite object of prayer, is a thing so difficult and rare even in the case of a believing husband and wife (*ex. gr.*, for the preservation of a dying child), we will at once understand how significant, in all points of view, is the word which Christ has here spoken. He means truly no *agreeing* of the lips but of the *heart*, and the Holy Spirit in the heart. Where two together can truly pray for any definite thing in innermost unity, as children before God, this is from God, and is valid before God.

Verse 20. According to Jewish statute a *synagogue*, to which the Shekinah of the divine presence and hearing descends, must consist at least of *ten*; a smaller number God despises and reproaches: Wherefore do I come when there is no one there? Yet, on the

* Therefore it was wrong not at once to admit the Pœnitentes as ἀκροωμένους, but first to put them outside the door as προσκλαίοντας, χειμάζοντας; this went beyond the word of Christ, who would allow even every heathen and publican to hear

other hand, we find in *Pirke Aboth*, chap. iii. § 8, the saying: "Wherever two are sitting conversing on the law, there the Shekinah is with them." Here Christ names the smallest society that is possible, *two* or three (as at ver. 16, united witnesses before the throne of God), and ascribes to them the right and power of a Church in virtue of his presence with them. "He who can say, Thou and I, can speak of a Church, and can lay claim to the common grace" (Zinzendorf). *Συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα, gather together into* ("in") *my name*, signifies something more than, and different from *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, in my name*, because it closely belongs to *συνηγμένοι*, and this again signifies: They *are* assembled, have not merely assembled themselves, are not first comprehended in the *συνάγεσθαι*. *There I am in the midst of them* (comp. 1 Cor. v. 4), as the Mediator through whom their prayer is heard, as the giver of that which they ask, as the confirmer of that which comes forth from them as a testimony either publicly or privately. Christ certainly speaks here already in the same sense as at John xiv. 13, 14, and we have here already a prospective glance into the period of his heavenly omnipresence, which at Matt. xxviii. 20, he promised, when about to ascend to the Father. "This must signify a spiritual presence, or nothing, but it is a stupenduous expression" (Pfenninger). Yes, the as yet future spiritualization of his presence when he would be gone to the Father, he then in heaven and his Church on the earth, and yet at the same time, he in the power of the Spirit *every where*, wherever his disciples are and unite together upon earth—this and nothing else is what clearly lies in these words. We ask, therefore, again: Has he not here spoken with reference to the future Church? Therefore of course it is only: What ye *shall* bind, for he could not possibly speak of the present, and the final *ἐκεῖ εἰμι*, "there am I," is only a *prophetic* present connected with the foregoing futures. His presence depends not on the greater or smaller *number* of those assembled, and as little on any locality or *place* (which, in Old Testament fashion, he had again chosen to put his name there); but wherever he is in the midst of his believing and praying people, there is the Church to which he has given this power. Could there be a more severe judgment pronounced against all pseudo-Catholicism than is given in this word, and again a more friendly consolation, a stronger call to make use of this power; addressed to the weak Protestanism which seeks the "invisible Church" elsewhere than upon earth, in the assembly of the faithful, "in all their and our places," which never remains invisible, from which the testimony of the *ἐκεῖ εἰμι* goes forth ever anew to the world?

THE WICKED SERVANT.

(Matt. xviii. 22–35; Luke xvii. 3, 4.)

Peter has rightly understood verse 17 to the effect, that the exercise of brotherly rebuke, and the gaining of a brother, pre-supposes the mild spirit of forgiving love, and only by this is possible. His thoughts being arrested by this, and flesh and blood again objecting to it, he has perhaps not listened with perfect attention to what follows, namely, the transference of the keys from him to the Church. Or it may be he has apprehended this, so that in his confusion he does not venture to ask: Lord, but how does it then stand with the keys given to *me*? He rather now withdraws himself into the simple place of a brother in the Church, against whom a brother sins. We are inclined to prefer this explanation, and in so far to reckon it to the apostle's praise that he puts *this* question at *this time*; still there remains in it, on the other hand, the carnally proud reluctance to go on granting forgiveness to a brother without count or measure—only the same reluctance indeed, as in all of us, for who would not oftentimes have in heart asked the same question as Peter here does? That Peter lays the matter so frankly before Christ, shows an honesty which is the second thing to be commended in his question, and which always imparts a certain measure of goodness to his ill sayings.

Verse 22. As Christ has repeatedly made use of numbers one or two, two or three, Peter, on his part, will do so also, quite in the manner of Jewish ethics, which measured every thing by numbers. Not merely *ἁμαρτήσει καὶ ἀφήσω* as a Hebraism for *ἁμαρτήσαντι ἀφήσω* (so Winer thinks), but in reality: How often may my brother sin against me, with the right and claim to receive forgiveness from me? This might indeed become very frequent and very bad, it must surely then have its limits! *Seven times* then appear to him all that can possibly be required for a wide *ἕως* or "oft"*—but the matter stands quite otherwise: For if I can still count, then have I not yet forgotten what went before, and therefore not at all really

* In the Talmud it is determined, that a man may be forgiven his sin till the third time, but not till the fourth time, according to Amos i. 3, ii. 6; Job xxxiii. 29, 30.

forgiven from the heart. The answer of Christ indicates this with a quite perceptible irony, when it puts number against number. The first seven times is outbid by multiplication (in nowise by addition: 70 and 7 times), and the meaning of the ἑβδομηκοτάκις ἑπτά can only be: *Septies non solum, sed id ipsum septuagies* (not merely seven times, but that repeated seventy times over). The formula with the ἑπτά, "seven," instead of ἑπτάκις, "seven times," exactly corresponds to the word of Lamech, Gen. iv. 24, in the Sept., where the Heb. שִׁבְעִים וְשִׁבְעָה, *seventy and seven*, is certainly to be taken as a multiplication;* grant that it may have been proverbial, still it cannot be supposed that Christ, whose thoughts ever move in the sphere of Scripture, had not here that passage in his thoughts. Thus does the loving forgiveness here come into sharp and significant opposition to the revenge there expressed. But for what space of time is the reckoning to be understood? Seven times *a day* was also a Bible proverb (Prov. xxiv. 16; Psa. cxix. 165)—hence, in the parallel passage (Luke xvii. 4), the relation of which to the present will there be investigated, this is expressly said. If Peter, as is probable, meant his seven times as applying to the whole life, then, in opposition to this absurdly small measure, Christ with all the greater right puts a proverbially large number, which is properly intended to be no number. He certainly does not say what would be monstrous and inconceivable: Seventy times seven in a day—still less will he advise that a register be kept extending over years until the 490 be completed. But he means by this saying, which is quite as definite as it is indefinite: Let there be no numbering at all!† Such a deliverance of course finds its proportionate application to the loosing again of one who has been bound before the Church, whose forgiving love remains ever open for the excluded one; although an inconsiderately hasty restoration, without a sufficient guarantee for the reality of the *Μετανοῶ*, "*I repent*" (Luke xvii.), cannot thereby be enjoyed.

And now the foregoing profoundly compressed saying is expanded into a parable, in which the idea is presented in a striking and popular form. It has quite the appearance of being only a parable, the particulars being represented in the manner of the parable; yet the profound ideas to which it relates are embodied in it in rich fulness, and it is significant even in the minutest details. Preach anew upon it every year and you will not exhaust it, you will ever find something new to draw from it. We will make it our endeavor here, where the superficial school-exegesis makes much shorter work than the exposition for the preacher, at least briefly to indicate all the principal points.

Verses 23—25. Ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ, "*to a king*," again not a mere unmeaning variation for *βασιλεῖ τινι, to a certain king*, but, as has been observed at chap. xiii. 24, 31, and is applicable to all the parables (see immediately again chap. xx. 1): Coelestium similitudines *ex humanis!* (similitudes of heavenly things *from human*). If even in the kingdoms of the world, where the right of punishment must upon the whole be maintained firmly and strictly, a king yet exercises the royal right of forgiveness and release, so is it to be in the *kingdom of heaven* upon earth, in the Church, only according to the holy right of divine compassion. The king is God the Lord in his kingdom, the δοῦλοι are of course not slaves (as is evident from the selling afterwards), they are not even in the first place common subjects, but servants of the crown, and ministers; their reckoning shows in its immense sums, so to speak, "royal debts."* The most immediate application points, therefore, to the apostles and great ones in the Church, who, the more that has been intrusted to them, are capable of making all the greater failure; this, however, does not exclude the farther application to the reckoning before God of every man, according to his high calling. To be able to contract great debts is itself even an honor and dignity. If we understand talents of gold or silver, *ten thousand* are so much, that even Haman, in the book of Esther (chap. iii. 9), rated at this amount the riches of all the Jews in the land, speaking of it as a large sum. The number corresponds indeed, as a proverbially large amount, to the seventy times seven†—still because a *reckoning* is spoken of, Christ will at the same time say that God actually *counts* our sins—and *weighs* them. There is a sermon by G. K. Rieger (in his *Herzenspostille*), which, with equal profoundness and ingenuity, enters into this point, and with an inexorable particularity notes and sums up our register of sins through all their titles. Truly the number is

* For partly, the placing the small number after is not agreeable to the most ancient mode of speech, partly there is least of all reason here for making an exception on account of emphasis (as elsewhere occurs once or twice in Genesis)—how flat would be this: Also seventy times *and yet* seven times in addition thereto! Rather: Septuagies idque septuplum, many times seventy—as already ancient Rabbinical interpretation speaks of שִׁבְעִיעִיּוֹת הַרְבֵּה.

† So also Lange, although he comes to it certainly by a different way, when he takes the seventieth number as the expression of "the endless Sabbath-rest in God, the absolute divine composure, in which alone it is possible always to forgive." How *that* could lie in the words, we do not comprehend.

* We may certainly also, with Sepp, be reminded here of the colossal lease-systems of that time—only we are not to find precisely the leaseholder Zenodorus of Lebanon expressly denoted here!

† Others are so bold as to find an allusion to the *ten* commandments (every one of which has been a thousand-fold transgressed?).

for us incalculable, and the heavy weight of *every sin* that is to be counted already a talent. For of so-called small or light sins there are none. God will *reckon* with his servants, and he cannot but do so, although he makes the reckoning only to give the acquittance, he brings the sin to knowledge only to forgive it (Isa. i. 18). Without reckoning, there is no discharge, there is here no forgiveness and acquittance in the lump, without previous inspection. The debt stands registered in the conscience, the revealed law brings the contra-book to our unfaithful book-keeping, then it becomes manifest that our cancelling could yet not cancel, but that we ourselves have written: The two books agree with fearful exactness! God reckons with us because it is his *will* to do so, no avoiding or not willing on our part is in that case of any avail; he wakens the conscience, denounces the curse of the law, begins with visitation and rebuke—all which are *included* in this reckoning, which is certainly at the same time to be distinguished from the final reckoning that awaits us, spoken of in other parables (as chap. xxv. 19).—When he *began* to reckon, there came one before him, the first with ten thousand talents—the others owe certainly not less, perhaps more. He was brought before the king, προσηνέχθη, for he came not of himself, had never yet considered the reckoning, but had indifferently and wilfully accumulated debt without limit (Psa. l. 21). He is apprehended also before, and without, his having been able to see and compare the account of his fellow-servants, for this belongs not to the business between him and his Lord. The balance is absolute bankruptcy; he has nothing to pay! There is not even any counter-reckoning in part payment. Where, however, there is nothing, the king has not lost his *right*, as the half-false proverb runs, at least to punish the wilful bankrupt. The divine right, in its strict demands, is here represented in a human parable; when the king, according to Jewish law (Lev. xxv. 39, 47; Exod. xxii. 3; 2 Kings iv. 1; Amos ii. 6, viii. 6), here commands the debtor, with his wife and children, and all that he has, to be sold, so that he may at least receive something, this representation belongs certainly to the not entirely corresponding figure; still every one with whom the Lord begins to reckon, will feel what it means, without the critics having first to inquire.

Verses 26, 27. The servant who, according to ver. 25, must already have confessed that he had not to pay, does not resolve to beg for forgiveness, but like all bad debtors who are ever speaking of future payment, he proceeds, not without continued presumption, to ask for delay and patience in his difficulty, although with all patience, nothing remains to be obtained. This is meant in the same sense as (in Luke xv. 19) the word of the prodigal son, who still thinks of working off what he owes to his Father. "This is the torment of all consciences when sin comes and gnaws them, they run hither and thither, seek help here and there, and presume still to do a great deal in order to pay God. A heart that is smitten by the law is humbled indeed, therefore it falls down before the Lord and asks grace; *but it has still the fault that it will help itself: this cannot be cast out of nature*" (Luther). The common expression *I will pay thee all* (ver. 29), holds good among men—but can it have place between the Most High and us, who are so totally in his debt, and who can only pay every former debt out of his new gift and grace! Thus the Lord *pities* not only our poverty, but, in addition to this, our foolish anxiety, in which we promise what is impossible, and there is imparted to us unasked, nay, as it were, against our will, full and entire grace. The previous debt is remitted in opposition to our ἀποδώσω σοι, "I will pay;" this *remitting of the debt*, however, is still to be distinguished (as Luther has rightly indicated by the addition of the word *also*) from the complete *loosing* out of the prison which we had properly again deserved by our wrong-asking. Go, thou poor man, and know that thou hast a gracious king!

Verses 28—30. That was a counter-question for Peter: How often and how much must God forgive thee, *has* he forgiven thee? from which, then, the willingness to forgive his brother must follow as an inference. But how little does the wicked, harsh man learn *this* self-evident inference! In the ἐξελθών, emphatically placed before, the parable turns to its centre-point: So let us *go forth* from the presence of God to walk and to act with our neighbor, from the judgment and mercy seat of the royal Father and paternal King, before whom we stood, to our fellow-servants and brethren. But this wicked servant, whom Christ holds up here as a warning example, has learned nothing, has not at all in heart understood or received grace, but carries it away as a robbery. He goes out as soon as he can, light and joyful that he is only free again to go on as before. "He who seeks only forgiveness from God, and not also a new nature, will soon again lose the forgiveness also by new guilt, which he contracts with the old nature."* He *finds*—as we all find at every step, if only we seek—one of his *fellow-servants;* it may be one who was inferior to himself, as regards the high place he filled in relation to the King, in which he could contract debts so large; still minister and day-laborer are both servants of the King, the former also only a fellow-servant, and the latter properly a servant and subject of the King, whom no one can seize wrongfully against the law of the kingdom, without offending the King. The debt may, in this case, have been small in comparison with the great debt of the other

* Thus much is true, although, on the part of God, the actual forgiveness of sins at all times affords the beginning of a change of heart. Doubtful, at least liable to be misunderstood, is the still sharper statement of Alford: We may observe, that forgiveness of sins does not imply a change of heart or principle in the sinner.

for the thoughtless spendthrift out of the King's treasury would have the will and power to squander much, and would borrow but little from others; now for the first time, when, by being called to account himself, the idea of remission or payment has come into his consciousness, he thinks of his own *Activa* (as we would know nothing at all of "sinning against us," did not God first speak to our conscience of sin)—in order thereby to gather as much as possible for the delayed payment; which extreme perversity might then be understood to represent the disposition of the Pharisees who, by severe and harsh judgment, with respect to their neighbor, seek to make themselves righteous before God. This, however, seems to us to lie rather far back, amid the inexhaustible applications of which this parable is capable; what is most directly meant is *perversity* in general, delineated in the manner of the parable, the perversity that leads us not to have compassion on others when God has had compassion on us (ver 33). The βασιλεύς or Tetrarch appealed on his own behalf to the law of Israel—the servant applies against the common man, his fellow-servant, the still severer Roman law.* The κρατεῖν and πνίγειν, "laying hands on" and "taking by the throat," were, in so far, not properly "unlawful acts of violence," but a practice quite warranted by law, according to which the creditor was allowed even to seize the debtor by the throat, and thus to lead him into custody.† The reading ὅ, τι, *what*, for εἴ τι ὀφείλεις, *if aught thou owest*, is certainly only a correction, and the latter is probably no "courtly style of expression," but rather expresses the severity which appeals to the fact with an unavoidable *Ergo: If* thou owest me anything, now must thou pay, I seize thee, and will not let thee go till thou payest!‡ This would hold good before the tribunal of any earthly kingdom, and must also hold good in the outward sphere of the law, but the law of love in the kingdom of heaven absolutely forbids one, who is himself a pardoned sinner from exercising every legal right against a fellow-sinner.—The scene of humble suppliancy is here repeated in the same words; here, however, it is in its proper place, for one servant *may* pay to another, in so far as, and what, he owes to him. Christ, in order to bring out the contrast in the parable in the most striking form, selects as the example a truly humble debtor who acknowledges his debts (an ἀδελφὸς μετανοῶν, or at least λέγων, Μετανοῶ, with which we ought to be satisfied); not, as it generally happens, a bad fellow-servant, who produces his counter-reckoning: Thou owest me as much, or more, even, than I owe *thee!* so that an endless quarrel begins between the sinners as to which of the two is in the other's debt. In opposition to this humble servant, he puts the wicked servant, whose proud, heartless zeal for law is only provoked the more, as very often happens, by the entreaty and confession of the other, instead of letting himself be *reminded* with shame of his own entreaty before, which was quite the same. He would not, he threw him into prison—this is, in the first stage, the end of the sad story, but not the complete end, for there is yet another Judge above him who judges on earth.

Verses 31—34. Yes, there are also good-hearted servants there, who understand better what in his subjects pleases the King, who, with warm compassion take the part of him who has been thus harshly treated, and cannot forbear telling the whole story which has grieved them, to their Lord, with whom they stand in the confidential relation of a like disposition. These are the pious ones, who send up sighs to the God of love over all the want of love which they see around them; and Christ will teach us by this feature of the parable, that certainly not merely through the omniscience of God, but in this instrumental way, our new debt which we incur when we do not forgive our debtors, must come before God to our deeper shame. Thus must the unmerciful one be put to shame, not only before the All-merciful, but even before his merciful fellow-servants, and in this already lies his convicting sentence: Wherefore didst thou also not act thus?—Sinful man is *sad* (Psa. cxix. 136)—the subject is grieved and complains of it to the Lord; but God himself the King, in his majesty, is *angry*. It is a pity that Luther's rendering "mischievous servant" (*Schalksknecht*), cannot be altered, it certainly does not express properly what is here denoted by the δοῦλε πονηρέ (in Munster very well עֶבֶד בְּלִיַּעַל). Only now is πονηρός, "*wicked*," to be understood in the most proper sense of the word; not before, with all the wilful contracting of debt in blindness, but now, when he to whom the same things are done, exercises no compassion. For "this is the climax of our depravity, that we are beggars with God, and yet tyrants with our brethren" (Helferich). Now first, after the foregoing σπλαγχνίζεσθαι, "compassion," comes the proper ὀργίζεσθαι, "anger," which must not be overlooked by those soft-hearted ones who conclude far too much from the first exercise of compassion on the part of God, as if he cannot and will not at all be angry. Here again, before the anger breaks out, the King judging the unmerciful servant out of a heart full of compassion, condescendingly demonstrates why he has deserved the epithet πονηρέ. This, however, is also the κρίσις ἀνίλεως, "judgment

---

* Which mixture of things, according to Hug's remark, perfectly corresponds to that period.

† According to the law *in obaeratos*, the debtor was adjudged to the creditor: "addicebatur"—so that the latter "in nervum ducebat."

‡ Not (according to Lange) any uncertainty about the proper reckoning: That which thou owest me *whatever* it be. On the other hand, Alford finely observes, that he is ashamed to name a small sum, and therefore expresses his claim in a general form: Be it much or little, this something, enough thou owest me and must pay!

without mercy" (James ii. 13). *I forgave thee all that debt* (the entire great reckoning still lies there, not yet irrevocably blotted out and cast away, and is now held up before him anew!)—that was my royal act done in perfect earnest. Wherefore and for what? What hast thou given or offered to me for it? Nothing but an entreaty, and that not even a right one, for forgiveness, but only for patience, till thou shouldst pay though with still more wickedness and a new debt, seeing that thou hadst nothing. But I have reckoned thine anxiety to thee for honesty, and have made thy wrong entreaty itself the legal ground of my compassion, *ἐπεὶ παρεκάλεσάς με—as soon as* and *because* thou didst entreat me! Now, that thou shouldst exercise a like compassion, was self-evident; was it not? This smites the conscience, in ourselves moreover, for whom this *condition* of grace is expressly laid down, as in this parable, so too in all the word of God, and who have it put into our mouths in our daily prayer to the Father. Here we see then that God's forgiveness is not and cannot be *ἀμεταμέλητος*, "without repentance," so that the remitted account of former sins (2 Pet. i. 9) still hangs over all who turn grace into presumption, and must again become perfectly valid against them (Ezek. xviii. 24, xxxiii. 13). Here we have a decision upon the theological question, *utrum peccata semel dimissa redeant* (whether sins once remitted may return). Therefore now strict law returns in the King's sentence: Till he should pay all that was due! Of this *paying* as impossible, and this *till* as unending, we have already spoken at Matt. v. 26 (of which we are here reminded). Is it till the debt be worked off? It is, however, a prison that is spoken of, and not a house of correction; it will certainly be the *πῦρ αἰώνιον, everlasting fire*, of ver. 8 (Mark ix. 43, 44).* Or until he learns again to entreat? This he would probably do again immediately, but it would now be still less right *to ask* than it was the time before. Formerly the king acted only as a creditor towards the debtor, now in addition to this as a judge against the *πονηρός*, and the *βασανισταί* (which can hardly be the mere official name for *δεσμοφύλακες*), he must so execute the aggravated sentence, that any softening of the hard heart that was not softened by love, is as little to be hoped for from this tormenting, as that the poor debtor under the rack can yet gather either a first or a last farthing.

Verse 35. This is also from the Sermon on the Mount, chap. vi. 14, 15. But in the more emphatic repetition here it is no longer *your* Father as it is there—but, *my* heavenly Father,* in whose name and commission I, by way of warning, announce to you this principle according to which if you judge yourselves the matter rests there! My *Father*, who remains not the less King, Lord, and Judge. *Οὕτως, So*, precisely as the parable represents it, and not otherwise, will he certainly do to you also my disciples and apostles—*if* ye (of course not in a single instance, but perseveringly and permanently as the definitive result) forgive not your brethren. *Τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, their trespasses*, cannot possibly be a spurious addition, but belongs essentially to the conclusion of the parable, as explanation of the *δάνεια* and *ὀφειλόμενα, debt*—as, in like manner, the important expression, "from the heart," belongs also essentially to the matter. In this word, finally, all judgment is referred to him who alone knows the heart, before whom *every one* who forgives not from the heart is already in heaven viewed as bound and shut out, although the Church on earth may not know it.

OF DIVORCE, CELIBACY, AND THE COMING OF LITTLE CHILDREN.

(Matt. xix. 4–14; Mark x. 3–16; Luke xviii. 16, 17.)

The incident here recorded belongs evidently to the close of that last journey to Jerusalem, of which Luke gives so detailed an account, interweaving, at the same time, other things with it. But the same Evangelist, inasmuch as he has already (xvi. 18), adduced an earlier repetition of Christ's principal saying on the subject of divorce, now only mentions the children who were brought to him; this, however, evidently brings him into harmony with the other Evangelists. There is a considerable interval then between Matt. xviii. and xix.; for from chap. xix. onwards to xx. 17; xxi. 1, all is closely connected. To this interval must be assigned the raising of Lazarus, on the remarkable omission of which we shall speak in our interpretation of John. The *departing from Galilee* and coming to Judea beyond Jordan—in which Matthew and Mark agree—correspond, therefore, with what is said at John xi. 7; x. 40; comp. also here ver. 2 with John x. 41, 42. Probably Matthew includes under *these sayings*, in the wider sense, the collective *sayings* of Christ *in Galilee* now completed; for he often thus thoughtfully sums up particulars in general statements: see, *e. g.*, at the very outset, chap. i. 1, the title to the genealogy, forming at the same time the title to the whole book. Not until after he had risen did Christ come again to Galilee.

* Already Chryost. here: *Τουτέστι, διηνεκῶς· οὔτε γὰρ ἀποδώσει ποτέ* (that is, perpetually; for he could never repay).

* *Ἐπουράνιος* (various reading *οὐράνιος*) occurs with *πατήρ* only here in the Gospels, nay in the whole New Testament, and in general, only here in Matt. in the first three Gospels.

The question of the Pharisees was, first of all, in an exegetical point of view, difficult; for, in the single passage of the law relating to it, the עֶרְוַת דָּבָר, "*matter of uncleanness*," might certainly be explained more strictly or more loosely, according to the diverse interests and feelings of the expositors. Hence, the very different interpretations that were given to it, formed the two contending schools of Rabbies Hillel and Shammai. The one which had become dominant allowed full scope to every caprice on the part of the man, as soon as his wife, from any cause whatever, was no longer to his mind (so Sir. xxv. 26, *εἰ μὴ πορεύεται κατὰ χειρά σου*).* The other, urged by moral instincts, limited the Mosaic expression to gross faults, especially those connected with unchastity. Both schools were wrong. Shammai, although he meant well, yet wrongly inserted into the words of the law what they do not express; for although עֶרְוַת דָּבָר by itself (comp. with chap. xxiii. 15), indicates what is in some way shameful—an important delinquency, not *πᾶσαν αἰτίαν*,† *every* cause—still it is preceded by the quite general expression אִם־לֹא תִמְצָא־חֵן בְּעֵינָיו, which can only mean: When she no longer pleases him, he may no longer love her and keep her. That this should only take place in the worst cases Moses evidently explains in the context. Yet he leaves to the feeling and conscience of the man (although the somewhat obscure expression of the law might bind and burden a pious, narrow conscience), the *liberty* of determining what such cases are; nay, in the *first* clause, he allows the widest scope to the dislike of the man. Hillel, on the other hand, who was exegetically right, fell into the serious fault of relaxing that proper aversion to divorce which proceeds from the entire *spirit* of the divine law. He abused the letter of the relaxation, which was outwardly just and right, as if, what the law permitted, only on the pre-supposition of a sinful state of things, might be safely regarded as morally good. Such a controversy of the schools—in which according to the original view of their founders, the one side had some right from an unbiassed exegesis, but the other also a certain right on the score of moral feeling, and both no proper understanding of what the law meant—had naturally become a party quarrel; and the design of the Pharisees is, that Christ should take a side in this strife of the schools. This is the captious element in their *tempting* question. He must break with the one party or the other. If he sides with Shammai, then he makes himself an object of hatred to the frivolous multitude, and may be called in question by the governor, Herod (who had sinned in this way).* But if he takes part with Hillel, he brings himself into collision with the more seriously disposed of the people, if not into contradiction with his own well-known usual strictness in interpreting the law. His words in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 31, 32)—which were in precise contradiction to the law of Moses, as then understood—perhaps, also, the repetition of these in the denunciation of Luke xvi. 17, 18, had called forth this new question. The fools are for entangling him in the letter of Moses, whose spirit they had missed in their disputation. They come slyly enough with the general question, saying not a word of the passage in Moses, or of Hillel and Shammai; but keeping all this cunningly in reserve. In the form of their question, however, "*Is it lawful?*" the truth, by no means unknown to the conscience of the questioners, betrays itself in the very first word, unconsciously and against their will. That *Moses* allowed it is indeed plainly written, as Hillel rightly read it; but that it was not therefore right and lawful before God was testified not merely by the feeling which sought another interpretation, but also by the very form in which these malicious interrogators put their question. "Man is inclined to license"—that is true, therefore he is ever fond of asking, Is not this or that also lawful? But when he thus asks, and would have Yes for answer, he has already uttered, in most cases, the No in his conscience. The erring doctrine and practice of human statute move in the sphere of the lawful or not lawful; whoever enters upon this, will always give offence on one side or the other. But the wisdom of Christ, rising above this entire sphere, enters upon it only so far as to disclose the original ground of divine ordinances in relation to sinful man, and to demonstrate it with incontrovertible simplicity, and with irresistible clearness, by the accordant testimony of *nature* and *Scripture*. Thus does he answer the captious question—which is of more importance for all mankind than the tempters were aware of—with a supreme decision, always and every where valid, reaching far beyond the law of Moses, and yet only leading back to the original history of the same Moses; a decision, on the right understanding of which, the entire doctrine concerning marriage in all its aspects and relations develops itself.

There is a plain connection in what Matthew narrates as far as to ver. 15. In strict harmony with the answer given to the question of the Pharisees stands, according to Christ's own design, the further *esoteric* expla

* "If she go not as thou wouldst have her." It is said expressly in the Tract *Gittin*, fol. 90: "Even if she had only over-salted his soup"—nay, with shameless license: "Even if he should find a fairer one in whom he has more pleasure!" The repeated rule in the Talmud runs: Hillel looses what Shammai binds.

† Or as Josephus, *Ant.* iv. 8 23, *καθ' ὅς δηποτοῦν αἰτίας, for whatever reasons.*

* To what a length the laxity of morals had gone at that time, we may see in Josephus. He coolly tells of himself, that his first wife left him, whilst the second, although the mother of three children, he put away, in order to take the third.

nation respecting the state of celibacy—an explanation occasioned by the doubts of the disciples. But even the blessing pronounced upon the little children must also, according to the Father's wondrous arrangement of events, follow precisely now. Thus the utterances of the Son upon earth are made complete; and every possible misunderstanding of what had just been said about marriage is obviated by his loving recognition and benediction of children, who are themselves indeed God's continual blessing upon marriage.

Verses 4—6. Mark having once more lost the proper order and succession of the discourse (as we have already found to be frequently the case with him; for example, in the sayings against human statutes and lip-service), we adhere entirely to Matthew. Our Lord goes back at once to the ground and origin of the marriage relation according to the first creation. He leaves the new, supreme decision respecting all irregularities that may intervene, respecting all laws that condescend to such cases, to be expressed by God (whom he here calls with emphasis *ὁ ποιήσας*—for which in Mark there is only *ὁ θεός*). Thus does he teach us in general, in every similar controversy, to ascend to its origin, to find the true restoration of every human relation that has been disturbed by sin, there where its first roots and beginnings lie. But where are we to find these; where do they lie disclosed to our view? As if there were no *Scripture* which testifies of the beginning and end! *Have ye not read?* There where alone we can read of these things; where Moses, by the Spirit of God, has written an account of the beginning of the world and of man. What an undeniable attestation have we here against all the confusion of the present criticism of the Pentateuch and of Genesis, from the mouth of Christ, the Fulfiller of all revelation, the Restorer of all disturbed order and forgotten truth, the Critic of all human doctrine that falsely interprets the Word—an attestation not only to the fact that Moses wrote the five books (which is here between question and answer self-evident; in Mark ver. 5, *Moses wrote*), but that in the first book he actually writes of the *first* creation! *Ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, from the beginning*, which belongs as well to *ὁ ποιήσας, he that made*, as to *ἐποίησεν αὐτούς, made them* (Mark, *ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, i. e.*, from the creation of the world in general, and the creation of man in particular, from the beginning also of the human creature), significantly corresponds with the בְּרֵאשִׁית, "in the beginning," of Moses, and assures us that in those first chapters, which now indeed few can or will *read*, the beginning and roots of things as they proceeded from the Creator are truly to be found. Alas! how far is our present groping and presumptuous science from going back, in all and in every thing, to the first verse which is to be found concerning it in Moses! And how in the Uranienburg University of Solyma—"with the clock and the great bell on the beautiful high hill"*—will the inquiries and controversies of men respecting geology and anthropology square with the *Genesis* already written with the pen of God? We are here further taught, in our interpretation of Scripture, to explain the particular parts by the whole, the later by the earlier, the law by the history, the law of Moses by the primitive history of Moses. In order to determine the import of the command respecting the bill of divorce our Lord here cites *two passages* from the first two chapters; and (taking for granted, of course, also the *unity* of the two chapters) brings these into strict connection. The former speaks of the first creation of the man, ere yet the woman was taken from the man, *fashioned* (not created) out of his side. As we *read* in Moses the wondrously mysterious, yet not less literally clear, connection of unity and duality: בָּרָא אֹתוֹ—וַיִּבְרָא אֶת־הָאָדָם, "He created *him*—and he created man," and then again זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם, "male and female created he *them*" (compare, for the complete interpretation of this, chap. v. 1, 2)—so and not otherwise does Christ speak, making use of the precise and correct rendering of the Septuagint in the neuter: *ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς*, not *ἄνδρα καὶ γυναῖκα* (*male and female*; not *man and woman*). God made *man* in the beginning, certainly "not man-woman," as a theology and exegesis that rejects the mystery half truly protests; yet neither did he make them as two men, a man and a female-man; but as אָדָם, *i. e.*, as man, who as yet had the woman in himself, before the separation was made. Upon *this* original *unity* of the two* Christ now grafts the "therefore" in Adam's saying, and by a connection even closer than belongs to it as it there stands. *Καὶ εἶπεν, and said*, is not precisely an indefinite לֵאמֹר, *saying* (as if what follows were further said by Adam with reference to this); but it really belongs also to *ὁ ποιήσας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, "he that made them from the beginning." *God* spoke by Adam, at least so far forth as this, that his word became a *γραφή* or Scripture, just as he spoke by Sara (Gal. iv. 30) and others. But this is still more emphatically a saying of God, inasmuch as this first word of the awakening man is a prophecy respecting the new relation imparted by the Creator to his new consciousness, and belongs to what has just been done as a divine explanation of it.† Thus does

* Those who as Christians and theologians have the true longing for home have probably read Stilling's *Heimweh*.

* Which at all events (just as in Moses) lies in the expression. Unsatisfactory and only evasive is the translation: "As the man and as the woman"—even if (with Lange) it were more particularly explained: "The male and the female in their being for each other." Just as little are we at liberty at once to understand by the *cited αὐτούς* only the "human race."

† Deus utique per hominem dixit quod homo prophetando prædixit (Augustine, *de Nupt.* ii. 4).

Adam prophesy for the then *future* of his race; he speaks less of himself than of those who are afterwards to be born as man or woman; for he speaks of *father* and *mother* ere yet he has learned by experience the meaning of these names. In every word of this saying there is involved some principle that regulates and determines this relation, which, however, is not now particularly mentioned by Christ, as the occasion did not require that it should be. For example, the appointment of only one wife; in opposition to the unnatural caprice of Lamech, and also to the equally unnatural separation of man and wife (for God did not make two women to provide for the case of separation). It is here implicitly declared also that to the marriage relation belongs a sacredness superior to the sacred obligation of children to parents; consequently that to leave one's wife, to whom one should cleave, is a greater crime than to leave one's parents. Again, that while the man might at first take his sister to *wife*, he was at all events not at liberty to take his *mother*, and so on.

As it is agreeable to the object which Christ has here in view to stop at the last words—which he emphatically repeats as the ground of his inference—he cites for further confirmation according to the Sept., which has only the *οἱ δύο, the two*, as the Samaritan. Pentateuch the שְׁנֵיהֶם, *they two*. This, although not in the genuine original text, is yet so evidently to be understood there, that Christ bases his entire doctrine upon this "two," to which prominence is given.* They are two, and yet *no longer two:* this is the shortest and profoundest expression of the mystery of marriage: that great mystery the further typical significance of which the Apostle Paul opens to us in Eph. v. 31, 32. *One flesh:* this Olshausen (and many others), with a good intention but erroneously, interprets thus: "Not only ἓν πνεῦμα and *μία ψυχή, one spirit* and *one soul*, but also *σὰρξ μία;* marriage in its ideal form appears as the union of the entire human being in love; it pre-supposes unity and concord of spirit and soul." No! that is marriage as humanly idealized, but by no means the real marriage which God has instituted, and will maintain inviolable. If this enthusiastic view of nuptial love were right, then that would be no true marriage where this unity is wanting; then indeed would the discovery of a want of "elective affinity" afford a valid ground of separation. The *bodily* fellowship is not merely the basis of *marriage*, but also that which is alone essential; it may indeed, and in a certain sense, should be sweetened and glorified by friendship of soul being superadded, but marriage subsists as such apart from that. Observe the distinction in 1 Cor. vi. 16, 17. *One flesh, i. e.*, one person, forming together one man, within the limits of this life in the flesh, for this world; beyond these limits the death of the flesh has separated the marriage tie. In this alone lies the justification of second marriages, which do no injury to the continuing spiritual fellowship of love with the partner who is gone.*

And now comes the great inference, which appears to be simply a repetition of the old word rightly read, and yet is made the sacred marriage formula of the new Church. God has *joined together* man and wife, in the first unity and *beginning* of the *man*, who was *male and female;* and *therefore*, again, in the *restoration*—as declared by the man—of those who are now two to their original unity. Here consequently is applied in the most important case a *universal* proposition, the applications of which to cases of every kind are inexhaustible. viz.: That which in general, and in any way, God hath united, let no man in capricious innovation of God's primitive and natural law put asunder! God indeed also separates again: as (for reasons regarding which we are here silent in order not to provoke dispute) he took the woman out of the man; and as he now dissolves marriages by death. What man joins together unjustly, that the judging and saving God wholly separates; but what the sin of man has separated, that he can and will join again together. *Ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω*, Let not *man* put asunder: this is the answer to the question, *Is it lawful for man?* The result, then, of this first answer is: *Properly there should be* no separation;† as there should not be that sin, and that hatred from which alone *the bill of divorce* and *finding no favor* can proceed; there should be no separation, as not by adultery, so not by hindering and prohibiting marriage where God will have it. But indeed, before the second question of the Pharisees calls forth the second answer of Christ respecting the *permission* of separation, the reasonable difficulty suggests itself, Whether all marriages that have been actually contracted, and are admitted as real, are to be regarded as the joining together of God? Here the strict word of our Lord leaves room for many considerations, which may be justified elsewhere from the word of truth. Even the strict *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* (June, 1843) itself says: "Marriages are concluded in heaven—now, however, mostly on the low earth, and often still deeper." How then, if any one were just to invert the word of Christ, and to maintain that, *because God* has not joined together all that passes under the name of marriage, therefore divorces are not to be allowed? Some time ago, the discussion of the new Prussian law of mar-

* We have not here, however, an argument for a *Greek* version of the Gospel of Matthew, which is as good as the original, or for the fact that our Lord himself spoke Greek; for Christ might with the same right as the Sept. derive the *δύο* from the context.

* Compare the doctrine of Rothe, which agrees with the above (*Ethik*, iii. 638).

† For it is contrary to nature, as Chrysostom said: *παρὰ φύσιν τὸ γινόμενον, ὅτι μία διατέμνεται σάρξ.*

riage tended to impress upon all the important truth, that a law of marriage should first purify and as much as possible vindicate the sanctity of the marriage contract, before it carelessly confirmed every marriage that is contracted. Certainly *man also should not* join together without God; this the marriage ceremony expresses, but only shadows it forth, however, *without its being on every occasion a truth.* To speak again with the *Kirchenzeitung:* "Is it less culpable when a minister *at once* pronounces the marriage ceremony upon those, of whom he is convinced that in heart they break the marriage-vow at the moment they are taking it upon them, than it would be to throw away the blessing of the Church in the marriage of persons who are separated contrary to the Church?" But we ask further: Is it possible so to try the heart, in all cases, as that, even in the best condition of Christian states and national Churches, no marriages should receive the form of divine confirmation, which were already null and void from the first? One sees that Christ could not possibly have expressed his sublime law in such a manner as to be rigidly maintained in its application to the outward sinful reality.

The first question—which, with the design to "tempt," refers to the passage in the law of Moses, without precisely naming it, and asks, "How understandest *thou* this, what is thy interpretation?"—our Lord so answers as to pierce their conscience, that very conscience which, notwithstanding the plainly prescribed permission, could yet not forbear asking—"Is it lawful?" How great his condescension! Instead of laying bare and condemning the hostile purpose of the tempters, in the question which was *now* in the first place addressed *to him*, he rather grafts his answer on the secret acknowledgment of the truth which the important question, viewed as the question of man in general, implies, namely, "It is not lawful." This, however, he confirms by appealing to the original appointment of God, according to the Scripture; as already expressed in the creation from the beginning, before the taking of the woman out of the man, and then in the first prophecy of the man, respecting the unity of flesh, which continues to subsist in the duality. He has thereby very unexpectedly risen far above the disputed passage of the law taken by itself; this is inconvenient for the inquirers, and perplexes them. They must then, if they would not be at once refuted, resolve to speak out more pointedly and pressingly. Since Christ, going further even than Shammai, will allow no reasons of divorce to be valid, they, after the manner of malicious disputants, naturally leap at once to the other side: Wherefore, then (if it be as thou sayest), did Moses command to give a bill of divorce, and to put her away? That is, Wherefore did he *command*, and require nothing more than, this form, in order to put her away? Or, How then could Moses prescribe illegal forms for things which are against God's ordinance?

Verses 8, 9. The second answer, still more unexpected than the first, although to the upright conscience long since present and obvious, now puts them to shame, and administers befitting rebuke: "What you call *command* is only *permission*, and that, on account of the hardness of men's hearts, against the ordinance of God from the beginning. That ordinance I am come through grace to restore; and therefore I now declare and ordain, without contradiction of Moses, what you already know (from the Sermon on the Mount) as my marriage-law." Our Lord, in the first place, interprets those disputed expressions of Moses which, as specifying the *cause of divorce*, must be supposed to be in the background of the whole transaction, really in the same way as *Hillel;* for he admits that Moses has permitted divorce in general, apparently almost *for every cause.* But he rejects, at the same time, the acceptation of this entire ἐντολή or ordinance of Moses (Mark, ver. 5) as a *commandment*; and maintains another reading and construction of the whole clause, just as it also stands in our German Bibles. If we read the original text (Deut. xxiv.) correctly, we shall find that the whole of vers. 1–3 forms what we may call the *premiss*, or preamble, consisting of pre-supposed and at that time acknowledged circumstances and events, and that only ver. 4 contains the *conclusion* or statement, of the *law* properly so called.* Moses admits the long existing practice of divorce, and the bill of divorcement, to be valid in the same way as blood-revenge, and many other customs which then obtained; he does not properly speaking ordain the bill of divorce, but only confirms it by expressly mentioning that it must not, as heretofore, be wanting; he adds, however, the highly necessary limitation of the custom, that at least the abomination of running back from a second husband again to the first is not to be permitted. For the rest, he *permits it to be done*, and takes meanwhile under his legislative care what in the Old Testament was not to be changed without causing greater evil.† Σκληροκαρδία, *hardness of heart*, the adjective of

* To which Michaelis rightly directs attention, *Mos. Recht.* ii. § 119. For if the law begins already at וְכָתַב לָהּ, then would it further be *commanded:* She shall marry another man, who shall hate her, and also send her away, etc. Rather does the אוֹ כִּי יָמוּת show plainly that the preamble of the supposed case extends as far as to this point.

† On a right consideration of this whole subject there would result, in the case of a still lower degree of corruption (such indeed as now exists to the shame of Christendom), an answer respecting the present brothel-question, not corresponding to the most *rigorous* view, but somewhat as Wichern states it. Here, of course, only for the magistrate or police; not for the Church, the Church of the New Testament. Compare besides such laws as Deut. xxi. 10, ss.; Exod. xxi. 9, 10 (Michaelis, *Mos. R.* § 87). How far did *God's* police at that time condescend for the Jews!

which occurs, Ezek. iii. 7 (Sept. *πᾶς ὁ οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ φιλόνεικοί εἰσι καὶ σκληροκάρδιοι*, קְשֵׁי לֵב), is found in Deut. x. 16, Sept. for עָרְלַת לְבַבְכֶם, where the *circumcision of the heart* is spoken of—we know in what sense Moses speaks of this, and prophesies for the future of a new covenant. (Comp. also Deut. ix. 27, *σκληρότητα τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου*, קְשִׁי הָעָם, and the קְשֵׁה עֹרֶף, הַוֹּה, and the elsewhere so often said of Israel.) All these passages Christ brings to mind, in order that the lawgiver may be explained from his own words. When he three times repeats with emphasis *ὑμῶν*, *ὑμῖν*, *ὑμῶν* (the hardness of *your* hearts, *your* wives), he thereby intimates, in a manner not to be overlooked, the particular and temporary character of the permissive ordinance, as precisely for such a hard-hearted people, in contrast with the *ἄνθρωπος*, the *man*, vers. 4–6. Moses, indeed, although Christ purposely mentions only him, rightly permitted this, not arbitrarily as man, but in virtue of a *commission from God.** "A law which Moses has given cannot be sinful"—what Moses has allowed, the governor of a country may now permit without sin; "the subjects sin when they avail themselves of the permission, but he is as it were protected by the example of God and of Moses, and sins not when he grants permission to them for the prevention of a greater evil" (Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, i. § 2). Much is permitted by the state, and *must* even be permitted by the *Church*, although in the eye of conscience it be wrong, although the *word* of Christ preached in the Church may testify against it.† When the apostle in 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11, adduces the saying of Christ, he represents him, in the words *ἐὰν δὲ καὶ χωρισθῇ*, *but if she depart* (quite similarly to the Mosaic phrase), as taking for granted the possible occurrence of such unhappy cases even among Christians, precisely in the same way as here (ver. 9). A forcible hindrance of separation, in the name of Christ and by commission from him for his Church, cannot be what is here spoken of. It is enough that he designates all divorce in general as proceeding from sin, and against God's ordinance (which sooner or later conscience makes known to all who avail themselves of the permission). Enough, that he acknowledges only the *πορνεία*, *fornication*—*i. e.*, however, every unfaithfulness performed and consummated by the entire person, and essentially annulling marriage, be it in a work, or lust of the flesh*—as justifying the divorce of those who are already in reality divorced. Enough, that in all other cases he forbids, for all who will hear him in the spirit of free obedience, marriage with another woman as adultery, on account of that which is still valid. On all this—how far it reaches, and how far it is not for outward legislation—we have already expressed our views in our interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount. It remains only to be observed, that while here the *λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν*, *but I say unto you*, certainly stands parallel to the foregoing *ὑμῖν*, *to you*, in connection with the permission granted by Moses, and addresses the *Pharisees* (differently from the *ὑμῖν* addressed to the *μαθηταί* in the Sermon on the Mount), it yet does not imply that the commandment of our Lord is actually to take the place of the permissive legislation of Moses. For we are evidently to understand and supply: I say unto you, *if ye ask me*, as at ver. 3, in the spirit of those who would hear my decision on the subject, and follow my word in regard to it. He thus answers the insincere question with all the earnestness of truth.

According to Mark—who does not accurately know and represent the *details* of the discourse with the Pharisees, but does not on that account misstate its *import*—*the disciples* again privately questioned Christ on the matter. This corresponds with what Matthew relates with a subsequent objection and doubt on the part of the disciples. It is not, however, to be supposed that Mark has erroneously put the repetition of the prohibition of divorce in place of the other esoteric saying about castrating; it is quite possible that both may consist with each other.† Before that happened which Matthew relates, it was very natural that the question should be further asked: *Does the matter stand really thus?* Art thou perfectly earnest in what thou hast just said to the Pharisees? This Mark, moreover, indicates in the words, "ask him again of the same matter." This Evangelist, finally, has still another sentence peculiar to himself, which can hardly have been merely invented or have lost its proper place: And if a *wife shall put away her* husband. This happened sometimes, although (as Josephus expressly explains, *Ant.* xv. 7, 10) not according to Jewish law, which, indeed, in many cases permitted an action on the part of the wife with a

* Origen very wrongly found here what he regarded as a significant distinction between *God's* command, and *Moses'* permission yielding to the hardness of heart.

† This goes beyond the mere permission of "magisterial" authority, as Von Gerlach thus softens it. Nay, much more is permitted than he allows, when, ingeniously explaining the words of Luther to this effect, he is for "rejecting all divorced persons from the fellowship of the Christian Church."

* How then if the one partner had for years secretly maintained a refined sensual intercourse with a third person, although without concubitus? Would this in the judgment of Jesus be no *πορνεία*, no adultery? There is much wanting to prove the assertion (on which Von Gerlach lays so much stress), that in the mouth of Jesus *πορνεία* can throughout only unequivocally mean the 'bodily act;" comp. what we have said already at the Sermon on the Mount, p. 67.

† It is even possible that Mark here, as generally, narrates with historical exactness; although upon other grounds pertaining to the internal connection, we do not believe this.

view to divorce, but by no means an arbitrary divorce or leaving of her husband, such as that of Salome who wrote a bill of divorce against Costobarus, or that of Herodias who left Herod Philip. When Christ thus mentions instances, as occurring in his own time, of a still worse caprice than was allowed by Moses (though allowed by Greek and Roman law), he thereby indicates more strongly the results of hardness of heart, and thus sets all the more sharply in opposition to all such conduct his own holy ordinance, for the keeping of which he also furnishes the necessary grace.

Verses 11, 12. Hereupon the disciples are alarmed at the idea of an indissoluble union among sinful men—not so much on their own account as on account of other people—seeing that their master had employed the universal "whosoever." They are right in this fear, which would rather not venture on incurring an obligation for the full discharge of which grace is necessary; but, they forget, on the other hand, that to remain unmarried without sin requires a still larger measure of grace. Their frank declaration proceeding from the first strong impression is: If *the case of the man with his wife** be so, it is *not good* to marry, as it appears to us! (are not the Essenes with their celibacy after all in the right?). Our Lord, however, in his answer, points to the still worse evil of lustful desire, or fornication (1 Cor. vii. 1, 2, 9); since only a chaste celibacy can be pleasing to God, and profitable or better for man. He at the same time neglects not the occasion thus presented—in order to the *completion* of his doctrine for all future disciples—of giving its due merit and honor to *celibacy*. This he does in such a way as to point out the true and direct path of decision between the first utterance of God—"It is not good for man to be alone"—and that special grace of the New Testament, already allied with the angelic state, which Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 1, acknowledges as the truth corresponding to the ascetical error. He, first of all, explains that chaste celibacy is an *exception* to the general institution, and can therefore only be *given* through the will and power of God.† He then declares that such an exception can only be conceived of as *threefold*. First in the case of such as are naturally and by birth disqualified, and which in the special case corresponds to the ἀρχὴ κτίσεως or "beginning of the creation" in general; this, however, is only a rare circumstance, and constitutes, so to speak, a permision of the Creator. Secondly, in the case of those disqualified by the unnatural act of men (therefore forbidden by Moses, Deut. xxiii. 1; Lev. xxii. 24, to be done to men or beasts); which, however, also constitutes a permission of God, a divine dispensation for those who have been thus dealt with. Finally (and this he means as the principal answer, which was to be explained by the two foregoing parallels), in the case of those who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He concludes, after having at the beginning repelled those who are not called to this, with a confirmation of this last case; a confirmation in which, while he strongly limits its operation, he yet truly acknowledges, nay, almost *requires it*.

All men cannot receive *this saying:* Christ certainly does *not* mean by "this saying" (as Wizenmann in his simplicity supposes) his own prohibition of all divorce except in the case of fornication, that which, as he had just expressed it, had seemed so alarming to the disciples. This would yield, indeed, a very perverted sense. It would mean that the universal grace of the New Testament, for the restoration of all that has been disturbed by sin to the pure ἀρχὴ κτίσεως, or original institution was *not given to all;* and as if *on that account* this new appointment of Christ could be required only of those who were specially chosen to keep it. No, our Lord does not here go back to his foregoing words; but he closely connects something new with the word which the disciples had used as the expression of their perplexity. *This*, and nothing else, he means by the τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, *this saying*. It is not his intention absolutely to contradict the disciples, who have spoken more truly than they themselves know; but rather to acknowledge that, in a certain case, a partial truth belongs to their rash general proposition. The *saying* then is, "*It is not good to marry*"—which, upon other grounds, is in fact true as regards *some*, those, namely, who have the *gift* and the *calling* to abstain (I Cor. vii. 7–17). That thus only can it be rightly understood, is clearly proved by the repetition at the conclusion: He that is able to receive it, let him receive it! The carnal mind also shrinks from the restraints of marriage but only that it may yield itself unrestrained to its lusts; than which nothing can be more evil. Only chaste celibacy can in certain circumstances be better than marriage; or, as Christ here expresses it: for the οὐ γαμῆσαι, *not marrying*, are required εὐνοῦχοι, "*eunuchs*." Of these there are three kinds: as some are so *without*, and some *against* their own will, so there are others certainly who are so *with* their own will, yet only *according to* the will of God. It ought not to be overlooked that, in the first two cases, the expression is indeed in the first place to be taken literally; but even in them it passes into a further meaning, so as to prepare the way for

* *Αἰτία* is not with Meyer to be explained according to ver. 3: If there is only this single reason for divorce. The *μετά* will not agree with this. But quite correctly with Luther: The *matter* of the marriage covenant, namely in its ground, its first institution. Elsewhere also *αἰτία* has a signification equivalent to *ratio, conditio;* here, therefore, the original law of the marriage-state. Hesych. *τὰ κατ' ἀρχὴν πράγματα.* Euthym. *ἐὰν τοιαύτη ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τῆς συζυγίας.*

† This idea seems to us to afford sufficient *connection* between the question and the answer; there is no necessity for Neander's difficulties, who says that, either the discourse has no such connection, or intermediate words have been left out.

the non-literal continuation and application of it in the third case. A *eunuch from his mother's womb** is not merely one who is born and constituted with a real natural defect in this respect; but also, in a certain measure, one who is destitute of the sexual desire that impels to marriage, so that chastity costs him no struggle, and is to him no victory. *Being made eunuchs* by other men† includes also being restrained or kept back from marriage in the various ways in which this may be done; those cases in which such restraint finds easy obedience in accordance with God's providential arrangements (certainly not the unnaturally forced, and therefore all the more unchaste, celibacy of monks, soldiers, and the like). In so far as this intermediate case stands between the foregoing and the following, it is either similar to the first or the third. Yet Christ essentially distinguishes the first and second as being irregular and wrong, from the third, which he himself ordains and confirms, only however as a rare exception. For he has already acknowledged marriage as the ordinance of the Creator; he himself called a married person to be his first apostle; and his last chosen apostle, although unmarried, not merely confirms in very earnest terms the general ordinance, but in particular speaks of cases (and these not of rare occurrence) in which, as the reverse of what Christ here says, it is rather required of a man that he *marry* for the kingdom of heaven's sake. Something to this effect lies certainly in 1 Tim. iii. 2; and this may find its application as well in reference to missionaries who seek, by means of female missionaries, to open a door for the Gospel to the wives and daughters of the heathen, as to the pastors of Christendom in town and country. Nay, one might say further, that for example a widower, who again gives a mother to his children *against* the felt want and inclination of his own heart; and, finally, that every one who cannot live chastely unmarried, and who enters into the married state in order to his sanctification, marries for the sake of Christ and his kingdom. As for those, however, *who have made themselves eunuchs, i. e.*, who by victorious conflict with the lust of the flesh have reached a state in which they feel it no longer (for Christ here denotes the end of a conflict which is indeed not so speedily accomplished, and graciously reckons it finished when it is only begun)—they have certainly done it *for the kingdom of heaven's sake.* He who undertakes it from other motives, in self-will, without the gift and calling of God, will not accomplish it, can never accomplish it. *This*, experience testifies, even as our Lord here takes it for granted; for he recognizes no fourth class consisting of those who from pride, avarice, or any other motive, might achieve it. Even he who would deal with himself as Origen did would not thereby destroy the desire, which it is well known may still exist in those who have been bodily castrated (Sir. xx. 3, xxx. 21).

But what is here meant by "*for the kingdom of heaven's sake?*" We think our Lord comprehends in this expression two sorts of cases: the first, when any one renounces the state of marriage on account of an office, and for the sake of active labor for the kingdom of heaven, as was probably the case with Paul; the second, and this is the most proper and immediate sense of the word, when any one feels in his experience before God that he himself can, and is to be, holy and happy, only in an unmarried state, and that this is *for him* the appointed way into the kingdom of heaven. In which case, therefore, it must always be acknowledged that Christ knows nothing and says nothing of a relatively greater value belonging to celibacy, or of a higher degree of holiness in it.* For, *the kingdom of heaven*, into which we are all in various ways to press, and the most of us in the state of marriage, is alone the object and end; while the refraining on the part of some is only the means to that end. Let every one see to it indeed that he be not disobedient, if this means and this way have been appointed for him; let him not think that the δέδοται (*it is given*) must at once be realized, whenever he thinks so; but let him do his part in order to the acquisition of the gift held out to him, in the painful, gradual, perhaps in the life of the flesh never to be entirely accomplished, εὐνουχίζειν ἑαυτόν, "making himself a eunuch." And in so far our Lord says, last of all: Whoso finds that he can receive it, let him go on with earnestness and zeal! which is certainly at the same time an evangelical counsel, a challenge addressed to all whom it concerns.

Nothing could more appropriately follow these sayings about marriage and celibacy than the requirement to acknowledge that *children* also (with the blessing of grace) are of the kingdom of heaven—children as the fruit of wedlock, which, notwithstanding what has just been said, is yet always of course blessed of God. As what had just been said might easily be misunderstood by men inclined to ἐθελοθρησκεία, or "will-worship," we see the counter-working wisdom of the Father—who *prepares* for the Son upon earth the course of his testimony as well as of his sacrifice—in causing at this precise moment the

* Such a one was said by the Jews to be castrated by the sun (one who has never otherwise seen the sun), or by the hand of Heaven.

† In Israel, as already said, unconditionally forbidden by Moses; therefore all the more common in the entire East. Hamann observes rightly for once: Self-castration for the sake of the kingdom of heaven (as afterwards follows) must have been a word which no Jewish head nor Jewish taste was in a condition to understand.

* On which Neander, who himself, as is well known, remained unmarried, notwithstanding speaks very truly; he not inaptly suggests that Christ elsewhere has found fault with the burying of the talent in order to preserve it more safely.

children to be brought to Jesus that he might bless them. Luke, who has not preserved this important connection, points at least by the article in τὰ βρέφη (*the* infants) to the typical, general significance of the incident: There were once brought to him also *the* children; and thus did he receive them, these were his words concerning the children!* It, moreover, certainly appears from the expression βρέφη, *infants*, if it were not already implied in the προσφέρειν, *bringing*, that they were not even παιδία, *little children*—as was the child (Matt. xviii.) who was called and placed in the midst of the disciples—but mere infants (1 Pet. ii. 2; Acts vii. 19; Luke ii. 12–16, and even i. 41. On the other hand, ἀπὸ βρέφους, 2 Tim. iii. 15, is used only as a proverbially strong expression). Our Lord was not desired to say any thing to them, but merely to lay his hands on them, and pray over them; or, as the two other Evangelists denote the retiring modesty of the request, to *touch* them. It was a praiseworthy faith on the part of the mothers who brought them (whoever else the οἱ προσφέροντες, indefinitely named in Mark, may be) thus to expect, from the laying on of the hands of the holy man (according to ancient custom), a real blessing for those who were as yet incapable of receiving the word. The disciples, however, being thus interrupted in a very interesting conversation which they would fain have continued by further questioning, were displeased with the expectation, and harshly repel it as improper. "Do not overpower him; he has more than enough to do with those who are grown up.† What good can such children get from his laying his hands upon *them*?" Thus "do they chide, with the gravity of young Rabbis, this interruption to a difficult inquiry of their profound school" (Lange). Upon this Christ speaks the great word, which completes what he had previously taught regarding marriage; which rebukes all that proud contempt with which many would in after times look upon the fruit of blessed marriages; and which gives a new and more deeply-reaching commentary on all that had been said in Matt. xviii., and was here so soon forgotten by the disciples.

That the "*children*" and the "*such*" here, as at chap. xviii., are to be distinguished, and yet that the first certainly include the second, we shall not undertake to prove anew; it is evidently implied in the connecting word *for*. In like manner, that the kingdom of heaven consists of such children, as also of childlike men—not on account of their own original innocence, but through the saving grace in which they receive it as a gift and blessing—is equally evident: "*If they come*, and come to *me*, then of such is the kingdom of heaven." Children and childlike men, then, do not need to be made eunuchs in order to this. If the disciples, in a Pelagian spirit, take it for granted that man, through his own knowing and willing, believing and obeying, must meet the coming of the kingdom with something of his own—Christ, while he does not indeed deny that those commands are elsewhere found, according to which a man must himself take and lay hold, must himself enter by force, must struggle, strive, and persevere, yet sharply and clearly strips this of every thing Pelagian. "Not, the children must first become as you; but, *vice versa*, you must become as the children" (Richter). The saying, which is added in Mark and Luke, determines this in a simple measured expression: it remains grace and gift, for the attainment of which the *receiving*, *i. e.*, of course the *accepting* it, is sufficient; nay, all that goes beyond such acceptance is already too much and a hindrance. In all the so-called co-operation of man there remains always the first and ever present *initiative* of God's working and giving; the more *passively*, in the true sense, man comes and takes, the better; and, at the end as at the beginning, he actually enters only by this pure passivity into the kingdom of heaven. Is not a child in the arms of its mother a living and personified call for help? "Receive me, I have nothing, I need every thing, I too would fain find my little place upon earth!" Is it not a living expression of faith? "I reckon and trust that I shall not be left to perish without help!" It is, as it were, an embodied appeal to the faithfulness of the Creator, who does not forsake his work even though marred and corrupted (Isa. xlv. 10, 11). As truly as God has let that child be born, so surely has he also prepared salvation for it; it lives and smiles with a *fides implicita* in this salvation. *As* a child—this, in reference to adults, is not being like a machine. For, as the child at least lets itself be carried and brought, and keeps itself quiet when caressed and blessed, so we, on our part, when brought to Christ or drawn to him, must ourselves *come* and *receive;* and in so far as a counteractive tendency has been awakened in us, we have enough to do to overcome this, in order not to *keep away* from ourselves and from Christ. But all this again must be done in childlike simplicity, humility, sense of need, and childlike trust. If we have to do with men, then the true rule is: Be *no* child, trust, look to—whom? But if we have to do with God, then it cannot often enough be repeated: Be only a child—follow the call, trust to the promise, take the gift, obey the word, all as if thou didst let thyself be lifted, carried, comforted, blessed!

Fully warranted, then, against all unchildlike objection—which does not understand the *receiving* of the kingdom of heaven—is the use

* One may even say here: Thus do *the children* ever come protestingly in our way, when we would be too severe against matrimony. Alford understands it only thus: *They* (the people) brought to him also *their* children along with them. But this scarcely does justice to the context.

† It is, however, not necessary to suppose with Schleiermacher "that the children were all at once presented in a crowd and throng."

which the Church makes of this declaration and act of her Lord as the institution of *infant baptism*. He who here *blesses* children, certainly with no empty and unmeaning ceremony, or merely to please the superstition of those who brought them (does he ever at any other time act thus?), gives also the greater blessing of baptism, which includes the whole kingdom of heaven, to those who are now brought to him; and, just as here, reckons their being brought as a *coming*. For it is truly a coming, quite as sufficient as that of adults, who have also nothing to bring but themselves and their own sinful nature. If conscious sins have already proceeded from the sinful nature, then *repentance* and *faith* belong to a true coming, and without both of these can no one be baptized; but a little child does not need repentance, and the grace in which we believe comes before his faith, just as it comes before ours. Do we not all *receive* the grace, which we afterwards consciously experience, first unconsciously, as *βρέφη*, as embryos, so to speak, of the new birth?* He who afterwards *believes*, as he has already been *baptized*, is saved; for he also who is baptized because he has believed, received in his faith already the first fruits of the grace of baptism sealed by the outward sacrament. We may therefore boldly say that infant baptism *alone* corresponds to the idea of the first sacrament, in so far as it is a giving and receiving on the part of God which goes before, lays the foundation, and is alone efficacious.* And if baptized children *die*, they are saved and blessed, before they could resist. If they die *unbaptized?* In that case also is fully warranted the use, only less general on account of unbelief, which the Church makes of the same saying, "Suffer the little children to come unto me," in the hymns and funeral orations for consolation at the burial of children. He who lets them die bids them precisely thereby to *come to him*, and will assuredly have the same blessing for them in the other world, which in this he does not withhold from them. At most, it might still be said, there remains a *difference* between receiving the grace of inward baptism (which gives all, and which washes away the sinful nature) in this world, and receiving it in the other world; a difference, *it may be supposed* (for who will say more on these secret things), which always leaves a preference to baptism in the flesh—to be compared, at least in its first stage, with the important difference between adults who have attained regeneration upon earth, and those who receive it in Hades. But this again, in reference to *little children*, seems not very conceivable.

ON FOLLOWING JESUS, AND THE RENUNCIATION BELONGING THERETO. (THE RICH YOUNG MAN AND THE LABORERS IN THE VINEYARD.)

(Matt. xix. 17–30, xx. 1–16; Mark x. 18–31; Luke xviii. 19–30.)

So far all is again connected. The discourse of Christ progressively develops itself as circumstances give him occasion: it, moreover, completes and supplements itself; here, as elsewhere, advancing from the exoteric to the esoteric in the parable intended for the disciples at the beginning of chap. xx.—which *Matthew*, alone of the apostles and ear-witnesses, has preserved. Would that the critics of the first Gospel could be persuaded to seek, by patient inquiry and interpretation, to apprehend its relation to the two others—particularly as regards the sayings of Christ—in the way in which it is our aim to present it in this book! Then would the supposition, in other respects so natural, more and more commend itself, that the Church has put, and could only put, at the head of the New Testament canon, a reproduction *precisely* corresponding to the Aramaic original of the apostle.† The *following* of Jesus, and the *renunciation* which that requires, is the subject of the discourse upon which we now enter. The young man, rich in possessions and good works, who offers himself as a follower of Christ, and yet cannot make up his mind to the necessary conditions, affords occasion for showing that, in order to take the *first step* in following Christ, all riches and *possessions* (what is outward to be understood as the expression and figure for what is inward) must be renounced. In order to complete this testimony, the question of Peter makes it necessary for our Lord to show that, in *continuing* to follow him, there is required a further renunciation of all *eager seeking after reward*, of all self-willed striving after future possession, and of all views of compensation for what has been forsaken. The introductory conversation with the rich young man consists of three questions and their corresponding answers. The first question and answer contain only the *preparatory test* applied to him; in the second the test

* For "all gifts of God do not enter by the door of the *understanding* into the soul" (Roos). The first fundamental gift never!

† We do not agree with Harless' "fabula de Matthaeo syro-chaldaice conscripto." With Guerike, we hold to the supposition of an Aramaic original; the translation of which—not always *literal*, yet always an exact rendering—was executed at all events under the authority of the apostle, either by himself or by others.

* Upon which we have further expressed ourselves in the last part of this work, in the excursus on infant baptism (on Matt. xxviii. 18–20).

is more definitely applied; the third contains, on the other hand, the decisive *disclosure* of the real state of the case. To the first, partly improper, question (so far improper as it makes the attainment of life to depend upon *doing* in the false sense of merit) our Lord replies by a test answer: Be it so! only seriously attempt it in this way, and keep the commandments of the good God concerning doing good! On the second question, in which the inquirer foolishly betrays himself, the more definite test answer presses more closely home: The old commandments with which thou art familiar—art thou then really perfect as to these? And now, when the error of the young man comes to full expression (All these have I kept!), Christ also decisively discloses (although still *figuratively* trying him) what is implied in emptying himself of all his *possessions*, of all outward and inward riches, as a poor man who will enter into the kingdom of heaven—what is implied in following *him*, receiving grace from him, and retaining that grace under the cross. That the rich young man goes away gives further occasion to Christ to open up more fully to the disciples, who were then present, the true significance of this incident and of what he had already said. He affirms by way of warning that *a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven*; and in such a manner that the disciples must have understood the general and deep-reaching meaning of the words. Therefore, by the general question at ver. 25, they elicit the concluding declaration: *The being saved*, with all that belongs thereto, is for men generally (rich and poor) possible only through the omnipotent grace of God. But upon this Peter leaps again from the first and more intelligent question to the other side of the error; he thinks that *they had done what* was required of the young man, and thus appropriates to himself again as a possession the (not yet inwardly true) renunciation which they had made. For he claims the *reward* of this as a thing due to him and meritoriously earned. Upon this our Lord declares, finally, that an inconceivable reward of grace is (in future and even now) assuredly prepared, as for the apostles, so for every disciple who forsakes and renounces all in order to follow Christ; *but yet there is great danger* of losing what is the main element and consummation of the reward, *eternal life*, if an eager desire of reward should mar and inwardly cancel the act of renunciation. This, as we shall see, is the import of the saying which, in chap. xix. 30 and xx. 16, stands at the beginning and the end of the parable that illustrates it.

Matthew, the eye-witness, introduces the incident, which had made a deep impression upon him, with a *Behold!* to awaken attention. Luke at least gives it in the same connection; while Mark still more definitely connects it with the foregoing in the words "*When he was gone out*," *i. e.*, after blessing the children. The indefinite εἷς (*a*) or τίς (*a certain*) of Matthew and Mark is afterwards designated by νεανίσκος, *young man*; according to Luke he was an ἄρχων, president, or ruler of some kind. However much this incident resembles in the beginning that other recorded by Luke, chap. x. 25, there is yet a great difference. This appears in the further course of the reply to the same question; and, moreover, the question is in the other case put in a malicious, tempting spirit, while in this it is asked, notwithstanding the error that accompanies it, in the sincere earnestness of a good intention. The zealous young man has already waited for Christ's coming out; he runs to meet him in the way; he kneels down before him with reverence, and addresses him with the sincere title, *good Master* (used in the sense in which ἀγαθέ, κράτιστε, and the like were generally used, and as the seven elders of a synagogue were—at least at a later period —called טוֹבִים). There is perhaps less of flattery than of thoughtlessness in this expression; it is inconsiderateness which leads him to use this great word, ἀγαθός, *good*, in connection with τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω, "*what good thing* shall I do?" This is the error which our Lord lays hold of. He was not precisely a youth, according to the present use of the term; for he says, ver. 20, ἐκ νεότητός μου, *from my youth* (which indicates one who had passed considerably beyond the stage of νεότης). Yet he was a *young man* to be a ruler, and this also speaks for the earnestness and zeal of his legal piety.* He has aimed at *doing what is good*, and would fain produce instances of this goodness; he knows also (what not many so clearly knew and frankly confessed) that the way into the kingdom of heaven, even for Israelites and rulers, is this doing good. He even speaks earnestly of *eternal life*,† a phrase which occurs literally in the Old Testament only in Dan. xii. 2; but afterwards had a settled place in the deeper *doctrine* among the Jews (Wis. ii. 23; xv. 3); and, in the time of Christ, was a current idea and expression, adopted, like many others, in the language of that time in anticipation of a fuller revelation. He who thus spoke in earnest had already passed beyond that understanding of the Old Testament promises which cleaves to what is earthly (and for that reason

* How, according to Stein (*on Luke*, p. 205), Matthew could be induced by the ἐκ νεότητός μου to add his νεανίσκος as a conjecture, seems incomprehensible to us; seeing that the opposite might rather be inferred from that expression, as Neander even infers from the entire style of address.

† Here this expression occurs for *the first time*, and again only at Matthew xxv. 46 in the first three Gospels; it first comes prominently forward in John. Still it denotes only what is pre-supposed in, and forms the fundamental idea of the entire Bible revelation, even from the Old Testament onwards. Lutz, in his *Bibl. Dogmatik*, p. 19, affirms this more satisfactorily than he afterwards brings out in detail.

Marcion would here cancel the αἰώνιον). It might almost be said in praise of this ruler, that he desired a better life, even an heavenly (Heb. xi. 16). But apart from what we shall soon find, namely, that in deep reality his heart yet cleaves to the professions of this world, his grand error lies certainly in the ἵνα, *that*, I may have. He connects the ἔχειν ζωήν, *have life* (according to Mark and Luke it is even κληρονομεῖν, *inherit;* he does not perceive the contradiction between this Scripture expression and his meaning), with the deserving and earning ποιεῖν, *do*. Nay, since, in his question, he goes beyond the ordinary commandments, we see that in his blindness he aims at truly meritorious, extraordinary, works by which he might come to be like the *good* Master!

Verse 17. The other reading in Matthew, "*What askest thou me about the good?* One is good!"—although received by many with favor*—we cannot by any means accept, notwithstanding the authorities quoted in its support. It might appear indeed to be quite agreeable to the sense that in περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, *about the good*, the idea, the essence of the good should be brought into prominence. But, on the other hand, this is far *too abstract* for the concrete saying of our Lord, which directly takes up the word of the questioner; since he seldom, and only upon special occasions, speaks in abstract terms. It is rather an early gloss to correct the text; because the τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; *Why callest thou me good?* (confirmed by two other Evangelists) was found to be dogmatically offensive and unintelligible.† If Christ, however, had not really said this, how could any one have been so bold as to put in this expression? And why should Matthew in this place, quite against his usual manner, give the paraphrase instead of the more exact word? He alone has the question and answer quite exact. *Twice* does the young man make use of the weighty word ἀγαθός, *good* (the other Evangelists have merely τί ποιήσω, τί ποιήσας); and, strictly corresponding with this, the same word occurs twice also in the answer: "What dost thou mean by this word which thou hast twice used? Be not so hasty with this great word! I am (for thee) not so suddenly a good Master; and there are great doubts about the *doing* good of those who *are not* good." The young ruler of course, with all his kneeling reverence, held Christ to be a mere *man;* and this pre-supposition our Lord condescends for the time to accept for the sake of his other words. In his address to the Lord, the young man, with substantially the same error, calls *him* ἀγαθός, *good;* and artlessly without more ado gives *himself* credit for the capacity ἀγαθόν τι ποιῆσαι, *to do that which is good*. The same error exhibits itself in ignorance of the *evil* of fallen man; and further, in not knowing that even the creature who is not fallen has yet not in himself the ground and source of the *being good*. Christ takes care not to say, *I am not good;* or, One only is good, *my Father*.* When he calls himself the good *Shepherd*, John x. 12, this is more than a good *Master;* when, John viii. 46, he maintains his sinlessness, he *thereby precisely* attests the *divinity* dwelling in his present humanity; for, without this, בֶּן־אָדָם, the *Son of Man*, and sinner, are one and the same.† He deals more exactly with the word than the rationalists, who "exhaust themselves in phrases, call him the best, noblest, most excellent, most perfect, etc.," and yet deny his divine dignity. He said then to the young ruler what he must say still more strongly to these modern panegyrists, not in kindness, but in anger: "*Why callest thou me good?*" He, however, at the same time attests his divinity (although he does not speak plainly of what is concealed) when he who knew no sin affirms: "*None is good save One, that is God.*"‡ Luther well compares with this that other word, "My doctrine is not mine"—where Christ in like manner speaks of his humanity as such. Still more profoundly Augustine says here: "Christ knew himself not after the flesh." Oetinger, on the other hand, seems to go too deep when he thinks that God alone is *good* as being ἀπείραστος κακῶν, *not tempted of evil* (James i. 13); that the good angels, as being still liable to fall, are not pure before him; and that even the humanity of Christ, as liable to temptation, was not *good* in the absolute sense. For these ideas, though true in a certain measure, do not belong to the connection here; and would be too far above the

* Amongst whom is Jul. Müller, because this reading suits *his* philosophy: Christ leads first of all from the particular to the *abstract*, general *idea* of the good; then from this to the personal God! (*Von der Sünde*, i, 110). Schleiermacher nearly to the same effect.

† Origen already read both texts beside each other; the *Syriac*, however, which has always great value for us, has only the common reading.

* It is so read only in the Clementines, in order to introduce the Marcionitic separation of the *good* God of Christ, from the merely *righteous* Lawgiver of the Old Testament (see Hilgenfeld, *Clement. Recogn.*, p. 270). Recently, Vigilantius Rationalis scrupled not to interpret: "only the *Father* in heaven"—so as to bring out an antithesis to the *Son*, as at chap. xxiv. 36.

† *Never* has Jesus any where said (if he says so here it is the only time) that any one honored him too highly; never did he protest against any degree of love, honor, thanksgiving, adoration (Roos, *Die Lehre J. Christi*, p. 79).

‡ See *Hom. lit. Correspondenzblatt*, 1829, p. 176: "Choose then, ye friends of reason, between these two conclusions dictated by reason itself. None is good but the one God; Christ is good; therefore Christ is the one God. Or: none is good but the one God; Christ is not the one God; therefore *Christ is not good*." The same dilemma is presented quite as sharply and correctly in the fine sermon by Nitzch (Selection vi., p. 6)—with which we in general entirely agree as it respects the exegesis of the text.

capacity of the inquirer to be an answer to his question. Nay, we would not even adopt Ullmann's view—that Jesus here calls only God "good" in the most pregnant sense, because the *human* goodness and morality of Jesus can only be what *becomes* goodness, such as develops itself and must reach its perfection through conflict—for this necessarily runs into the preceding error.* We abide by the simple sense that Christ—without denying his own goodness or his own divinity, in virtue of which (different from what it is in other men) such goodness dwells in his humanity—testingly corrects the youth, and thus in the first place shames his pride by his own humility. "Thou speakest with too much readiness of *doing* good; I tell thee it is necessary first *to be* good (I too should not be good, as thou thinkest, if I were a man as thou supposest); it is necessary in particular for thee to *become* good, before, in the way of *doing*, thou canst bring out this or that good thing from the inward treasure (chap. xii. 35). It is necessary to stand in unbroken fellowship with the alone independent original source of all goodness; for out of, and without God, no one is good.† But if, with real and upright earnestness, thou wilt enter into the *life* of which thou speakest—the good God has long since told thee (so that thou needest not to ask of me) in what way man is again to become holy as God is holy!" As we read in the Talmud (*Rosh has-hanah*, fol. 59, 1; *Zeror hammor*, fol. 151, 2), "Nothing is good but *the law*"—so Christ points to this mirror of the divine goodness and holiness for sinful man, to its particular *commandments*, which contain answer enough for every τί ἀγαθόν. Wilt thou do good?—then be and become good; God is good—"let *his* word (and commandment) be thy *teacher*." Our Lord here, as at ver. 23, makes the *eternal life*, after which the young man inquires, to be the same with the kingdom of heaven; for he uses the word εἰσελθεῖν, *enter into*, which is the formula generally used in connection with the latter. For the rest he quotes only the word of Moses (Lev. xviii. 5). He does not say, however, *eternal* life, because it does not so stand in that passage; but he teaches us to interpret and understand the Mosaic promise as referring to eternal life, just as at Luke x. 25, 28. Those who will not do so, and who understand by the word "life" in the writings of Moses only temporal good, are refuted by Christ himself. Further, our Lord here maintains against the Antinomians, that the law must by all means be kept and fulfilled in order to salvation; only that this is to be done in no other way than that which is by grace.* In the error of those who seek righteousness by works, and apply themselves to this in their own strength, there is a partial and perverted truth; Christ builds upon this, and teaches in the first place to be thoroughly earnest in the endeavor, so as to penetrate through that to the truth. How can he who has not first *made the attempt* by works, come to that repentance which alone leads to faith in divine grace, and thus to the true establishing of the law?

Verses 18, 19. *The* commandments—says Christ plainly; and the expression would denote the "ten commandments" almost as definitely to an Israelite, as the same expression would do now to a Christian child. Or, if the usage according to which these commandments were thus designated had by this time begun to be uncertain, Christ here confirms it, and teaches us to recognize in the commandments given from Sinai the permanent kernel of legislation, universally binding in order to eternal life; just as he here, and again chap. xxii. 37–40, makes use of two summary expressions from Moses for the two tables. The ruler must have begun to perceive what the good Master would say; this he betrayed at once when, with an inconsiderately hasty expression of surprise at being thus referred back to old things, he asked—Ποίας; *Which?* Surely not the old, familiar, common commandments? Mark and Luke (in which we have another instance of their more inexact condensation) pass over, as the foregoing citation from Lev. xviii. 5, so also this characteristic intermediate question. They represent Christ as at once saying, "*Thou knowest the commandments.*" Matthew informs us most exactly how and what Christ spoke; and that he prescribed, not merely to this young man, but at the same time to us all, the *true beginning of the catechism* in order to a knowledge of sin. Let those Christian catechists who deem the Decalogue imperfect and insufficient to embrace all that men are required to do in order to eternal life; and those, in like manner, who would remove it from the true place which God himself has given to it as the παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν, *the schoolmaster leading to Christ*—see to it that they are not contradicting their Master, who here undeniably fixes its true use and place, at the beginning of the catechism. But why does he begin with the *second* table? Because this is most fitted to carry conviction from without to the heart; and because it is more natural

* Comp. Wimmer's argument against this, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1845, 1. What he, however, seeks to bring out by a different interpretation of the εἰ μή—No one is good *except* under the condition that God, as the original source of all goodness, is the ground also of his goodness—appears to us too far-fetched, and beyond the connection, when put forward on grammatical grounds in this way, although it certainly remains the deeper fundamental idea.

† "The master in Israel (John iii. 2), and the *ruler* of our text, are to be pronounced alike foolish, because they presume to give judgment upon a thing which they do not yet at all understand" (Stein *on Luke*, p. 206).

* Wilt thou, an accepted follower of the Saviour, lose again the life received from him, and from being one of the first become one of the last who remain without? Only despise the commandments, as if they were not to be kept precisely by thee!

to test at once man's conduct towards men.* The sum and substance of the *first* table—Honor God alone!—he has already indicated at ver. 17; nor does he fail here, looking back, to repeat the commandment respecting father and mother (already, chap. xv. 4, brought forward as an important fundamental commandment), as the *transition* from the first table to the second. He then concludes with what is also explained at chap. xxii. 39, as the *sum* of the second table; which declares that it must be understood in a spiritual sense as taking cognizance of and judging the *disposition of the heart*, so that these very words, Thou shalt *love!* at the same time include and represent the last commandment against coveting. The two other Evangelists do not so carefully preserve the original words; both follow (as also the apostle at Rom. xiii. 9), a transposition to be found in Philo (and which had come to be in use in Jewish schools), of adultery before murder, and leave out the love of our neighbor. Mark gives instead of this a peculiar, and by no means strictly corresponding, expression of the *last* commandment, which denotes the Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις (Thou shalt not covet), by its most natural expression in the outward act, Μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς (defraud not). Only as given by Matthew does the *test* of our Lord's question rise with psychological delicacy to its keenest climax: Hast thou kept *this?* And actually *this* also. First come the negative commandments, the expression of which has most to do with the outward work and word, and as to which a man most easily justifies himself. Then, more positively, a commandment which points to the disposition of heart; that, viz., which is the *first* commandment for men, and in which the honor which as a child he gives to God coincides with that which he gives to those who stand to him in the stead of God. Finally comes the wholly positive and inward commandment of *love*. All this, however, implies in it the rebuking question: Is the man to whom such prohibitions and commands must be given—by nature *good?* Is he not from his birth a murderer, adulterer, thief, and liar in heart, a child without reverence, a man without love?

Verse 20. The young man is too much blinded to understand Christ's meaning, and now first makes manifest his entire blindness.† He vainly imagines, as, alas! many do still, that he stands perfectly well with the ten commandments! Probably when our Lord began with *Thou shalt not kill!* he had his answer already on his tongue. When he reached the *Honor thy father and mother*, he hastened in his thought to add *from my youth up*—which was a proverbial expression among the Jews for the fulfillment of the law and piety (see Tob. i. 8–10; ii. 13; 2 Tim. iii. 15).* The Lord's last word, however, which should have struck him most keenly, he *does not hear at all;* and so he delivers himself at once of the fearfully artless lie: All these have I kept, and carefully had respect to! "Thou hast been a reverently obedient child from the womb? Thou hast then loved thy neighbor as thyself thy whole life long?"—And yet the young man does not consciously lie, but seriously thinks that it is as he says; hence, according to Mark, Christ looked upon him with pitying love and kindness. Be not thou, O Christian teacher and evangelist, too soon polemically offended with all who are legally righteous! Do not unwisely and unjustly speak against such mistaken ones with angry dogmatical rebuke! There is a difference to be observed among the self-righteous. This young man is of a nobler nature, and stands unconsciously in a transitional class between the Pharisee and publican, the contrast between whom is portrayed in the parable which, in Luke, immediately precedes. The *justitia civilis*, the outward keeping of the commandments so far as one knows and can keep them, has a certain worth in its kind—who would not regard such a youth with more pleasure than he would a wild and dissolute transgressor? But, indeed, this very rectitude prevents the heart which honestly strives from being at peace, assured, and tranquil; the more one has kept the commandments, the more urgently will the self-betraying question obtrude, *What lack I yet?* Such a man understands not his own question; he thinks that he means, Are there not somewhere still more commandments to which I must apply myself?—is there not some special extra-work for my zeal in doing good? But his heart confesses, against his knowledge and will, that there is still one thing, lacking to him. Now, he who goes on self-willed and uninstructed in this way, will doubtless, from a good beginning, land at last in the worst Pharisaism and monasticism; but he who only proceeds with *questioning*, and comes to the *true Master*, shall obtain the true *answer* which will lay open the bottom of the heart.

Verse 21. Thus does the wisdom and love of Christ receive and treat the case. He does not deal unjustly with the young man, as if he understood him arrogantly to say, Am I not then perfect, having kept all the commandments? for then he would not have come to the good Master at all, and would not have stayed to ask any thing more after the first

---

* As a true catechist must still always *hold up prominently* before children the *second* table (with the "Father and Mother" that leads to it; and, in its sum, the love of our neighbor). So, on the other hand, the deeper *understanding* of the first table is reached only in the second and third parts of it.

† Mark puts into his mouth in this answer again a Διδάσκαλε, now without the rejected *epitheton ornans*.

* This sufficiently accounts for the expression. We are not under the necessity (with Neander, as already mentioned) of supposing that this was an *aged* man looking back complacently on his past life, and of correcting the statement of Matthew accordingly.

question. *One thing thou lackest still!* Thus do Mark and Luke express Christ's meaning; but we must interpret the words, with Luther's marginal note: Thou art still entirely lacking; with one thing thou lackest all—the principal thing! Literally Christ said, *If thou wilt be perfect*—words which sympathize with, and enter into, the young man's feelings; but at the same time humbly and most keenly convict him. Apparently Christ gives him what he has desired, and points out to him a special work; but observe that what he requires of him is only a simple test, whether he is able really to keep that first commandment of the first table from which all others flow, whether he has even understood its spiritual requirement. "Keep then the first commandment in truth, and show that thy possessions are not Mammon and an idol to thee!" A foolish teacher would have directly contradicted the young man by merely laying down the doctrine that the matter so stands, and following that up with the direct charge, Thou art in thy riches still an idolater! But the wise Teacher lays hold on him by proposing to him something to be done, just as he himself had requested: Go, sell thy goods and give them to the poor, so that thou mayest love these poor as thyself! Not the fanatical advice to throw them into the street or the sea, but to distribute (Luke, διάδος; comp. Luke chap. xi. 22, Acts iv. 35), with the wisdom and joy of love, the superfluity among the needy. It is evident that the outward obeying of this command is to be no general rule for all possessors who would be saved; while Christ gave an earnest command to this young ruler, he imposes it only upon such special individual cases as his was. It is equally clear, further, that this selling all, in itself without price and merit, is required of this individual only as a test; it was but the preparatory act which would disembarrass him for what comes immediately after, viz., *Follow me!* Still, however, we shall altogether mistake the meaning of Christ—who always in the external meaning includes the interna'—if we do not recognize in his words the figuratively embodied fundamental commandment which he utters, for example, in Luke xiv. 33, comp. Luke xii. 33—"*Become poor!*" That is the great essential. *All that thou hast* (Mark and Luke already spiritualizing and explaining: ὅσα ἔχεις)—that is, also the imagined riches consisting in the fulfillment of the law and virtuous deeds, ver. 20. Hast thou, as a monk, parted with thy goods only to be more proud of them in heart, what will that help thee?* The command comes ever anew, penetrates deeper and deeper, until it pierces the heart: Sell also thy imagined possession, expressed in the words, "*I have sold all.*" *Follow me*, that thou mayest learn in my school what grace is, how thou mayest receive the kingdom of heaven as a little child, and look only to the treasure in heaven. *Me*—there now stands, supplementing the humble saying at ver. 17, the one Master, as personally and essentially good, to cleave to whom is and becomes alone true doing good. Mark adds (from Matt. x. 38 and similar sayings), *Take up the cross;* we might certainly doubt whether Christ uttered the word in so discouraging and repelling a manner precisely to *this* young man; still, as regards the profound and general import of the saying, this is its true meaning.

"A man may pledge and stake his head a hundred times; but if any one were to proceed to take it from him, he would feel for the first time how firmly it sits—how it sticks to him" (Gossner). So is it with the young man here, who now perceives with deep shame how much his idolatrous heart cleaves still to the possession of this world. Caught by his own inquiry after works of perfection, sharply smitten in his own conscience, he cannot turn aside the command of the Master by asking, Where, then, is such a commandment enjoined upon me? With what right dost thou require in the name of God so much as this of me? He feels what our Lord purposed to make him feel. "To disobey is hard for him, and to obey still more hard" (as Roos excellently expresses it). The command addressed to him with friendly look makes his countenance and heart sad; he goes away silent, and his silence says: "No, that I cannot possibly do!" We are not told whether this sadness resulted in the godly sorrow and humility proper to a sinner. But Christ makes him, going away just as he is, a warning example for his disciples; and proceeds more fully to disclose to them the import of what he had said and done.

Verses 23, 24. Proverbial and figurative discourse has always this character, that the outward letter is not to be pressed in the particulars as it is in a doctrinal proposition, but that a background of spiritual meaning all the more deep opens itself up for the application. As our Lord in ver. 24 does not merely repeat with greater emphasis what he had said in ver. 23, but intends rather to lay the real emphasis on the figurative proverb, and to conduct to *this* by the transition from the case that had just occurred, what is said in ver. 23 acquires also for all subsequent hearers and readers, nay, even for the apprehension of the disciples at the time, a parabolic character. He speaks indeed first of all in strict earnestness of the outwardly rich, to whom the possession of their goods becomes a dangerous hindrance, and that because they do not possess as if they possessed not, because their hearts cleave to their possessions (Psa. lxii. 11). For, "not so much is he rich who possesses a great deal, as he who is possessed of a great deal" (Von Gerlach). Thus do Mark and Luke rightly interpret "they that have riches." Mark—who (as in chap. vii., where human statutes are spoken of, and elsewhere[א] most frequently appends an

*See the words of Fulgentius in Neander's *Denkwürdigkeiten*, iii. 1–28.

explanation to the word—here very considerately, in order to obviate all misunderstanding of Christ's words, says, *Those who trust in riches* (Prov. xi. 28; 1 Tim. vi. 17); and he does so under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, in order that they in the Church who are slow to hear might have the saying of Christ also in this form. It is therefore not with Schleiermacher to be called "a limitation by a later hand;" so much, however, is true, that Christ did not here at first speak thus, otherwise the impression produced on the disciples would not have been so startling—it remains, notwithstanding, undeniably the true *interpretation* of the meaning of Christ's words. Again it is true that such danger of putting false confidence in their possessions lies very near to all possessors. Does not Christ speak also, Matt. xiii. 22, of the deceitfulness of riches; and does not experience still prove, in spite of the exceptions from Abraham to Joseph of Arimathea, that riches properly speaking, or the possession of many goods, bring with them peculiar and serious dangers, hindrances and temptations? As a rich man, then—*i. e.*, without putting away his riches inwardly, and in some cases also outwardly (the latter is nothing without the former)—no one *shall enter* into the kingdom of heaven. And one might certainly, speaking strongly, apply the saying with Wesley still further thus: "It is also easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle* than for a rich man to give up trusting in his riches"—although this seems only partly true, and in comparison with the saying of Christ too severe. It is further true, that the poor cleave to the mammon which they do not possess, when with idolatrous *covetousness*, they strive after it, and *will* be rich (1 Tim. vi. 9). But the whole of what was exemplified in this incident becomes for Christ a parable embodied in fact, representing a truth which entirely applies only to what is inward. If—as according to Matthew we suppose to be certain, and for a proverbial expression find to be natural—Christ said merely πλούσιος, *rich*, we have only to call to mind what is said in Luke vi. 24, 25, in order to understand, that he speaks in the deepest sense of the *rich in spirit*, of such as are rich in genius, in virtues, in knowledge, in honors, etc. This was the real hindrance in the way of the young man; had he been *poor in spirit*, he would also have been ready to sell his goods. Through the strait gate one must come only poor and naked, not laden with goods and virtues; this lies as much in the nature of the case as that a camel cannot go through the eye of a needle. This our Lord declares to his disciples, addressing them with a friendly τέκνα, "children," as Mark has it;* and we see immediately from their exclamation of amazement and fear that *they* have understood his meaning.

Verses 25, 26. *Who* then can be saved! Τίς ἄρα, "Who then"—this is more comprehensive than merely τίς πλούσιος (what rich man). Do not the poor also cleave to their scrap of possession and strive after more; has not every man at bottom something which as his possession he will not let go? If the entrance into the kingdom of heaven is so narrow, *who* then is small and unencumbered enough to enter! What thou sayest is truly the case of all—we understand thee; then the being saved must be in general a thing of *impossibility?* Thus do the amazed disciples think; and not of other people merely, of the always not numerous class of the rich to whom they certainly did not belong: they regard themselves as included, inasmuch as they perceive that man must renounce and relinquish all *that he has* in every sense. Christ, however, confirming this understanding of his words, *looked upon them* (which ἐμβλέψας, Mark also does not let slip), and spoke, quite openly now, of the *salvation of men* in general as a thing impossible with man, and only possible through the omnipotence of God. He strengthens the δυσκόλως into ἀδύνατον, the *hard* into *impossible;* and thus it is: Who would be saved if it were not for the power of redeeming grace? To man of himself it is impossible even to break through the blindness of the heart, so that as a sinner he shall know and truly see *what is lacking to him;* then it is impossible to confess this in true penitence before God, and to receive grace in faith; then again always impossible to persevere in grace unto the end. But all is accomplished by the efficacious working of God, by his anticipating, strengthening, and confirming power; certainly not without *faith* (to which, therefore, all things are possible, Mark ix. 23), but that faith is (although without predestinating, electing compulsion) "in the power of God" (ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ, 1 Pet. i. 5), as a "faith of the operation of God" (πίστις τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ, Col. ii. 12). To this faith that lays hold on the power of God, on the other hand, all is possible that pertains to salvation; from the first becoming poor and following Christ even to the *keeping of the commandments*, which also is indispensable. *Possible*—although a *difficulty* attends it to the last. Christ, indeed, is come to save the lost (Matt. xviii. 11); for otherwise this was not possible even for God. Sin must be blotted out in

* The conjecture of many Greek commentators, following Theophylact (not camel but cable), is no longer thought of by any one; *going* pre-supposes *feet*. The similar proverb of the *elephant* is familiar in the Koran (Sur. vii. 38), and in the Talmud (Buxtorf, *Lex.* p. 1722), also the camel, more familiar among the Jews, according to Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.*, in a proverb respecting a stupid Galilean. Comp. Matt. xxiii. 24. Sepp well observes that in the natural connection of what is said about the entering into the kingdom of God, the eye of a needle, and the door (door, gate), appear as in perspective contrasted with each other.

* Another reading is even τεκνία. Here, for the first time, Christ thus addresses the disciples; yet hardly, as Sepp imagines, with reference to the little ones shortly before commended.

order that God may remain just in bestowing grace, and man free in receiving it; and atonement was necessary, and such an atonement as sanctifies. This great *ἀδύναιον παρὰ ἀνθρώποις*, this great *impossibility with men*, God has brought to pass in the miracle of all miracles, in the incarnate Son !*

How ought the disciples now to have reflected upon this important saying, with other and joyful astonishment, at once satisfied and silent and affected in heart! But this was beyond their temper of mind and capacity of apprehension, at least in the case of Peter and most of them; although perhaps John and Nathanael might have thus reflected. Peter soon passes from the first salutary astonishment with which he was struck, to the opposite extreme; he has too hastily appropriated to himself the friendly *look* with which Christ regarded them, as if it said, "Are not ye yourselves an example how God can save?"—and with great folly brings forward what he *himself* has done in addition to the omnipotence of God. He hides as usual behind the general *we* his favorite, *I*, and says, certainly not without self-complacency: Behold we have left all and followed thee! If these words stood alone without the *question* (again only preserved by Matthew) which is annexed to them, they might then have been taken in a good sense to mean: Behold the almighty God has made this possible for us, we rejoice in this and are thankful! But it sounds more questionable, t really reverses the whole matter, when he asks *τί ἄρα ἔσται ἡμῖν;* "What then shall we have?" It is perceived clearly that his meaning is: We have done much better than the young man—and that again the idea of merit creeps forth from his heart. That mild interpretation of the question—deviating from the translation of Luther—viz., "Is our renunciation of all indeed that which thou requirest? what will fall to our lot, or be our sentence? wilt thou pronounce a judgment upon us different from that upon the young man, and let us pass?"—is fully confuted by the answer of Christ. Because Peter has inquired after reward and compensation, Christ says, first of all, what is contained in vers. 28, 29; but because he has asked with a culpable eagerness for reward, the parable concerning the first and the last follows with its earnest warning and rebuke. The matter then stands thus: Peter, who has not yet understood Luke xvii. 10, puts his question in the spirit of Job (chap. xxxi. 2); and betrays what, alas! may still be too often found in the followers of Christ who have left all, a self-righteous regard to the reward of grace, as if it were not pure grace. In such cases the injunction is ever again to be repeated: Sell all that thou hast; renounce also all that thou has received from me, appropriate it not to *thyself*, as if thou hadst not *received* it! Look not self-complacently to what thou hast done, but zealously to what thou hast still to do, that thou mayest fulfill thy course! Imagine not that thou art complete and perfect! Ask rather, without ceasing, *What lack I yet?* This is better than *What shall I have, therefore?*

Verse 28. The scanty possessions, of which Peter seems somewhat presumptuously to speak when he says, We have given up *all* (not entirely, however, as they still retained possession of it), were certainly not worth the kingdom of heaven as a purchase-price; and Christ might indeed have sharply ridiculed it. This he does not do, however. He knows well that it is *difficult* for the fisher to leave his boat, the publican his little house, and every one whatever he calls his own; that in the end the poorest does enough when he renounces his *all;* and that the heart of the beggar may cleave more to a few pence than that of the rich man to great sums. Nor was that so altogether inconsiderable which, for example, Peter possessed in Capernaum; and the two sons of Zebedee, with their hired servants (Mark i. 20); and Matthew, who could give a great feast in his house. Therefore, with great kindness and grace, he first of all acknowledges that they had actually "followed him" by *renouncing* all, holds in all honor their obedience to the apostolic calling, and, without finding fault, holds out to them the apostle-thrones as its result; then, however, follows the earnest rebuke of the impure element of self which was mixed up with their renunciation. Not, as many harshly understand the sincere meaning of Christ, that he at first, half *ironically*,* set before them the glory to which their faithfulness would not fail to attain (which was the self-evident reward of those who were the supreme ministers of the highest King), in order then all the more severely to say: But take care that you do not lose it! No, he is exalted above such feelings and moods; he himself, joyfully prophesying, looks first at the future glory to which he knows that his twelve apostles *will* attain, and to which he would have them to look up. For we are to rejoice on account of the reward in heaven (Luke vi. 23); the command addressed to the rich young man contained in it also the promise—Thou shalt have treasure in heaven! Mark and Luke leave out the first special promise to the apostles; but Matthew gives it all the more exactly. Ye who have *followed me*—this not merely acknowledges the past, but lays down at the same time, with the full emphasis of this great word, the condition which still remains; therefore, in latent prophecy, it already excludes Judas, just as later Luke xxii. 28, 30. Still, there are *twelve* seats; for another shall receive the office

* This interpretation is a strange contrast with that extreme which may be found—and only a specimen of his enfeebling paraphrase—in my predecessor in the exposition of the *sayings* of Jesus, the notorious Bahrdt. According to him the meaning here is: "That which in the present intractable state of mankind is infinitely difficult, God can make gradually to become easier."

* That it is entirely ironical has been asserted only by perverse expositors, such as Liebe in Winer's *Exeget. Studien.*

of the traitor, and God's plans suffer no defeat on account of individual sinners.* The *regeneration*, as appears from the explanatory clause which is added respecting the glory of the Son of Man, is the renewal of the world, of the earth (hence the Persian version has, *in the new world*); a restoration of the primitive state of things on the whole, as well as the regeneration of man, from which the expression, by extension and comparison, is derived.† Not merely the final *adoption* of the children of God (Rom. viii. 23; Luke xx. 36) in the resurrection of the dead, but the concomitant glorification of all creatures in order to the glory which corresponds to the freedom of the children of God (Rom. viii. 23). This δοξα or glory of the new world, is itself the δόξα of the υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, or Son of Man, in which, however, his special θρόνος will in some way be set up. All the members of the new-born race of this second Adam have a common participation in the glory of the Son of Man; for such as bear honors, however, there are special *thrones*, from which are to be governed the twelve tribes of Israel; *i. e.*, the new and true Israel, the entire people of God in their multiplicity, formed after the *type* of those twelve tribes. Accordingly ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ is, in the last sense, equivalent to *in my kingdom*, Luke xxii. 30 (comp. Matt. xxvi. 29); and the sense in which it is understood by the two sons of Zebedee (Matt. xx. 21) is quite correct. Although finally κρίνειν in this place signifies not *judge* but *govern*, as שפט in the Heb., yet Bengel's fine observation is not without ground: Of Christ, it is καθίῃ (*sit*) in the *Active*, of the apostles καθίσεσθε (*shall be seated*) in the *Middle*;‡ for they take not their seats until they have first stood, with all others, before the judgment throne of him who sits (Luke xxi. 36; 2 Cor. v. 10).

Verse 29. Should not an honest heart have been *humbled* by the very greatness and loftiness of the promise? Should not Peter and all the apostles have been constrained to say with shame: Lord, this comes to us not as a recompense for leaving our ships and nets; this is *grace*, and not reward at all! Christ even now, in passing to the intended rebuke, helps them to such thoughts and feelings, inasmuch as, in order to check their special *we*, he *widens* the promise. They must learn to speak as the last apostle did, who, according to Christ's choice, came in the room of one who fell from the number of the twelve—the greatest and last apostle: *Not to me only* shall the crown be given by the righteous Judge, but to all them also that love his appearing (2 Tim. iv. 8). *Every one* without distinction who *has forsaken* whatsoever he loved and held dear, whatever his heart clave to (here it is not at first μισεῖν, *hate*, Luke xiv. 26, which is yet always indispensable, but, the bearing patiently actual loss, the free surrender)—*for the sake of Christ* (Matt.: "for my name's sake;" Mark: "for my sake and the Gospel's;" Luke: "for the kingdom of God's sake")—shall suffer no loss thereby, but shall obtain most abundant compensation. The so-called sacrifices which are made in the cause of God receive this name at first only with reference to our unbelief; for every such loss brings after it rich gain. The only goods that are named by way of example, are those of house, of family love, and of the earthly possession that most binds the heart; for, of such things the disciples had been speaking. Matthew and Mark have, with slight differences, the same arrangement of the particulars. It begins at first generally with the house; then, in the members of the family, it rises gradually to an ever more difficult renunciation (for one separates himself from brothers and sisters sooner than from parents, while one cleaves to his wife more than to these, and finally, with most intensity to children); and then returns again to the more direct and real property in lands. This we take to be the original form; while Luke gives the substance by an abridgment, in which the arrangement is not so exact. There are many significant things to be noticed in these words; in which we plainly perceive the superintending care of the Holy Spirit, providing against every essentially improper expression, such as might contradict the cautious and well-weighed saying of our Lord. That no divorce can be meant here by the forsaking of wife is self-evident from the declaration so earnestly made by Christ not long before. That he mentions brothers, and sisters, and children in the plural, but only one wife, as also one father and one mother, is in like manner conformable to that declaration in favor of monogamy. Finally, that, in the particular repetition of the persons who are to be received back by way of recompense (which Mark alone gives, and, we can hardly suppose, as a mere amplification), even *mother** is specified, while there is *no* mention again of wife or wives—is wisely and becomingly directed against all fanatical abuse; although it is also true that in a certain sense (only not in the *conjugal*) compensation will be given also for the wife who has been given up. How and when does Christ promise that this hundredfold (Luke, "manifold"), *i. e.*, this intensive

* The spiritualizing interpretation of Rud. Matthai (*Die Macht und Wunde des Fürsten*), which finds here a *dominion* also, in the perfected kingdom at the end, for those who are called and prepared to exercise it, goes beyond these literally named *twelve* apostolic thrones.

† *To follow Christ in the regeneration* (as Göschel, *von d. letzten Dingen*, p. 23 *in one place* connects the words) is not a correct expression; but the hope of the near regeneration of the world on account of their own regeneration, is a combination which Göschel correctly gives.

‡ Hence also the difference of the case in θρόνου and θρόνους.

* For nature gives us only one, but love many So Alford excellently, although he forgets himself when he speaks of "*fathers* and mothers." This also Christ has wisely not repeated; the reading καὶ πατέρα appears to us introduced as a correction, just as the singular μητέρα adopted by Lachmann.

(somewhat as in 1 Sam. i. 8) and much better compensation, shall be made? *Now* already *in this time*, or world, which Mark and Luke precisely distinguish from the eternal life in the future world; as also Matthew (at least in his καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον). Therefore, by virtue of the spiritual fellowship of goods and of love, this took place in the Church of believers; where Paul found a mother (Rom. xvi. 13) and many children, where Timothy found brothers and sisters (1 Tim. v. 1, 2); and where the great principle holds good, *All things are yours!* (1 Cor. iii. 22). Even *houses* and *lands* in this present time are compensated in this manner. Often indeed quite literally, as when those who forsake them are received by others for the sake of Christ into the joint possession and use of their property; at all events, in the sense of 2 Cor. vi. 10, that Christ takes better care of his followers than if they had retained house and hall with unfaithfulness toward him. All this, however, is μετὰ διωγμῶν, *i. e.*, at present amid persecutions, according to the nature of the kingdom of the cross before the period of glory; not without continued patience for righteousness sake.

Verse 30. And now, after such great promises—the fulfillment of which every one who ventures to put them to the test has in all times experienced—there follows a warning contrast. The saying which contains this, Luke has not subjoined; Mark only gives the simplest expression of it; while Matthew connects it with the parable which illustrates it. Our Lord indeed had already uttered the proverbial saying on another occasion (Luke xiii. 30); here, however, he devotes to it an entire parable, as he does in like manner to that other in Matt. xiii. 12, spoken at a later period, chap. xxv. 14–30; and again to that which is added at chap. xx. 16 ("many are called but few chosen") the entire parable in chap. xxii. 2-14. We will leave, then, this profound saying to explain itself in the parable; and at the outset content ourselves with Meyer's excellent note, which indeed contains every thing: The first "in time, gifts, self-estimation, and appearance" shall be last, and *vice versa*. We observe now only so much—as indicating the *proper direction* for the understanding of the *parable*, which beyond all question culminates in the saying placed before and after it—that Christ according to all evident connection with what goes before means to say: The *penny of this country* (which, at ver. 29, I promise to all my followers, as a reward of grace to be obtained *even here upon earth*) I will assuredly pay to every one. But *at last* (as respects *eternal life*) it will be otherwise; then shall many who had been preferred remain behind and without, having been sufficiently paid by what they have received; while many late ones shall be advanced.

We must at once, according to what is here indicated, declare against the arbitrary assertion of Neander (with Strauss and De Wette), that both sayings (chap. xix. 30, and xx. 16) are entirely out of their place here, and mar the import of the parable! We are sorry to be obliged to say rather that Neander shows he has entirely misunderstood the parable—a necessary result, indeed, of such rejection of the authentic interpretation of the sacred text.

Chapter xx. 1—16. In order to understand this parable,* so much contested from the beginning, and lately so much mangled and perverted in a multitude of special treatises, it is certainly of decisive importance to settle the principal question, What does Christ mean by the penny, or day's hire? We maintain that all who take it to represent eternal life or blessedness grossly err, and entirely mistake the true meaning of the whole. There are three reasons in support of this, so clear that one must wonder they have not always appeared evident to all. First, eternal life cannot surely be promised as a reward of labor, in the same way as in a legal contract; which is yet plainly the meaning of the συμφωνεῖν, *agree*, ver. 2, comp. ver. 13. The Lord agreed with the laborers and the laborers with him; and this contract is *at all events* kept, even without respect to the disposition and worthiness which afterwards shows itself; but it is not thus, assuredly, in the bestowing of eternal life. Then, secondly: The murmurers also receive the penny, and on receiving it complain that what they have received is not so much as is due to them. These, however, as the conclusion of the parable plainly declares, are in reality none of the *chosen ones* who earn eternal life; otherwise the entire parable would contradict this its conclusion, and all who had been called would come at last into the kingdom of heaven. And yet we must in any case interpret the parable from this concluding sentence, and by no means explain this sentence as incorrectly added here, or (with Calvin) cancel it altogether, when it is found not to fit in with the interpretation given before to the parable. Steffensen (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1848, 3) with perfect right maintains that our Lord, by adding these concluding words, *obliges* us to seek precisely in them the principal idea of the parable. That he intends, as has been said in opposition to this, to show, by the striking contradiction implied, "that such a murmuring in heavenly things is in itself *inconceivable*"—is an idea which itself is inconceivable; because then, contrary

* To which, strangely enough, there is to be found an analogous saying in the Jerusalem Talmud (see in Lightfoot or Vitringa), although, consistently with Jewish self-righteous feeling, with a different turn at the conclusion: "This one has *wrought more* in two hours than you the whole day!" Comp. the statements in Döpke (*Hermeneutik d. neutest. Schriftsteller*, p. 36), but still more exactly in Sepp, ii. 244. The Mohammedan parallel adduced by Trench after Hammer (*Theol. Litt. Anz.* 1847, p. 252) had certainly its origin in the parable of Christ.

to the fundamental rule to be observed in every parable, no reality would correspond with the principal point of the figurative narration. As little can it be understood of a mere *offer* of the same eternal reward to all objectively, although afterwards the envious ones exclude themselves as being subjectively unworthy to receive it; this explanation (for which Trench decides) is neither agreeable to the text of the parable nor to the nature of the case. We are not even at liberty with many to explain it of the as yet tolerant reception of the murmurers into a kingdom of earthly glory before the last day; for even there, as we are elsewhere sufficiently taught, the unworthy remain *without*. This lies plainly in the ὕπαγε,* *go thy way* (ver. 14), which expresses *rejection* and anger; and together with which, the adjudication "Take that is *thine!*" can mean nothing else, than what, at another stage, Abraham says to the rich man (Luke xvi. 25). What thou hast contracted for, with that thou art discharged; but now, Away from my service, and from all further intercourse with me! "There can be no blessedness without acceptance with God"—this is the sure point of this parable; as already Gregory the Great (whom Besser cannot confute) has said: "No murmurer can receive the kingdom of heaven; and no one who receives it can murmur." Luther also (to whom the present Lutherans with their artificial exegesis ought *in this instance* to yield) saw clearly that the murmuring laborers "go off with their penny and *are damned*." What, then, is the day's hire? The same Luther, who preferred to leave this unsettled as a subordinate point, which is certainly not admissible,† yet goes on to say, "Therefore if we would strictly interpret, we must understand the penny of the *temporal* good; and the *favor of the householder* of the *eternal* good." Melancthon is still more positive that the *denarius* is not to be explained of the *vita aeterna*. Valerius Herberger adheres to Luther, when he says: "The object and aim of the parable is not represented in the question, Who obtains the penny—as several have racked their brains to make out, and have only made bad worse—but in this, Who retains the grace of the heavenly Father, so good to all?" Very true; but that we may rightly investigate this latter point, it is necessary that we thus strictly interpret the former; and it needs no racking of one's brains to read that people are here spoken of who *obtain* the penny, but at the same time lose the grace of the Lord. A simple glance at what goes before suffices to show that the penny is certainly a *temporal* good, different from eternal life, though not of a merely outward and earthly nature.* It is manifestly that *reward, profit, or compensation* of whatsoever kind, having no necessary connection with eternal life, which such a hireling question as that of Peter (chap. xix. 27) seeks; and it means precisely the "what" after which that question asked Such a reward the grace and righteousness of God will actually connect with service in the kingdom of God, so that *no one shall labor there in vain*. Such a portion as is rather of a merely outward kind, as the most direct compensation for any thing that may have been renounced, was spoken of in Mark x. 30. Yet the "promise of *this* life" which belongs to godliness (1 Tim. iv. 8), includes in it, what must not be overlooked, the internal spiritual enjoyment and reward which all doing of what is good and right carries directly in itself; for also in this sense is Psa. xix. 12 already true, comp. 1 Cor. ix. 18. Who is there that gets *harm* from following after that which is good (1 Pet. iii. 13), and not rather abundant good? So that those who serve Christ, even *with persecutions*, and with all manner of *afflictions in the world, in the flesh*, have yet a better portion than sinners even here. We are by no means to understand a worthless *hypocritical* self-righteousness in those first who become last, but an actual entering into the calling of God by service and labor, a first laying hold of the promise, apprehended superficially, Do this and live! a promise which leads the humble, who go on to learn in God's school, to blessedness; but which has for the insincere, and those who are eager after rewards, no more than the penny that was bargained for. This penny is very various, but in every case it is exactly *that* and nothing else at which the striving of the individual aimed. For (as should well be observed) to serve for blessedness as a strict reward, to bargain for the kingdom of heaven as a return for labor—*this* no one can in truth do, *this* properly never occurs. Where it seems to occur it will be found that the heart has really meant a Jewish Messiah-kingdom or a Moham-

* Rupprecht (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1847, 2) explains this most groundlessly of a mere command to go away, to leave the presence (as at ver. 4 to labor!). And even in such a departure, that is, from God's countenance, good pleasure, and fellowship, the reward can never be the inheriting of eternal life, named at chap. xix. 29.

† "The point of the parable, therefore, in this Gospel does not lie in the penny, *whatever* that may be, nor in the distinction of the hours, but in the *earning* and *obtaining*—how one may earn the penny." With this in substance agrees what the treatise in Tholuck's *Litt. Anz.* (1847, p. 275) strangely comes to at last: The denarius has properly no independent interpretation (is therefore *nothing at all?*), it only expresses what faithful diligence is worth *in itself!* It appears to us, however, that this says nothing at all; for surely this main feature in the parable must be something.

* In this assertion we are not shaken by the fact that those who have most recently treated the parable are for explaining the penny of eternal life; for their interpretations are truly deficient in the simplicity which would lead to another result. Alford is among those who oppose me, describing the criticism here as "much inferior to his usual remarks;" but I must wait to see whether the second edition, with its more exact references, may more effectually convince him.

medan paradise; always something of the nature of a penny, which, too, he will obtain in so far as it is right and possible, when God at last calls to account. In so far, also, every one receives his penny; the reward in relation to the person and his claim is, in a certain measure, the same for all. Only, we may say, on the other hand, with Dräseke: The same penny is to every one different, according to the hand that receives it, according to the mind that estimates it. Some taste in it from the first a reward *of God*, a grace and gift of eternal life; others receive it as *their* reward, as a booty which they have seized; and thus, in their penny, the penny properly so called is lost, it has become by their own fault a mere coin of discharge. "They turn the penny round about in their hand, and know not what they are to make of it." *Such* persons are represented in the parable to whom it will thus happen in the end; and *for such* the penny is certainly not eternal life.*

We inquire, further, with reference to the principal feature of the parable, upon which the understanding of the whole depends: What is the *day* with its twelve hours? How is the *earlier and later*, the first and last, to be interpreted? If we are at once to say, in order to obviate the other principal error of such an interpretation, that the day is *not at all* analogous to the period of the world up to the last day—we should speak too hastily by far.† For the parable certainly connects itself, in the first place, with the relation as to time in which the *apostles* and first disciples of Christ appear—they being the first called at the commencement of the work of the vineyard. But, not only so, *there is reflected* in it at the same time—*looking backwards*—the general fundamental relation which is the theme of so many parables; viz., the earlier calling of the Jews with whom God made the covenant of works in form of legal promise, and then the compassion for the Gentiles who were in due time placed on a par with them (Acts xv. 9). To deny entirely this reference and application would be quite as wrong here as it would be to deny it in the parable of the two sons, which is in general cognate with that before us. This is certainly the fundamental type in the background—on which, so to speak, the picture rests—*but nothing more;* and it is now necessary to observe, that while our Lord sets out from this reference to periods in the world's history, with their earlier and later calls, he immediately again leaves it; so that the parable, as a whole, in its developed form, can by no means be interpreted according to that reference. If, again, the apostles are the first, then, in order to maintain the chronological line from Christ to the judgment, we must take them in connection with the entire first apostolic church. To refer, however, the laborers thus directly to entire nations and churches, instead of *individual persons*, is in contradiction to the whole moral harmony and tendency of the parable. Nations and contemporaries in respect of calling, are not always of the same character or disposition; least of all does the history of the Christian Church, as a whole, exhibit such a state of things as is here denoted. Father Lambert, indeed, is for understanding it of the first Churches that were called out from the heathen, because they afterwards became proud and envious; that is true, but can it be said of them as a whole that at the first they agreed with Christ in the matter of a reward? Further, can it be said that they actually did the more difficult work—as it is said that they first cleared out the field of the world in order to the planting of the vineyard (which yet was already there)—so that in later times the heat of the conflict became less? In this chronological view we shall no where find what completely corresponds to the features of the parable. Such an interpretation too hastily lays aside the connection with the question of Peter, as also with the saying, quite manifestly referring to individual persons, *Many* that are first; which, indeed, only correspond to the πᾶς ὅστις (whosoever) before, ver. 29. It would also oblige us to give up all reference of the laborers to such as, like the apostles, serve Christ in the Church by a special office, a reference which, on account of the reasons just given, is *predominating* though not exclusive. The *laborers in the vineyard* are, of course, to be distinguished from the stems and branches of the vines; and there is evidently meant here, *first of all* (without excluding further application), a special call to labor and service, not the general call to salvation: "This special calling is a means to that general one" (Richter's *Hausbibel*). Further, a systematic chronological interpretation of the *day* stands too much in the way of the instructive and principal application to the individual Christians of all times; inasmuch as in that case all who live at one period would belong to one hour, and thus the moral point of the whole, so to speak, would be lost. But what if, as we have seen, our Lord only builds, upon the grand typical background of the relation of time between earlier and later calling (as first represented in the relation between the Jews and the Gentiles), a *parable* which is afterwards differently applied?* We say, first of all, in general, that the whole time of the world is reflected in every period, and repeats itself in every individual life; in order to *this* meaning, which

* How Alford can say of this eternal life, "To the enviers and grumblers it will be as the fruit which turns to ashes in the mouth"—we confess we cannot comprehend.

† Rupprecht goes too far in his protest against every supposition of Old Testament periods of time, on the ground that all parables respecting the kingdom of God make that kingdom to begin only with Christ. Has he then quite forgotten that the servants were sent to seek fruit from the vineyards before the Son?

* Otherwise expressed: "The difference of hours serves only as a figure for the difference of rank" (*Theol. Litt. Anz.*).

here comes into prominence in the evident reference to individual persons, we must withdraw our eye from the historical survey of the whole, as Christ himself does, in the particular development of the parable. For, in the first place, it is impossible to show how there can be a continuing to labor on the part of the first till the coming of Christ to judgment;* secondly, in this case *all* the first would appear as murmuring at last, which is yet far from the meaning of Christ; thirdly, taken in a literally historical view, the penny which was not paid till the evening, must certainly be the participation in the earthly kingdom of Christ, into which, however, as already said, no enviers shall enter. Is then the day to be understood as the *lifetime* of each individual man? We answer again, as above, that there is some truth in this (for parables in general throw out their light in manifold rays, and are not exhausted by a single fixed sense); but if, with many, we maintain this in a literally historical sense, we shall again miss the true meaning and find contradictions. Not merely, and not as the principal sense, can Christ mean the lifetime of the individual. For, in the first place, it may be said here again that not all who are called in youth are eager for reward, nor are all who are called later in life on that account chosen. Further, the different lifetimes have not all the same beginning and end, they have not a common date of payment; and this is strong enough of itself to limit this chronological view; finally, the *preference* and *precedence* of the first, certainly, by no means, refer *merely* to time. Many a one labors much in a more difficult office than others, bears the heat of the conflict without, while others tarry by the stuff in peace; nay, what is equally to the purpose, many a one is merely first in honor, or moreover, only to his own fancy: I am more, and labor more. What, then, is the day with its hours? No other than a parabolical *figurative* representation of the *relation between first and last* existing in *all possible* forms; certainly, with most immediate reference to time, from which, indeed, the expression "first and last" is derived, but including further all applications to all sorts of precedence, whether founded on truth, appearance, or fancy.

To conclude: this parable, as a whole, in respect to its *process of time*, is not a chronologically prophetic representation, to be explained in a literally historical manner,† of something that takes place precisely thus (as is the case in other parables; for example the tares and the wheat, the drawing of the net and selecting of the fishes, the casting out of the husbandmen who killed the son, the marriage of the king's son, the ten virgins, the servants with the talents, the great supper)—but a comprehensive *figurative* representation, taking its rise from the relation of time, but afterwards spiritualized, of something that thus takes place *oftentimes* and *in many ways*. The figure brings together and arranges into a totality of impression what is repeated in manifold ways; in *such* parables, for example, as the building of the house on the rock, the various kinds of ground, the treasure and pearls, the wicked servant, the true and wise servant, the fig-tree in the vineyard, the lost son, the unrighteous householder, Lazarus in Abraham's bosom.*

The *point of connection* for the parable is no other than the question of Peter: *for this reason only those* "first" are selected, in ver. 2, who have regard to the reward; and the agreement is as it were an irony *coming after* the discourse in chap. xix. 27–29. Observe now the different form of the proverbial saying at the beginning and the end, a difference which thus precisely justifies and explains itself. *Οἱ ἔσχατοι, οἱ πρῶτοι*, "*the* last," "*the* first," at the end (with the article) are only to be understood as meaning—*those* last and first of whom I said at the beginning, *many* that are first shall be last. For there are certainly first who remain first, and last who remain last. The proposition—all the last become first, and all the first become the last—as if Christ had said this in the *οἱ*, is in no possible way to be justified.† The *difference of disposition* between those here represented as first and last, is the principal thing to which the *οὕτως ἔσονται*, "*so* shall be," remains applicable.

The *limited sphere*, then, of the parable is the *warning* representation of such as are called with a real or seeming preference, and who thereupon do not renounce the eager anxiety for reward—all that is thought to be found in detail beyond this limit is erro-

* Origen fables about the transmigration of souls, according to which the first work on to the end, and even the last have stood idle the whole day (in former bodies)!

† Bengel also cannot quite disengage himself from this misapprehension; and when he understands the space of time comprehended by the parable to be from the first calling of the apostles onwards to the Pentecost, he forgets that, previous to the Pentecost, those who were called had not wrought at all! Chronological fancies respecting the great world-hours are to be found in the *Berlenberg Bible*, as also in the fathers, according to which the apostles come again at the eleventh hour! Of these Luther said. "Such talk is good for passing the time when one has nothing else to preach." And here, where the parable affords quite different material for *preaching*, he is quite right.

* In what is here said lies the measure of truth which belongs to the principle laid down by Rudel, that the parables only figuratively represent the last judgment by way of warning; that here, therefore, as a sharp warning, the murmuring disposition which had just been exhibited by Peter, is represented as still the same in future, even at the last judgment (Rudelb. and Guer. *Zeitschrift*, 1851, 3). Yet we must still reject the consequences which Rudel draws from this view carried to an extreme, as tending to make the historico-dogmatical ground of the parable evaporate into what is merely practical and didactic.

† Although, as it is well known, many (with whom Lisco agrees) have strangely attempted it.

neous. The application, however, to a merely *imagined* preference is certainly included; for it is in harmony with our Lord's manner to put such conceit to shame by condescending as it were to allow its validity. The *object* of the parable is finally: First, *to detect and put to shame* the evil intention; to demonstrate that such a hateful *envy* lies in the eager anxiety about reward (ver. 15). There is a concealed envy of the favor shown to others; and the saying of the eldest son finds its repetition, alas! even in the circle of the disciples of Christ: "What shall *we* have therefore?" Beneath this *we*, there lies hid as its evil motive a secret *us in preference to others*—which the Lord here brings to light. "This parable hits even excellent people; nay, it terrifies the greatest saints; therefore Christ holds it up before the apostles themselves" (Luther). "How many shining stars have already been struck by the tail of the dragon, and cast down by pride to the earth!" (Rambach). Herberger, rich in anecdote, brings a strikingly illustrative story into his sermon on this text,* which indeed strongly portrays what our Lord here mildly represents, but still corresponds to the reality of the parable.

Secondly, there is then the keen and ever true *warning:* In such a spirit, thou, now among the first (even thou, Apostle Peter, if it remain in thee, and go on developing itself in thee), mayest at some future time take the *reward*, and yet lose eternal life—worse than one who is *lost*, thou mayest remain behind, and without, as a *last one* in the worst sense (2 John 8). For *this* is plainly declared by a final climax in the *second* saying, respecting the called and chosen, which is annexed to the first. Meanwhile let us reflect on this! We shall not at once conclude; but after this general survey consider the details, and thus arrive again at this decisive concluding verse.

Verses 1, 2. God always goes out ἅμα πρωΐ, early in the morning, diligently anticipating those whom he seeks.† At the earliest dawn of the world he began to call such as Enoch and Abraham; long before there was any mention of cultivating a vineyard in the proper sense, had he uttered the word: I am thy reward, walk before me! This is not indeed directly meant here, but, pointing backwards, it is hinted. At all events we learn, from the first word, that it is not caprice on the part of God which calls the late ones so late. Many in preaching from this passage erroneously take pains to show that the compassion of the Lord (for it depends indeed upon this alone, not upon the willing or running of any one) takes effect in some sooner, in others later; and that of this difference in the "hours of grace" we have nothing more to say than, So it seems good in his sight, he has power to do what he will with his own. What truth there is in this is not taught here; the other side rather comes into prominence. If, on the other hand, we refer the first, third, sixth hours, etc., which are selected (with the omission of the intervening ones) to certain terms or epochs in the history of the world, and of an individual lifetime, when the call of grace goes forth more loudly and directly—it is yet to be remembered that the same call also continues to sound through all the intervening times. Those who subsequently went into the vineyard had already been invited in the morning; they knew of the vineyard where work was to be had; and every one that stands at a disadvantage has himself to blame, because he was not there when God called, or disregarded his calling from one hour to another. This is the meaning of the parable, which will also be confirmed by the apparent contradiction in ver. 7. The *vineyard* may be traced to Isa. v. (and still earlier to the Song of Solomon and Psa. lxxx.), as the similitude retained by Christ to denote God's economy upon earth, his people, his kingdom; the fruit of it is the most excellent, the labor in it is severe and difficult. The laborers correspond indeed in the *first place*, as we have already seen, to the husbandmen (Matt. xxi. 33); consequently, further, to the apostles and their successors in office in Christendom, of course not precisely according to the outward official title, but according to their divine calling. Yet the word "laborers" warrants further the general application, in so far as, in the vineyard, no one is allowed to remain idle or merely passive. The God who himself alone prepares his people for himself will yet have fellow-workers (1 Cor. iii. 9), as well out of grace as according to that justice which requires a *worthiness* for his kingdom—a worthiness, however, different from a meritorious claim to reward. *Laborers* at all events—for although thou art not a gardener, but a *branch*, thou art yet a *living* branch, which is not merely the object of cultivation, but in its turn is to bring forth fruit. Hast thou no special commission out of thy house, thou hast at least in thy house (Mark v. 19; Acts xvi. 31), and wherever thou shouldst let thy light shine so as to save others along with thyself. He who entirely neglects the salvation of others will not be likely to attain his own. These are ideas which lie in the background, and do not contradict the main reference to laborers in the more limited sense. Let no one boast of his labor, but praise the rich householder who so kindly cares for the poor; let us know nothing else than what we are wont to say: The gracious Lord hath *given me employment*. He promises the due reward, the

* A monk died, leaving a great name for sanctity; a robber, who had heard him preach, repented, ran to confess, but fell on the way and broke his neck. A devout man saw both, wept at the death of the saint, but rejoiced at that of the robber. Why so? "When the monk died, the devil took him because of his pride; when the robber broke his neck, angels received his penitent soul."

† In Jeremiah these words frequently occur: "I have sent unto you, rising up early and sending."

denarius (which, also in Tacitus, still appears as the usual ample day's wages for working soldiers); but gives infinitely more than this to the faithful who willingly labor for him, and are diligent. But if those who are called at the very first begin distrustfully to ask, How much am I certain to get?—then indeed they are in an evil way, and are to be warned of the unhappy end of such a course.

Verses 3—7. The next, going out at the third hour, πληθούσης ἀγορᾶς, or when the market-place was full (as also ἀγορᾶς πληθώρᾳ occurs), denote precisely the time when the ἀγόραιοι, or gaping idlers, are to be found. So far as this trait taken from man's work can correspond to what is higher, it finely maintains by this interval of three hours the medium between an undue zeal on the Lord's part, leading him to be ever running after laborers as if he needed them, and a neglect that cares not for the people who need him. We see evidently from the whole what is the aim of the master of the vineyard; every expression that might speak of his need is carefully avoided, while, on the other hand, the idleness of the fools is in a kindly manner rebuked. Go ye *also* into *the* vineyard—these words presuppose that the others had heard the first calling, or had heard of it; it is spoken of as a thing known; and in the "also," which sets before them the example of those who had gone previously, it is mildly hinted as a fault that they are standing idle. The market place of the world is contrasted with the vineyard of the kingdom of God; the greatest man of business in worldly things is yet only an idle starer, so long as he will not enter upon the true labor, which alone is of any value, which alone brings its reward.* The promise, *Whatsoever is right I will give you*, contains in the background likewise a hint at the penny, as if it were said—Go ye also (now at least); I will not count the time lost, but give to *you also* a full day's hire, as is due (only to the others). Or might we say, The Lord himself means by the words only what the reckoners could understand, namely, the part of the penny corresponding to the proportion of hours.† Hardly; if we interpret this in the light of the subsequent development! The indefinite form of the promise implies at the same time even a higher degree of kindness, even more than the first contract, and contains the true answer to the question of Peter, with which every one ought to be satisfied—Only serve the good Lord, it will assuredly do thee no hurt! The later laborers really trust more, they are ashamed of their idleness, and are contented that they are permitted to enter at all. From the ninth hour till the evening, when work ceases, would be once more the same interval of time; but the faithful and good Lord cannot refrain from even yet offering a last term for *one* last hour. Those whom he now finds are of course somewhat more pointedly rebuked: Why stand ye, why *have ye stood* all the day idle? Why have ye despised all the former calls, and, as much as in you lies, actually lost the whole day and the last hour, and thus brought a heavy penalty upon yourselves—if ye do not now take what I offer to you? Now there comes an excuse: No one hath hired us! A wonderfully bold speech! seeing that the lord of the vineyard has been calling from early morning, and has now, truly not without justice, charged them with idleness. Christ will certainly represent this excuse as groundless and hypocritical; for before God it will not be held valid. In the eye of man it indeed appears otherwise; *we* say rightly of many, Ah, if they had only been called earlier! No one has invited them, education has been wanting, they have been surrounded with bad company, perhaps even those who should have worked favorably upon their souls have been false teachers and destroyers. When such a one is called, *i. e.*, when first he distinctly hears the divine call, it is even natural for himself to think—No one has hitherto hired me; now, for the first time, light rises upon me. But when the light shines more clearly, and the call sinks deeper into his heart, he will no longer thus justify his cause, but rather take blame to himself. He will see and acknowledge that God called him even from the first, that he went out of the way of him who called when he saw him coming—in short, that the blame lies on himself alone. Only the poor heathen (in that first reference from which the parable started) may, with any semblance of right, still excuse themselves; no baptized and confirmed Christian, no man amongst us who has learned the ten commandments, and the Lord's prayer, or has ever heard a church bell, will be able to say—No one has hired or invited me! Still, in order to teach us that God's goodness will certainly do injustice to no one who might in any measure be able to excuse himself, Christ frames the parable so as to make the householder kindly overlook the pretext almost as if he admitted its force; and in the promise, which to the last is the same, only slightly touches the conscience: "Go ye *also* into the vineyard. *i. e.*, like those who have already gone; as ye know that I have often already thus called at the market place. Why, then, have ye disregarded the call?" Thus does God, in his abounding goodness, call kindly to the last; he calls the people only *not* to remain *idle;* and those here represented as last are such as enter upon the work merely from shame, which at length seizes them, and with-

---

* This is precisely what Rupprecht means when he finds here a designation of those "who, in reference to the kingdom of heaven, have yet done nothing." Why then should the market, as "the place where the idle people stand," *not* signify the *world?* Let us not, after modern fashion, be too nice in determining biblical, parabolical representations!

† As the Jews (see Lightfoot. *Horæ Talmud.*) pay differently the שְׂכִיר יוֹם and שְׂכִיר שָׁעוֹת—those who are hired by the day, and by the *hour.*

out much asking about the hire. They feel, indeed, what their idleness even to the last hour has deserved, and that if they are allowed to work at all it is only of grace; they trust the good Lord, and are far from thinking—The day of labor is now almost as good as past, there will be no wages for the last hour. We learn here, also, that even for the last hour there may be a superabundant recompense. The *eleventh hour* is still a precious hour of grace. To many it is evidently the last solemn hour of decision; while, to us all, it is at least uncertain at every call whether our last hour may not have come.

Verses 8–11. Every one who will receive wages must work, though it be only one hour; but the labor does not continue always; at the longest it lasts only one day, which is followed by the evening when all labor closes. That, in paying the laborers, the Lord gives orders to begin at the last, signifies in the first place—Give ample payment in general without respect and distinction! Then, however, from consideration of the laborers, and knowledge of their state of mind, he already, in his wisdom, sums all up in two classes, *last* and *first;* although there are, so to speak, five different gradations; it is supposed that all represent themselves either presumingly as first, or humbly as last. But since what pleases the Lord is only the humility which he would test and prove, in order afterwards to reward with something much better than the penny, he inverts the false order of precedence set up by his people; he already prophetically intimates what is to happen, by giving the last the first place, and the first the last; but he enjoins, at the same time, that as regards the penny no one, from the beginning to the end, is to be omitted. The diligence and zeal of *these* last here, who receive the whole day's hire, is, moreover, self-evident; and, so far, *what they get is really due to them*, according to the alone valid claim of grace. "So in our own times it has been maintained by a rationalistic theology (in a thoroughly Jewish spirit), that the sinner can never repair the neglect of which he has been guilty in the period before his conversion; the loss of time follows the converted person, even into eternity, in an irreparable abridgment of his happiness. But this parable seems framed with a special view of overthrowing such a delusion.* It belongs precisely to the majesty of grace that it can restore to the sinner from the bosom of its eternity even the time that, without it, would be irrecoverably lost" (Lange). Yes; even on our side, a certain truth subjectively corresponds to this, because it may be said, "A single true faithful moment and an entire lifetime, the right true earnest will and the act, are, according to the scale of eternal grace, the same" (Schubert). The faithful first ones of the right stamp know that full well, and do not vex themselves with envy. But others are here represented who murmur. They are called absolutely *the first*, and not, in express antithesis to the last, *those that were hired early in the morning;* for the intermediate laborers, who came at the third and sixth hour, may reckon themselves comparatively among the first (compare chapter xxv. 10, "those who were ready"—leaving it quite undetermined whether it applied to any of the foolish virgins). Suffice it to say, that what exactly fulfills the contract now appears to them to be not just, and this merely through comparison with the others; if these others get a penny, even for their hour, they foolishly think that they must receive more, at least a penny for every hour they had worked. It is an evil circumstance that instead of expressing thanks they murmur at the very time they are receiving their wages; but it is still worse that they murmur against the *householder*, whose bountiful *goodness* they have just witnessed, but without feeling and joy because that goodness was shown towards *others!* Here we have selfishness and envy in all its hateful nakedness! If the others had only received a farthing, *then* they would have been content! Hateful, most hateful!

Verses 12–15. And yet the spirit which Christ here brings to light, in the insolent words of the pretendedly first, is to be found in the hearts of all who are intent on reward, and filled with self-righteousness. They look proudly down on "these last," without knowing what was in their heart; they place themselves in lofty comparison with them, and daringly accuse the gracious householder of being unjust. Observe here the ἐποίησαν and ἐποίησας, the echo of the same work, which cannot be translated. The first ἐποίησα, is thoroughly in the calculating sense: these have earned, deserved, wrought an hour's wages. They themselves have borne the *burden* of the day, and the *heat* (τὸν καύσωνα, the scorching wind)—the labor properly so called, and, in addition to this, the fatigue from without (Gen. xxxi. 40); but with all this they have done no more than was due from them, no more than they knew before they would have to do. Viewed more deeply—though the parable could only indicate it—the Lord might well have replied to them, Are ye then become so bitter? How *unwillingly*, then, have ye labored!* But the house-

* [The doctrine which the author here combats, must be distinguished from the evangelical position, that on the one hand, those converted late in life can only make up by unusual diligence the attainments that *would have been* theirs by an earlier devotion of themselves to God, and on the other, that mere length of time, irrespective of diligence, does not argue a corresponding growth in grace.—Am. Ed.]

* Luther gives the following turn to this part of the parable: "The day and the heat must be understood not of the time, but with reference to the conscience; therefore as signifying, that the legally righteous go through great and heavy labor, *i. e.*, they go through it with a burdened conscience and an unwilling heart." Lange: "The labor has become hard to them, the burden and heat of the

holder, who was good to the idle ones that sought to excuse themselves, continues to be kind even to these; he addresses them in a way that might shame them, as if he actually needed to justify himself. To *one* among them "who was more ungracious than the rest" (as Bahrdt once expressed it)—we conceive this must be Peter, the spokesman; the spirit, which he showed a little while before, being exhibited in its natural consequence—he addresses words which first fill up the measure of goodness; but which, on that account, all the more keenly pierce. His payment is given to him; but with it the ὕπαγε, *go thy way.* The Lord condescendingly places himself, as it were, on a level with the servant; yet this *friendly* ἑταῖρε (good friend) has in it an essential tone of irony.* I do thee no wrong, I give thee what is *thine;* consider only, *thou hast already received it.*† If we go beyond the limits of the parable, (*whither it is designed to draw us, even in its very limitation, as every parable properly does*), the Lord might say: Even were I now to withhold from thee what is "*thine*" on account of thy murmuring, and to give it to that one (as chap. xxv. 28, 29), I should still do thee no wrong! He says, however, only: I will be *gracious*—I will give to this one who is last of all, τοὐτῳ τῷ ἐσχάτῳ, the same as to thee. He who has not labored at all, who has rejected my last call, receives indeed nothing at all but the punishment of the self-willed idlers at another term of payment; but this one deserves his wages, in my view, even more than thou; therefore am I good to him, while I must be angry with thee. (David's booty was to be divided even among those who remained by the stuff—is not this the custom and law in Israel, since 1 Sam. xxx. 25?) Art thou, then, a true servant if thou wilt prescribe to thy lord? Is my good will to yield to thy evil will, so that it is not permitted to me to be gracious? Wilt thou forbid me? Be ashamed! Even what I have just called τὸ σόν (what is thine) remains still ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς (with my own), and that I *gave* thee work was only an act of my grace and kindness! I do wrong to no one, not to thee, who art to learn the true *suum cuique* in the apparent inequality. For hirelings such as thou, enviers such as thou, I can have no further use in my house and vineyard, for I will have real ἑταίρους, *friends*, who understand and learn my mind, who are happy in my goodness; only for this have I called you all, not for the sake of the work. Is thine eye *evil** when, and because, I am *good*? With this keen question, in which every thing is said, he is *dismissed* and now stands without, eternally envious at the happiness of the last, which he, as first, has forfeited—if indeed this final judgment does not throw him down on his knees in deepest shame, and make him pray: O Lord forgive me, and receive me yet as the unworthiest and the last.

Verse 16. The entire parable—with the saying from which it sets out, and which it is meant to interpret—leaves still undecided whether the result in the case of all *such* first ones is that they absolutely remain without.† But that the parable with its *warning* is intended to reach thus far, is immediately proved by the second saying which is subjoined to it; in which a step is taken beyond the sphere of the parable, or rather in which by *keeping fast hold of* the ὕπαγε, it first receives the deepest interpretation of its meaning. The direct inference is: *Therefore, i. e.*, by the fault of their own evil disposition—and hence justly—those first whom I mean and have here denoted shall become last.‡ This, however,

---

day is what they chiefly remember in looking back upon it." Very good, but we do not understand how the same Lange can yet make out that these people are saved; but that they are "*more legal*, more *calculating* natures, whose capacity for blessedness is not of wide compass." We confess not to be able to find a place for these comparatives under our alternative, according to the analogy of Rom. xi. 6.

* Roos understands it as "seriously meant and with a tone of alienation"—but how so? It must in that case (which cannot be proved) have been a common form of address, like our "good friend!" Non vocabulum benevolentiæ et amicitiæ, sed *notitiæ*, as Herberger cites; but how do we know that? See again Matt. xxvi. 50.

† That (according to Steffensen) these grumblers who were first had contemptuously let the penny lie untouched, is certainly not true. Therefore neither will it do to explain the meaning thus: "If they took it (even now when advised to do so) repentingly, then at that very moment from being πρῶτοι they became ἔσχατοι; but if they refused to take it, then it was just their pretended merit that was to blame for their losing the reward intended for them." Against this we quote the words of Munchmeyer in opposition to Besser: "It is said here in words too plain and unambiguous to be misunderstood: The first *received* also each his penny; and when they *received* it (therefore took it, had taken it), they murmured against the householder" (*Luther. Zeitschrift*, 1851, 4).

* עַיִן רָע of envy, Prov. xxiii. 6, comp. xxii. 9.

† And in *this* sense might be said, what Herberger suggests in the wrong place, between vers. 14 and 15, that "here the parable ceases."

‡ "As regards the parable, it is self-evident that *all* the first in it become last, as it was intended only to show by an example how the first *might* become last, and the last first; therefore it was not necessary to speak of any exception in the story of the parable. Hence, also, the saying at ver. 16 is different only in words, by no means in sense, from chap. xix. 30; it is used here precisely because it connects so closely with the parable, in which *only such* first as actually became last are spoken of. and *vice versa*." In this Rupprecht agrees with Steffensen, who, in like manner, says rightly: "Thus, *as is represented in the parable*, shall the last, *i. e.*, all who esteem themselves last, be reckoned, before God, or with respect to the *inheritance of eternal life*, as first; while the first, *i. e.*, all who think themselves first, shall be last before God. For election, or being saved, is by no means given with the calling; he who has actually been called to

does not stand first, but again, in order graciously to recommend humility, it is—The last shall be first! *In this* has Christ joy, *this* is what we are rather to keep before us. Scarcely, however, is this said, than there follows, by a closely connecting *for*, the very difficult saying about the *called* and *chosen*, which chap. xxii. 1–14 explains clearly by a new parable. As in that parable those who are called in vain consist partly of such as do not come at all—such as despise the call—partly of those who come falsely, who venture to the wedding-table in their own garments, with still greater contempt of the royal robe of honor—so here the κλητοί (which imports more than merely κεκλημένοι, chap. xxii. 3–8) are such as really enter into covenant and labor, make a beginning in the service of God (not indeed in a pure spirit), but who are afterwards found to be not *worthy*, not able to stand the test. And certainly in this parable they are the rejected, the not-blessed; by no means (as Lange laboriously argues) the less blessed, having less capacity of blessedness. So much, however, is clear and certain—as from the two parables here and at chap. xxii., so further, from the whole Scripture—that it is not God's arbitrary decree which makes the ἐκλεκτούς, or "elect," but that *every one* who is called can, and may, and should himself make sure the election thereby offered to him (Rom. xi. 28, 29; 2 Pet. i. 10). *Chosen*—this is the last admonishing word of the parable, in which it sounds forth its full meaning and aim; this is the thorn which it would leave in our hearts. *Few* shall in the end come off as chosen—this is what Christ says here, as every where, from Matt. vii. 13, 14. (The *many* last who shall be first is quite consistent with this as spoken in a different relation altogether.) Few, that is, in comparison with the multitude of the rejected, of the last, or those who remain behind in the worst sense. That, even among *these* rejected ones, there will be such as long served sourly and discontentedly for the penny, and receive this too, but do *not* receive, in and with this penny, eternal life—this is most undeniably the mighty warning truth which was here to be testified. This truth, and with it the whole parable, is completely mistaken by those who so interpret as to find in ver. 16 only this, that in the kingdom of God there will, in the end, be *no difference* between the first and the last! This entirely mistaken idea Rudel at last, with well-meaning ingenuity, carries to a climax when he says: "The first in heaven will *also* be last, and the last first, *according as it is viewed!*" This is to corrupt and pervert the clear text by over-acuteness. The truth is this: God will regard all who, up to the period of decision, have not renounced their envious eagerness for reward, as not belonging to his heaven; and having paid them with their (in that case perishable) reward, will reject them.

THIRD ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUFFERINGS—ANSWER TO THE TWO SONS OF ZEBEDEE.

(Matt. xx. 18–28; Mark x. 33–45; Luke xviii. 31–33.)

The indiscreet request of the two disciples for places of honor, preferred at so unseasonable a time (τότε, ver. 20), just when Christ is again prophesying of his sufferings, gives him occasion to address a proper reply to the two disciples; and, in like manner, again more specifically to tell the other ten what properly the fact of his going before through suffering to glory had already intimated. Thus arises again a connected testimony concerning the way to honor through lowliness, to greatness through humility (as in chap. xviii.), or concerning the true relation between lowliness and greatness in the kingdom of God. First of all there is the great truth which, for the disciples as for us all, is so hard to be admitted, the fundamental principle of the kingdom, universally valid alike for the Head and the members, viz., *through suffering to glory* (Luke xxiv. 26). Christ himself voluntarily goes before in this way (vers. 18, 19), and his disciples are at liberty to go by no other. Their over-curious inquiry after another way here especially presents itself in the form of an ambitious, grasping desire after special glory above others, ver. 21. Our Lord rebukes the want of understanding which does not connect with that glory the sufferings of the Forerunner, those sufferings not yet being understood—and then points out the only true way, vers. 22, 23. The general fellowship in the sufferings of Christ belongs to all, and leads also to the general fellowship in his glory; special preference, however, is no matter of arbitrary distribution before the time, but of the eternal decree in which it is prepared for the individuals who are to receive it. What, therefore, is the principle which for the present obtains in the kingdom of Christ? It is only this—in serving consists true *ruling*, in humility true *greatness!* In opposition to the twofold principle in the kingdoms of this world, namely, to rule by the use of power, and by greater power to exalt oneself above others (ver. 25)—comes here the similar, twofold fundamental principle of the kingdom of Christ for his followers (vers. 26, 27)—whom

---

salvation *may lose* the election by proud self exaltation."

he indeed goes before as the highest example in the renunciation of his power and honor, in the giving up of himself for many. Thus, at ver. 28, the conclusion of the discourse again returns to the beginning of the intimation concerning his sufferings.

Verses 18, 19. This was now the *third* open prediction which our Lord made of his sufferings, since that which occurred at Cesarea Philippi; and it was followed by only one more last anounncement, two days before the Passover (chap. xxvi. 2). Already (previous to what is here recorded) had the raising of Lazarus taken place; the enmity of Jerusalem —of the "Jews" who were represented in that word—had risen to an official decree of murder; the great conflict of the Holy One with sinners—from which, according to the prophecy of the high priest, was to issue the saving, atoning death of the One for all—approached its crisis. The Captain and Forerunner of our salvation goes before, resolved upon the way of suffering; this Mark, ver. 32, prophetically indicates by selecting the expression ἦν προάγων αὐτούς, "he went before them"—or rather, he records his literal walking before them at that time, as a specific expression and symbol of his going before them in the way of suffering. To his he adds, quite as significantly, that the disciples *were amazed;* they were filled with astonishment and anxiety at the Master's *courage* in going to death (comp. John xi. 16); and were *afraid* for themselves who were to follow him—who now actually followed him with such fear.* Upon this he stands still, calls the hesitating ones encouragingly to him (Mark πάλιν, *again*, as at chap. ix. 31), and begins again, expressly and without concealment, to tell them *the things that were about to happen* with all particularity of detail. This he must do as a testimony that he knew it beforehand as the Father's counsel according to the Scripture, and that he freely undertook it—as a gracious provision that the weak ones, when now it is about to take place, may not entirely lose heart and confidence in him—and to point to the fact of his leading the way upon which his disciples are to follow him. He names *Jerusalem*, in which place, and no where else, his suffering is ordained and prepared to take place (Luke xiii. 33); and in the "*we*" he again indicates what he had often before declared, and is shortly afterwards again to declare, that they too are to follow him, and have fellowship with him in this. For the rest, his words are only a more exact and detailed repetition of what is said at chap. xvi. 21, xvii. 22, 23, in which latter passage we have already noticed the twofold *delivering up* which is here mentioned. Here it is not merely to be killed, but to be *judicially condemned* to death—not merely to be delivered up to "men," but to the *Gentiles*, the Romans, who as opposed to the Jews, represented the whole Gentile world. The πολλὰ παθεῖν, "suffer many things," is carried out into its most significant details: the being *mocked*, in which his kingly honor is made a ground of *ignominy* (in Luke ὑβρισθήσεται, as explaining what severity of wanton ill-treatment was involved in this act of mockery, in Mark and Luke there is also the consummated ignominy of being *spit upon*); then the being *scourged*, following in all legal form, and the being *crucified;* in which lie most properly his sufferings of flesh, in their pain and *anguish* even to the *death.** All is in succession, just as it happened during the last three days; and for the third time also is announced the *rising again* on the third day! Luke preserves the important additional clause which points in all this to the fulfillment of the Scripture: All things that are written of the Son of Man by the Holy Ghost in the prophets† shall and must be accomplished; consequently, before his glory his sufferings must be fulfilled (which fools cannot find or read in the Scripture)—the one as certainly as the other. Of his being mocked, spit upon, and scourged, it is plainly written in Isa. l. 6. Of the *cross* the Scripture spoke in types, such as the brazen serpent, and other ways of which we are not now called to speak particularly. Of his being delivered up to the Gentiles we may read in the עֲדַת מְרֵעִים, "the assembly o. the wicked," Psa. xxii. 16;‡ and in other places, perhaps, if our eyes were opened rightly to read.

Luke says, without tautology, very emphatically, "But they understood none of these things;" *i. e.*, from want of understanding and unwillingness of heart, they could and would

---

* Ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο can hardly mean merely, *on the way* they became ever more afraid! Ἀκολουθεῖν has like προάγειν more significance here.

* How Lange (ii. 3, 1148) finds here "three fundamental forms of temporal *death*, every preceding one of which ought rightly to *exclude* that which follows," I do not understand. Was not the scourging the beginning of the crucifixion "according to human law?" What reason was there why one who had been mocked must not also be judged or condemned? Braune observes more correctly the *gradation* in this trilogy: First, the being mocked, as the comparatively gentle beginning (although, along with the being spit upon, it was already severe enough); then the bodily ill-usage (according to law); then the shameful death.

† The Dat. τῷ υἱῷ not to be construed with τελεσθήσεται, (fulfilled in him), but written, prescribed, ordained *for him;* properly and precisely *pointing to him*, so that he should look upon himself in the light of what is thus written, and accommodate himself to it.

‡ In which case what was said in my commentary on this Psalm is retracted; since עֲדָה may be used by catachresis, and the מְרֵעִים may indicate the ἀνόμους in the proper sense, with whom the προσπηγνύναι, Acts ii. 23, is connected quite as directly as at Psa. xxii., the כָּאֲרִי; which refers to this, notwithstanding the objections of recent expositors.

understand nothing of *these* things, nothing of this *matter;* therefore was the whole ῥῆμα, the entire *saying*, hid from them, *i. e.*, its particular *words*, plain as they were.* A proof of this is immediately furnished in the request of the two sons of Zebedee, who now too hastily catch at the *rising again* which was before missed, and whose inquiry seems to emanate from the spirit and views of the disciples denoted in Luke xix. 11. What wavering hither and thither between affrighted horror at the sufferings and inquisitive grasping at the glory—because they could not understand both in their connection! The question here presents itself whether it was *the mother* of the sons of Zebedee (of the father we know nothing further, but the mother's name, according to Matt. xxvii. 56, Mark xv. 40, was Salome) who preferred the request, or the sons themselves. Here, of course, the more exact account of Matthew is to be preferred; and Mark, who generally abridges, only conceives of them as having spoken through the medium of their mother, just as in Matthew also Christ addresses the sons in his reply. It was then, at all events, *their* request; but it may still be asked whether the thought originated with her. This is certainly probable, as she takes the lead in the speech; the sons had become only less bold, not wiser, by the instructions they had received from the Master (chap. xviii. 1; xix. 30). The question came from the mother, and sprung originally from flesh and blood; but it found its echo in the flesh and blood of the children. For, as Luther's marginal gloss, which almost every one cites, here runs—"the flesh is always for becoming glorious ere it is crucified, exalted ere it is humbled." John, at least, is perfectly satisfied now, as always, with the thought of retaining the nearest place beside his Lord in glory; and in that case it is no matter to him whether it be on the right hand or the left. Did the mother—whose "these my two sons" affords so true a specimen of those maternal wishes and maternal demands, in which self is transferred to the children—think here of the preference already given to the two disciples with Peter (who is now to fall behind them, and be separated from them?) or did she think of the surname *sons of thunder*, which had been given to them (Mark iii. 17)—or of her own special claim as one who had constantly followed Christ (Mark xv. 41)—or of her relationship to him (certainly unauthenticated) as the sister of Joseph, his foster-father?* All this we do not know, and it would be of little consequence if we did know it; we are to look upon it in the same light in which our Lord did, as in any case an expression and example of a forward ambition on the part of his disciples. Not content with each having one of the twelve thrones, chap. xix. 28 (something like the thrones of the house of David, Psa. cxxii. 5), these two disciples will even have seats on the right hand and on the left! There is something praiseworthy, notwithstanding, in the *frankness*, as also in the humility, which, with all the pride of the wish, marks the *prayer* (Mark, δὸς ἡμῖν, *give us*); and in the strong faith which would even now have exchanged any place of honor in the presence of Herod or Cæsar for fellowship with Christ; which so confidently reckons on the approaching *glory* of him who was now humbled; and which recognizes the allotment of highest dignity and power as dependent on one word of his pleasure (εἰπὲ ἵνα καθίσωσιν). There yet remains enough of what is evil in the motive that dictated the wish. There was wanting to it only the bold temerity of assigning to themselves these places of honor on the right hand and the left—in which case the Lord would have much more sharply rebuked it than in his kindness he at first does. True, he afterwards, in terms of rebuke, rejects those who *seek to be first;* but his answer begins in milder terms—*Ye know not* what ye ask. At the very outset he addresses to them the question which is amplified in the somewhat different representation of Mark (ver. 36), *What wilt thou? What will ye?* Very improperly—and not so modestly as Bathsheba in 1 Kings ii. 20, with her "one small petition"†—is Christ here required to promise beforehand the indefinite *whatsoever*. This he never does in such cases; first we must distinctly ask, and then he applies the truth to our want of understanding, and corrects it.

Verses 22, 23 We always, properly speaking, know not what we ask, so long as it is not the Holy Spirit who teaches us to ask (Rom. viii. 26). We understand not the Lord's prayer which is on our lips; the ignorance of the flesh, and the pride of our own spirit, ever secretly pray: "Give thy kingdom *to us*, let *us* become something special in thy kingdom!" when we ought simply to say, "Let *thy* kingdom come to us all upon earth!" In this

* Only a little differently from Lange (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1839. i. 44), who would understand by ῥῆμα the "whole *matter* which remained an enigma to them." He afterwards (in *Leben Jesu*, i. 257) repeats this, but at last (ii. 3, 1148) comes to my interpretation, viz., "the meaning of the saying." Hamann (i. 484) distinguishes between τὸ ῥῆμα and τὰ λεγόμενα—"what he *said* and what he would *give* them *to understand*." So also Sepp: "And they could not comprehend what he would *thereby say*"—which then, at all events, would be no mere tautological amplification." Less successful appears to us, on the other hand, Alford's exegesis of the οὐδὲν τούτων: Neither the suffering nor the resurrection—for in the ταῦτα there is no separation.

* According to an ancient supposition. The newest hypothesis of Wieseler, which makes Salome to be the sister of Jesus' mother, we shall by and by set aside (on John xix. 26, 27, the third Word from the Cross).

† Although (as Braune observes) the request of Bathsheba may be compared with that here preferred by the disciples in this, that when one is not sure of his case he desires the promise beforehand.

general sense of the first word of sad and gentle rebuke lies a more definite application to the two disciples: Ye know, understand, and consider not *what* belongs to the becoming great and glorious in my kingdom; and that while *ye* are thinking only of special pre-eminence in honor, ye have, in asking for this, ignorantly asked for special pre-eminence in ignominy and pain (such places as those of the thieves who were crucified along with Christ, as Lange supposes that Christ has these in his mind here)—for this is the real relation in which these things stand to each other. In general, all glory to be attained in my kingdom is preceded by the condition of suffering; and as regards this there arises the serious question, Can and will ye also have this? Is it not true, also, that in merely human relations every honor has its burden? "Might not the possessors of those honors that are most coveted and striven after upon earth, say to those who envy or desire them, Can ye bear the duties and cares, the appendage that inseparably connects itself with this enjoyment?"* There are royal cups of all sorts, difficult baptisms, or consecrations and preparations for high rank (Prov. xv. 33). Here however, our Lord speaks of a *cup* and a *baptism* which are indispensable in order to glory, as for himself, so also for all his followers and friends. Even although, in Matthew, the second clause about the baptism (which, however, Mark also indisputably has) were a later interpolation, it would still be merely the proper restoration of an omission. Christ certainly said both; for the cup and baptism together form two ideas mutually supplementary. The *baptism* in this double idea is even the more distinctively important, is the decisive thing, and that which is so significantly referred to in the whole subsequent *doctrine of the apostles* and the *discipline of the Church*. To drink the cup—is said chiefly of the beginning made by the Forerunner; baptism applies chiefly to us who follow in his fellowship.

It is not then as if the baptism were intended to indicate only a greater measure of sufferings to be poured out on him; for, in opposition to this, it might be affirmed with a certain truth, that the cup in Gethsemane, as the crisis of resolution, was more severe to the Redeemer than the consummation of the baptism on Calvary. But both are essentially the same sufferings viewed in a different aspect. First of all, the cup points to something that is to be *inwardly* tasted or experienced; while the baptism denotes the same thing as also overpowering us *from without*. Consequently, the former expresses rather the personal undertaking of a resolute voluntary *obedience*, *i. e.*, precisely the *drinking;* hence the expression is afterwards retained especially to denote the alone perfect obedience of the Forerunner. The latter speaks rather of the imposed necessity of patient endurance, of the *being* baptized (as in no possible sense can any one baptize himself); hence, again, this expression passes over to us, although, in Luke xii. 50, Christ thus designates the holy Δεῖ (*necessity*) imposed upon himself as the decree of the Father.* Finally, as the cup points backward to the ordaining will of the Father, so there lies in the baptism a hint pointing forwards to the not remaining under the water, to the coming forth and rising again. It is, therefore, the second idea—that of baptism—which first completes the sense of the whole: viz., that of renewing consecration, a previous putting off of what is old, in order to a power and authority granted only in this way (Luke xii. 49, 50). *Both* expressions are drawn from a profound knowledge of Scripture symbols; the former, especially, is found in manifold anticipation throughout the Old Testament. No where does Scripture allude to a cup of poison or medicine to be drunk; but the origin of the figure is to be sought in passages such as Psa. xi. 6, מְנָת כּוֹסָם, "the portion of their cup;" Psa. xvi. 5, מְנָת־חֶלְקִי וְכוֹסִי, "the portion of my lot and my cup;" according to which a share of the repast is allotted and handed to any one. We then find in the Old Testament mention made of various cups; of a salutary cup of suffering, of a cup of fury, and—of a cup in which both of these ingredients are in a certain measure united. When it is said in Isa. li. 17, that Jerusalem has drunk at the hand of the Lord of the cup of his fury, the cup of trembling, and forthwith is restored as a holy and glorious Zion (chap. lii. 1)—this, according to the profound import and connection of the prophecy of Isaiah, is precisely that cup of suffering and of the cross which all the people of God, whose head Christ is, must drink, and to which all the typical and preparatory sufferings of Israel belong (Psa. lx. 5–7). This is always a כּוֹס יְשׁוּעוֹת, *a cup of salvation*, which is to be viewed as a benefit, a saving disciplinary correction from the Lord (Psa. cxvi. 12, 13), a מוּסַר שָׁלוֹם, *the chastisement of peace* (Isa. liii. 5), which finally issues only in salvation. In opposition to this stands the cup of anger and rejection, which neither Christ drinks nor his followers, but the unbelieving and condemned (Psa. lxxv. 9; Ezek. xxiii. 31; Rev. xiv. 10). Yet there is also in the cup of grace a taste of the salutary judicial anger, of the fury that burns hotly against sin—this was exhibited in Christ; as it is still in his followers; and as it is also in rejected Israel (and this is a biblical idea of fundamental importance in order to the understanding of Isaiah and all the prophets), which continues to present, against its knowledge and will, a final historical *type* of its Messiah.

* Nitzsch's sermon on this text (third Selection); in which, with great acuteness, he interprets its universal application, and shows that the Saviour knew how to cure his disciples of ambitious wishes.

* Which parallel passage refutes Braune's otherwise unfounded distinction—that the cup was given to Christ specially by the Father, but the baptism brought upon him by *men*.

It is for this that they live as a people, that they may repeat in themselves on a large scale the sufferings of Christ under wrath and desertion; until, at the appointed time, they turn again, as is written in Rom. xi. 15, from the same point of view. *Hence* we so often read in the Old Testament of a bitter potion, and a grievous cup on account of sin (Jer. viii. 14, ix. 15), in which there is yet, at the same time, a gracious visitation; hence we read so often of a similarity between the judgment of Israel and the judgment of the heathen (Jer. xxv. 15–29; comp. Ezek. ix. 6; 1 Pet. iv. 17; 1 Sam. iv. 21, 22), which yet is no similarity; for Jerusalem awakes again, and its sufferings, through fellowship with Christ's *atoning sufferings*, become *sufferings of restoration*. We may perceive at least, from these hints, to what a pervading symbolical usage in the prophetical writings Christ's words here point back, when he speaks of his sufferings as a *cup* to be drunk; when he thereby discloses that he will take upon himself all that sinful man, all that Israel, has to suffer *in order to salvation* (not their final condemnation); that fundamentally in himself the truth is to be confirmed and essentially fulfilled—that the cup of wrath is to become a cup of salvation. And thus we may observe that even the cup points to the new blessing and the new life, of which the baptism more distinctly speaks.

For this second word (which is not to be associated with the idea of a "fire-baptism" of suffering; for in Matt. iii. 11, it is the fire of the Holy Ghost, and in Luke xii. 49, 50, the water evidently stands opposed to it) the point of departure lies in the figure and example of floods that drown (Psa. xlii. 7, lxix. 2. cxxiv. 4). As the drinking of the cup is a painful *suffering*, a tasting of the zeal of God's holiness against the sin of the world, so this suffering consummates itself as a suffering of *death* (Heb. ii. 9) in the baptism; for, to be baptized is to go down and die. Upon *this* fundamental signification the command of God to John made the baptism of repentance to rest; in which the principal thing is by no means the cleansing, which only comes in addition, but the typified dying of the old man. This first type more nearly approximates to its truth when Christ himself, who is to baptize with spirit and fire, *i. e.*, life and power, first goes down into Jordan, into the water of death, in order to show how it becomes him to fulfill all righteousness for us, and us in him. What, however, is here as yet only a prophesying symbol, becomes a reality in his death upon the cross. The *cross* of Christ, in the full sense of the word, is his baptism, which now becomes ours; and in this fellowship of his sufferings and dying we too drink *all* of his cup. What our Lord says to the sons of Zebedee contains the kernel and germ of all the apostolic doctrine, as expressed, for example, in Rom. vi., and gives the inmost signification of the two *sacraments* of his Church, by which it is incorporated and united with him (1 Cor. xii. 13). In our case, indeed, it is in the inverted order: Christ alone began by his absolutely drinking of the cup, before that cup became baptism to him: we, on the contrary, must first enter into the fellowship and communication of his baptism, before we can have the right and the power to drink of his cup in voluntary faith. "*Ye* shall drink of my cup," etc.—in these words we are not to seek any special prophecy of special martyrdom in the case of *John* and *James*,* but must understand them thus: Ye shall *indeed* drink, as it is appointed to all; *but*, as to special honors and preferences, the matter is different from what ye imagine. Let all false dogmatic teaching which satisfies itself with the formal imputation of the sufferings of Christ, without a real entering into the fellowship with him, ask how it can dispose of the Redeemer's former saying about *his* cross being intended for all, from which what he here says of *his* cup and *his* baptism is, in like manner, to be explained as intended for all—not to speak of the entire doctrine of the apostles on this point. Only this remains as a settled and highly important truth: I drink first, I am first baptized; ye can drink only by the strength that has been gained, the right that has been won, by him who has gone before, and has opened up the way.

Can ye? This question requires, therefore, a twofold answer. *As thou, Lord, in our own strength—never!* But faith in him who has said, Ye shall drink and be baptized—answers with a joyful and trembling *We can*. The Yes of the disciples here is not yet this latter, for it anticipates ere Christ has decided, and is also for the most part to be understood only from Luke xviii. 34. It may be very much doubted whether, as Meyer thinks, they understood the figure literally, in its good sense, of the cup and basin of the king used at meals (Luke xxii. 30; Mark vii. 4); for, as Olshausen rightly observes, the testing question, *Can ye*, indicated not an honor, but something hard and difficult connected with the honor. Their answer is, taking the most favorable view of it, to be compared with the well-meant ignorant promise of Peter (John xiii. 37); if, indeed, the intensity of their regard for the places of honor did not prompt them to answer, *We can*, almost without thought, at all hazards. Further, there still lies in the background, as a tacit pre-supposition, the intermediate sentence—Then shall *ye all* also *sit*, *rest*, and *reign* with me; ye shall all participate with me in the glory which shall follow the suffering. Not merely, Ye twelve on your twelve thrones; but, as the apostolic doctrine

* To which view Lange still adheres; he further remarks on the not less but rather greater participation of *John* in the inward sympathetic experience of the suffering and dying of Christ. We understand, throughout, only the general participation of all Christians. As Koitsch sings, in his classical hymn, "O source of life;" and in the 6th verse—For *all* who drink with thee of the cup which thou hast drunk in suffering here, shall there eternally rejoice with thee.

rns (Rom. viii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12; 1 Pet. i. 11, v. 1; 1 John iii. 2), and as Christ in the last revelation actually promises to every one who has opened the door to him, and has overcome: To him will I give to sit with me on my throne (Rev. iii. 21). This latter is the strongest expression, denoting a degree of honor beyond which no other expression goes —and yet from the relative character of all human symbolical phraseology, even in the holy Scriptures, this expression does not exclude the fact, that in the general participation in the glory of Christ there are special degrees and honors. *This* Christ acknowledges here, and speaks, as the sons of Zebedee have spoken, of *sitting on his right hand and on his left.* We doubt whether he thereby confirms the supposition that *two* of the disciples would actually be thus distinguished; and should prefer to understand that he merely adopts from their prayer the words which he uses in his answer: What ye imagine and represent by these places of honor, *i. e.*, special honor, and dignity above others in general. Of this he now testifies by a twofold antithesis: This belongs not to *me*, but to the *Father;* this comes not from my *giving*, but from the Father's *preparing. Not mine to give*—of course, in the sense of the petition, not mine now as Son of Man, inasmuch as I myself am yet in lowliness, and yet in the way of suffering; and not according to the way and manner of men in earthly kingdoms, into which there might enter partiality and caprice. The δοῦναι (to give) of the answer corresponds to the δὸς ἡμῖν (give to us) of the question: Therefore it does not belong to me to give, it certainly does not belong to you to require or to ask it! The ἡτοίμασται, *for whom it is prepared*, points to the ground of the special destination, endowment, calling, equipment, keeping of certain individuals for special grace above the general grace, laid in the beginning, nay, in the eternity, of the supreme decree of the Father; and it is intended, at the same time, to intimate that those who are thus ordained to special honors must also themselves be specially prepared for these honors. There is again no absolute antithesis in the saying as a whole; for it is *prepared* of the Father for all in common, who inherit the kingdom (chap. xxv. 34); and moreover it is the Son, exalted by the Father, who will finally *confer* these special distinctions, as is plain from the ever-recurring δώσω, ποιήσω, "I will give," "I will make to sit down," etc., of the seven apocalyptical epistles, compared with the "I appoint" of Luke xxii. 29. (Οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται is not to be rendered with Erasmus, "Non est meum dare sed iis *continget;*" but if the ἡτοίμασται stands opposed to the ἐμόν falsely pre-supposed by the disciples, there yet belongs another and a true δοῦναι to the οἷς; and ἀλλά has the sense of εἰ μή, comp. Mark iv. 22, ix. 8; Matthew xvii. 8.)

With such an absolute refusal of the premature request the ten might have been satisfied; but the same pride that prompted the two to prefer such a request dwells also in them, and feels itself so offended by that act of presumption as not to be able at once to forget it: These two disciples would be greater than we! It only expresses itself in another form, while they exalt themselves in jealous displeasure, which they probably betray also in words. The all-surveying wisdom of the faithful Master at once perceives this; and, in order that equal justice may be dealt, he fails not to rebuke in them also the self-exaltation which will admit of no precedence beside itself. The continuation of the answer many have understood as if it only meant to say: Be not angry at the two, envy them not, even although it were prepared for them of the Father to sit on my right hand and on my left (which his answer at least left undetermined); for, if they are appointed to such honor, there is first ordained for them also a greater measure of humiliation—the higher any one would rise, the deeper must he first sink. But such a side-glance at the two, by way of comparing them with the rest, is here very remote from the Lord's simple saying, which is rather meant merely to return and point back to a lesson of universal significance, that in the kingdom of Christ humility alone is true greatness, and that serving is and leads to true reigning.

Verses 25–27. *To point back to this*—for already, at chap. xviii. 3, 4 (comp. Luke ix. 48), the Lord had said what he here more strongly impresses upon the forgetful disciples, further developing words which he afterwards (Matt. xxiii. 11, 12; Luke xxii. 25–27) again and again repeats.* Christ shows with great and strongly contrasting earnestness the difference and contrariety which exist between the heavenly and the earthly kingdom, the kingdom of God and the kingdoms of this world. The latter, as being built on the natural condition and natural mind of men generally, presuppose in their dominions and dignities the ambitious and selfish use of power, as all experience shows. *Ye know:* this does not apply to the saying and doctrine as a whole, as if it meant, "I have already often said to you that your being great consists in being little." But it applies, as may be plainly seen, only to the first clause—Ye know well how it goes in the kingdoms of the world, particularly now under the dominion of the Romans; and, in addition to this, at all events in the background—Ye know it from yourselves, inasmuch as your conscience testifies that, by nature, ye would be no exception. The ἄρχοντες τῶν ἐθνῶν, "*princes of the Gentiles*," are called in Mark more precisely οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν, "*they which are accounted* to rule;" and this remarkable expression—be it originally from the mouth of Christ, or an amplification of the

* Luke, as he gives the saying which Christ uttered at the Supper, in nearly the same form as this, has here omitted the first statement of it.

Evangelist which truly corresponds to the meaning of Christ—calls for explanation. We admit the truth of Winer's remark when we, *in the first place*, grammatically interpret it of those who pass for the rulers of the nations, who are thus acknowledged, who have the concomitant respect and consideration (comp. Gal. ii. 2, 6, 9; Luke xxii. 24; and in the History of Susanna (ver. 5), οἱ ἐδόκουν ἡυβερνᾶν τὸν λαόν). But in this first, and so to speak uncondemning sense, which acknowledges the thing as it is, there yet lies a slight antithesis to the real and actual truth, in so far as the respect of outward acknowledgment before men is a πρόσωπον not respected of God (Gal. v. 6); the appearing as ruler is in fact only a seeming. Hence the Vulgate is right with its *qui videntur principari*, even were we further to understand *qui sibi videntur*.* For there corresponds to the outward seeming and acknowledgment an inward thinking and imagining themselves to be what they pass for; whoever has the power in his hands also fancies that he may arbitrarily use it; so that (*here* at least, where Christ speaks of the self-willed disposition and conduct of the rulers of the world) the δοκεῖν or "being accounted" passes ironically into the same signification which it has, for example, at Luke viii. 18; 1 Cor. x. 12.† Christ will have in his kingdom no mere δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν in any sense whatever, but true rulers in full right; in the one sole might of ministering love, which is then in reality only *his own*, the sole legitimate power of the one Ruler.‡ He will have no mere external dominion *over* men outwardly, without subjection of their hearts; no mere seeming and being called "great," without the inward dignity of real worth and pre-eminence. Therefore, of the rulers of the world it is κατακυριεύειν, "exercise dominion," and κατεξουσιάζειν, "exercise authority," that are used; κατά often denoting the bad side of the accompanying idea, for example in the word of Peter (1 Pet. v. 3), where there is perhaps an allusion to this saying of Christ. The second αὐτῶν seems indeed, like the first, to belong to ἐθνῶν—"over them" and "upon them," both referring to "the Gentiles"—and in the repetition at Luke xxii. 25, it is certainly not otherwise to be taken; still, we are disposed to pay some regard to Grotius, who *here* refers the second αὐτῶν to the ἄρχοντας just named—"upon them" to "the princes." There then arises without violence a still deeper sense, which certainly quite corresponds to the meaning of Christ. As the *rulers* or ἄρχοντες in general exercise their power over the nations, so, by way of recompense, the same thing happens to them from those who are *great* and *greater* among themselves, who, in turn, subdue and enslave the weaker; thus there is in the world a gradual scale according to which dominion is exercised in an ever ascending degree, just as any one is able to make himself *great*, and aims at making himself greater than others. Not so with you! Christ does not (for this would only be in turn to exercise dominion on his part) do away with all this striving on the part of the rulers and great ones upon earth, which proceeds from the natural disposition of men; but he builds his kingdom, in which the power of ministering love is the great ruling principle, in, and under, these historical forms of national government. He does not disturb political dignities from without, with all their degrees of rank and power, although unfortunately they carry in them ambition and self-will; but he heals and renews from within outwardly, inasmuch as he puts his humble disciples here and there in the place of rulers, and at all events prepares for them, even in this world, a dominion of spiritual power—until the σχῆμα, *the fashion* of this world shall pass away, when the order of the kingdom of God may be represented also outwardly. In *this* kingdom there are also degrees of rank and power, as we have already seen; for in this place our Lord does *not* say—With you let there be no μέγας or πρῶτος, no "great" or "first," let no one aim at becoming such! But as regards the warrant to aim at this, and the way of attaining to it, the matter stands inversely as compared with the kingdoms of this world: he who will *become* truly great (not merely be accounted, or imagine himself, great), let him earn this distinction as a *servant;* whoso will *be* truly the first, let him seek dignity and honor in deeper humiliation; so that he may, with willing love, yield himself as a *servant* or slave to the last and the least—without detriment to his freedom, which is rather thus made manifest (1 Cor. ix. 19). And this ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ, *he that will*, Christ proposes to them *all*, in order to heal and give a right direction to their strivings after greatness. To strive in *this way* after the highest honors and crowns of ministering love, with a holy sanctified ambition, the Lord here most earnestly summons all his disciples, setting before them the prize: "Go and serve; he who does this best shall be, and be called, the chief!"*

* With Von Gerlach: Those who think to rule, who imagine that they have right of dominion—we should not regard this however as precisely the first and sole meaning. Lange, on the other hand, sharply hits our interpretation in the expression, "the acknowledged phenomenal powers, those that seem to be, the princes in the world of appearance."

† Comp. again 1 Cor. xi. 16, where it is somewhat differently applied, viz., when any one fancies that he must now indeed quarrel.

‡ So, for example, Crusius: Christ Jesus will not suffer such a state of things; since *he indeed rules*, while mortal rulers only *seem* to rule.

* But how and wherein *serve?* As if this were not self-evident! "Does any one ask, How must the living man *express* his life, the strong his strength, the compassionate his compassion? If thou art but truly humble and willing to serve—thou shalt never be perplexed about the expression of thy humility and readiness to serve, any more than thine eye about the objects of seeing, or thine heart about room for beating" (Hafeli).

How, then, does the matter stand as regards priority of rank in the kingdom of God? In the first place—apart from those outward honors and offices which must exist in state and church for the sake of the order of this present state of things—all are now equal as brethren (Matt. xxiii. 8); equal in the humility which teaches every one to esteem every other better than himself (Phil. ii. 3). Thus, but only thus, does every one who is less participate notwithstanding in the general greatness and dignity which the full grace of the New Testament confers (Matt. xi. 11); he who will be this greater one, let him willingly be in his own eyes the lesser one! And then there is held out to all of us in the future the *one* common hope of our calling (Eph. iv. 4), and the Scripture speaks constantly of equal blessedness and glory. Peter is partaker with Christ, even as all are whom he calls his disciples (John xiii. 8; xvii. 10, 20, 24); all the children are also heirs (Rom. viii. 17); and all saints judge the world (1 Cor. vi. 2; Psa. cxlix. 9): there is only one universal kingly and priestly nobility belonging to all citizens of the kingdom (1 Pet. ii. 9; Rev. i. 5, 6). Such passages point to a future of final consummation, when God will be all *in all* (1 Cor. xv. 28); and, in view of this, even now a Paul, or Cephas, is not to be accounted of, for *all is yours* (1 Cor. iii. 21). On the other hand, differences, degrees, thrones, are elsewhere spoken of. The twelve shall sit upon their twelve thrones, and judge or govern—of course so long as there is any thing to judge or govern; and in this lies the solution of the question, how that equality is to be reconciled with these distinctions. In a preliminary period of the kingdom of glory upon earth—ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ—there will be the thrones, and the cities (Luke xix. 17, 19), and for a time yet first and last. To be first rather than last—to *attain* to the *first* resurrection (Phil. iii. 11), etc.—after this we ought all to strive with the holy zeal of serving; and we shall receive what is due, that for which the Father according to the measure of his gifts would prepare and has prepared us. No preference of any kind whatever comes from the arbitrary gift and favor of the King in this kingdom; but the Father's decree and our faithfulness in our own special calling prepare, for each one, his future place. There will, indeed, remain in eternity also the members of the one body appointed by God (1 Cor. xii. 18), heads and eyes, as also hands and feet; a *difference* in the end to be reached corresponds with the different ways that lead to that end, and *in so far* there will be a pre-eminence of some above others. Still in the final fulfillment there will be no actual precedence; all will be the entire body, the fulness of him who filleth all in all (Eph. i. 23). What remains for us to strive and pray for? Seek not to become an eye if thou art called and prepared to be a hand, but do not remain a foot if something higher is ordained for thee. Be faithful in thy grace and gift, so shalt thou become what thou canst and art to become; at the last thou shalt certainly be blessed in thy portion, and glorious in common with all. As some one has said: "To be willing to know nothing but Christ crucified, makes us capable of attaining to all knowledge"—so say we also: To be willing to become nothing but the least servant of all, makes us capable and worthy to become great and exalted. And this is what our Lord has here said, and what he forthwith seals with his own example as the Head and King.

Verse 28. The "come" points always to the first advent and appearance of the Son of Man in the flesh. The "not to be ministered unto" does not, of course, refer to an outward renouncing of every act of service offered to him in love, nay even demanded by his undeniable dignity (chap. xxvii. 55; Luke x. 40; John xiii. 13); so that neither is it forbidden to us to have men-servants and maid-servants, as helpers to serve in the earthly work. But it is all the more deeply to be understood in its innermost truth, according to which the Son of God, who is come as the Son of Man, sought not his own honor, used not his power as King in the manner of men (ver. 25), so as to cast all things in adoration at his feet, which alone had been the true service due to him, but—as it is written in Isa. xliii. 24, 25, of God the Lord. He has served us sinners in order to wash us from our sin, has become the servant and burden-bearer of us all; and this he sometimes represented outwardly in himself for a testimony (see Luke xxii. 27). He has *given his life for us*, or laid it down in self-sacrificing love (John x. 12, 18; xv. 13); and in so far this is also set before us as a pattern which we are to follow (1 John iii. 16). But while he at first speaks thus humbly, he must at the same time, for the truth's sake, add a word concerning the great and sole virtue and significance of *his* sacrificial death—which goes far beyond a mere example, by which rather the power and *liberty* to follow him have been procured for us all.* This high and comprehensive testimony is yet extorted from him here in the deepest humility, so that he may not deny himself. *Λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, a ransom for many*—this is as well the germ of all the apostolic doctrine concerning the vicarious sacrificial death, as also a mere declaration, with retrospective reference to the prophecies and types of the Old Testament: "I am he who is come, who also should and must come to that end!" It would be necessary here to enter into the dogmatics of the subject,

* Also the *liberty* of the Church, thus ransomed by him, to refuse to be enslaved by any hierarchy, always allied to despotism; the liberty to acknowledge only that authority which, as the diaconate of love, ever goes on renewing itself through the Spirit of Christ. See in Lange ii. 1154, this profound connection of the words with all that precedes (formerly overlooked by me); at the same time the most striking confirmation of the principle of office in the Reformed Church, in its proper truth as confuting many Lutherans.

and into the Old Testament as a whole, in order to bring out the full meaning of this simply expressive term λύτρον, "ransom" (which is afterwards carried out in the New Testament in many compounds); but what belongs to the commentator is only to point out the sense and idea of the saying in order to deeper inquiry. We find in Exod. xxi. 30 כֹּפֶר and פִּדְיוֹן נַפְשׁ (Sept. λύτρα) used for the *ransom* and equivalent of *forfeited life** in the proper sense; and in Lev. xxv. 24, 51 *the purchase-price* to be paid for a possession in land, according to just valuation, גְּאֻלָּה, is rendered by τὰ λύτρα in the Sept. When in this passage, with evident allusion for the rest to Isa. liii. 10, 12, the Holy Spirit in recording the saying of Christ uses the word λύτρον, for אָשָׁם (and לְכַפֵּר, כֹּפֶר, Lev. xvii. 11), where Christ himself of course did not use it, the expression points at all events to a substitutionary, therefore redeeming, and thus releasing, saving, sacrificial death of Christ—although much may still remain to be said from the entire Scripture, and much to be inferred from the internal nature of the thing, respecting the true sense in which this substitution is to be understood. The expression here, however definite on one side, yet determines nothing more special; and admits of every doctrine which is reconcilable with the rest of Scripture, and with the simple letter of the λύτρον ἀντί, "a ransom for" (as also the ἀντίλυτρον, 1 Tim. ii. 6, which occurs only there). Even should we attach the strict sense to this solitary ἀντί (for which in every other place we find ὑπέρ, περί, διά), as is right, it would still be going beyond what is proper to raise from it the difficult question, which can only give rise to endless disputation, namely, *to whom* properly the ransom and the purchase price of the one life for all lives is paid. The meaning of the expression—which remains always at the same time figurative—does not, as appears to us, reach so far; and the δοῦναι τὴν ψυχήν, "to *give* his life," which is always put as it is here, *without* a dative, is by no means in this sense to be pressed. It signifies to *yield up*, to give up to death, to offer, to stake for something else in general, as the Heb. נתן, and particularly Isa. liii. 10, 12, תָּשִׂים נַפְשׁוֹ——הֶעֱרָה לַמָּוֶת. Christ has thereby rendered satisfaction in every sense, and on all sides; he has given what corresponds to, and is necessary for, our redemption; chiefly, and in the last and most proper intention, however, he has given his life only in order to take it again as a life *for us*, consequently thereby to pay *to us*, so as to cover our deficit and bankruptcy. Finally, as regards the πολλῶν, "many," here and Matt. xxvi. 28 (comp. besides Heb. ix. 28), it is clear, from numerous parallel passages of Scripture (at the head of which is 1 Tim. ii. 6, ἀντίλυτρον ὑπέρ πάντων), that the universal application of the death of Christ (which, as Richter remarks, already lies in the ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, the universal man, the one for all) is certainly not to be denied on the ground of this expression; and consequently that the πολλοί here might well enough denote the πάντας, or *all* who stand in contrast with the one, as at Rom. v. 15, 18, 19. If, however, the want of the article here is specially noticed, then it only remains to understand it of the many among the all, in whom, as actually redeemed, the power of redemption becomes a reality. This will at least appear as the most probable sense at chap. xxvi. 28, on the occasion of the last supper (as also Heb. ix. 28); and it seems most exactly to correspond to the רַבִּים, Isa. liii. 11, 12 (comp. liii. 14, 15) *together with* the כֻּלָּנוּ, ver. 6.

* Not merely "the ransoming from the condition of slaves," as Lange here mistakes it.

THE TWO BLIND MEN AT JERICHO.

(Matt. xx. 32; Mark x. 51, 52; Luke xviii. 41, 42.)

Although the question whether Christ here spoke to two blind men or only to one, whether on departing from, or entering into Jericho, is beside our object, which is to hear him *speak*, it would yet be affectation not to express our opinion, at least in a brief note, respecting this difficulty—a difficulty so welcome to the disputatious, and certainly remarkable even to the peaceable and simple student of the Harmony.† In other respects, there is little to be said on the words of Christ which occur in this narrative. The *first*, in which he *called* to him the blind men, who so

† We have already found frequently that Matthew does not record outward events with strict precision, but that he is always intent upon grasping the kernel of the sayings, and upon seizing what is essential and significant in the history; it is therefore natural to expect that, here also, he should deviate from the actual facts. For Mark mentions the *one* blind man, who was healed as Christ *was departing from Jericho*, so decidedly by name, and describes the entire scene so particularly even to the throwing away of the garments, as to make us unwilling to admit that there was another blind man cured along with this Bartimeus. Luke again seems to narrate, quite as distinctly, a similar (although not quite the same) incident as having taken place when they were *entering into Jericho*

importunately cried to him (Matt. ver. 32), or bade them be called (Mark ver. 49; Luke ver. 40), is not expressed, but (kindly checking the people) may have run thus: "Hinder them not, let them come!" The *second* is given by the three Evangelists in harmony with each other, differing only as to the singular or plural: *What will ye that I shall do unto you?* It seems indeed a strange question. But it is partly a challenge to them to testify their faith (as at Matt. ix. 28); partly a protest against the self-constituted masters of ceremonies with their courtly ideas, who will not suffer the procession of the King to be interrupted by the prayer of the beggars*—an expression of his readiness to *serve* (beautifully corresponding with what precedes, Matt. ver. 28, comp. ver. 21), in which he, in a truly royal manner, condescends to the will of beggars, so that all misery may disappear before him; partly, in fine, a significant intimation for us (according to the unconsciously symbolical character of all the particular sayings and doings of Christ), that he will do to us only according to what our faith and our prayer desire of him. The *third* word (only in Mark and Luke) which accompanies the cure, *Go!* as one who is whole, who can see, *with thy sight! thy faith hath helped thee*—is the well-known, familiar expression of the gracious, humble love and wisdom of the Saviour, pointing, in what is outward, to the inward thing which is of principal importance. Ἀναβλέπειν means here simply to *look up*—by no means to see *again*, to *become* seeing. The blind man prayed: Lord, that I *may see!* Christ gives immediately hearing and answer: *See!* for *thou canst!*

CHRIST SENDS FOR THE ASSES.

(Matt. xxi. 2, 3; Mark xi. 2, 3; Luke xix. 30, 31.)

We do not know whether the two disciples whom Christ here sends were Peter and John, as on a former occasion, Mark xiv. 13, comp. Luke xxii. 8; but there must needs be two, not merely in order to bring the two asses, but in order formally to represent the entire body of his disciples, and to remove from their mission the appearance of individual caprice. The village lying in sight of them was certainly Bethphage itself, which Matthew therefore alone has named. It can hardly at least have been Bethany, as, from the exact knowledge which Christ had of this village, the indefinite nature of the message, nay, even the indefinite designation of the place, would have had somewhat of affectation in it.† In no case are we to understand a previous agreement with the owner of the asses; for then the indefinite words given by the three Evangelists, "If *any man* hath aught to say against it," would contain a slight semblance of dissimulation. All that he says rather produces the impression of a miraculous foreseeing and foretelling of the particular circumstances: the εὑρήσετε, *ye shall find* (to which therefore John, in a statement that concisely pre-sup-

(chap. xix. 1); so that one is tempted to suppose that Matthew, in this case, *blends together* the narratives of the two Evangelists, who were not apostles, on account of the similarity of the occurrences. (Rather this, at least, than the old solution which has been re-produced with more acuteness than evidence in Richter's *Hausbibel;* viz. that there was an intervening space between old and new Jericho, and that according to their position the inhabitants of Palestine might speak of departing from, and the Greek of entering into Jericho.) *But*, against this, is to be considered, what Matthew and Mark represent as very probable, that the great multitude had collected first of all in the town, with which Luke xix. also agrees; again that the people should twice, and chiefly the second time, *rebuke* the blind man, when one had been healed immediately before, is almost inconceivable, and not at all so simple as Ebrard thinks; finally, as regards only one blind man being noticed, namely, Bartimeus, who was the better known of the two, we have a perfect parallel to this in the account of the Gadarene miracle. Luke does not intend to be so strictly observant of chronological order; in order that he may significantly connect vers. 34 and 35 (as preachers from the earliest times have taken it, and have discoursed of our blindness with respect to the understanding of the passion of our Lord), he puts this incident first, and then lets that concerning Zaccheus follow. We are not, therefore, warranted in having recourse to the artificial expedient of Grotius, that ἐγγίζειν εἰς, Luke xviii. 35, as also xix. 2, indicates only the being near in general, but must leave its proper force to καὶ εἰσελθὼν, chap. xix. 1. Luke starts from the fact, that the one blind man actually sat already on the way, at the entrance into Jericho; but then he himself explains, by διαπορευομένου, ver. 35 (to which chap. xix. 1 διήρχετο in the Pluperf. recurs), that, in his account, he anticipates and combines what was further done afterwards on leaving Jericho (after a second blind man had come to be there). Thus we agree in the main with what Bengel's correct tact already discovered, and Meyer's note on Luke's account holds to be probable. Lange's supposition, of an entrance and departure by the same gate, we think forced and unnatural, as the road to Jerusalem by Jericho could hardly lead to and from that town as a *cul-de-sac.*

* Compare on this Lange, iii. 194, 347.

† According to Mark and Luke, in traveling to Jerusalem Bethphage came before Bethany, perhaps was immediately contiguous to it

poses this transaction, chap. xii. 14, gives prominence in a εὑρών which excludes all previous concert) is nearly the same as εὑρήσεις, *thou shalt find*, Matt. xvii. 27. The εὐθέως, *straightway*, occurring twice (the first, according to Mark, equivalent to εἰσπορευομένοι εἰς τὴν κώμην), together with the circumstance that the ass would be found *tied*, *i. e.*, as it were already prepared, and waiting in the public way, confirms this interpretation of the words, which is still further confirmed afterwards on occasion of the second sending for the preparation of the paschal lamb. Here it is said, "A man will meet you bearing a pitcher of water, he will show you the way to the right house," like what Samuel the *seer* says to Saul, 1 Sam. x. 2–7; a manner of prophecy in its most ancient form, pointing immediately and specially to the nearest future (before that typical kind which points to more remote periods begins in 2 Sam. vii.), which must also be represented in Christ. If the disciples should at first be almost suspected of the intention to steal the animals, a single word is to satisfy the owner (and whoever else might belong to him, Mark, ver. 5; Luke, ver. 33), viz., *The Lord* hath need of them! *Here* at all events more is meant than merely *our Master* (ὁ διδάσκαλος, chap. xxvi. 18); in the sense in which Christ here uses this name, it borders on the designation *the King Messiah*.* It is therefore implied in this, that these people belonged to the number of those who believed on him, that they at once understood who "the Lord" was, and without hesitation willingly served him.† Christ could not call himself the "Son of Man" here where in his humiliation he will yet represent his *kingly dignity*; but, precisely on this account, the *need of the Lord*, who has not even an ass of his own for his festal procession, presents a significant contrast which the preachers on the Advent from the earliest times have not failed to notice.

Whether Jesus during the whole period of his public life ever before *rode*, is no where written; and, from his walking being mentioned so often and without an exception, it is very improbable. Wherefore then now? He who can believe that our Lord was too tired at this particular time to ascend the Mount of Olives, may do so; his words, and the narrative in its harmony with the prediction, show something else. If Christ wanted as usual to enter the town unobserved, he would not have acted thus; but he will consciously and on purpose enter in a thoroughly public manner, raised above the accompanying crowd (so that it might not happen as at Luke xix. 3); he will go to meet the multitudes that are eagerly waiting for him, and who afterwards fetch him; and thus make the accepted honor on his part more expressive of humility, and more significant than it would have been without this provision. *More significant;* for what Matthew adds, vers. 4, 5, includes in the τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον, "but all this," (which points beforehand to the result), the *remarkable sending* just narrated; and is meant therefore precisely to disclose the *thoughts and design of Christ in all this*, as if it were said: Thus did Christ speak and act, that the word of the prophet might be fulfilled. He knew that his hour was nearly come; once more, before his crucifixion, he will enter Jerusalem with a first and last outward demonstration of honor, such as is proper to him as her King, with a last public offer of himself for a testimony. (*Tell ye* the daughter of Zion!) We do not agree with Lange, who regards this *Hosanna*—which from the earliest times in Advent sermons has been taken as a figure of empty honor without understanding and earnestness—in the better sense, as an expression of "obscure beginnings of the higher Christological knowledge," of the "better hopes of the people;" and supposes that Christ could not any longer refuse the "enthusiasm, the homage of his people." No! it appears very evident from Luke xix. 41, etc., that Christ regarded the whole matter in quite a different light; his entry was rather a sacrificial procession, in which he yielded himself up to *this* people, who cried now Hosanna! and then Crucify! Yet so that, at least in the symbolical sense, such a homage was for once admitted by him, at the last *offer* of himself as King. Therefore, although even his disciples misunderstand it, he regards the whole event in its true light. Any insurrection on the part of those whose enmity has ripened, is now no longer to be regarded; the license attending the festival, which brought with it the entrance of many a procession into Jerusalem, permits what is unusual, so that even Pilate finds nothing offensive in this mere spectacle.* Only the enemies (who indeed could not possibly put these thousands under ban) murmur at it. The whole scene, as already said, becomes for him a *sacrificial procession*, to which he yields himself. To the people of Israel it is the last official declaration—Who he is; while for the entire *future* Church of *his* true people (the daughter of Zion in the prophetical sense) it is a permanent advent word and advent figure, ever reproduced in preaching, in which there

* For it is impossible (with Alford) to understand here Jehovah, the God of Israel, for whose service the animals were needed. If it were so, this would be the third example of such an expression in the mouth of Christ; see Mark v. 19, and xiii. 20 (compare my remark, p. 147); here, however, it would surely be against all decorum to say, *God the Lord* hath need of two asses!

† Indeed the communist Weitling, in his book on *Freedom*, finds here maintained the right of those who are in want to the possessions of their rich neighbors; and laments that, now-a-days, when we have become so much more refined, the Lord and his messengers who should act in this manner would be seized by the neck and accused of theft.

* Consequently nothing really punishable. Bahrdt very perversely found in this entry the design on the part of Jesus to *stir up* his enemies, and furnish them even with the *right* to accuse him—because he had now resolved to die (a false death!).

is a wondrous union of majesty and lowliness: *Behold, thy King cometh, meek!*—a preparatory type of the as yet future acknowledgment and glory of Christ (Matt. xxiii. 39).* All this is no strange product of a myth-framing Church, of the self-consciousness dreaming that the idea is history; *it took place*, γέγονεν, as recorded there in its consistent totality—the empty Hosanna before the Crucify! the tears over Jerusalem, the cleansing of the temple, the blind and lame, the children crying in the temple, the curse on the fig-tree. What a picture, intelligible only when viewed as actual history in the life of the Son of God! And how does the pencil of the Evangelist portray by a few strokes—how simply and artlessly, without a trace of imagination—what, if not history, would be the sublimest fiction!

It is evident that the fulfilled prophecy of Zechariah described generally the *Messiah*, as the humble Prince of Peace, procuring *deliverance* for himself and us only through *sufferings*. But it is also evident that, as often, so here, the fulfilling Providence, for the sake of abundant clearness, literally embodies the general idea; and in like manner that this literal realization in fact of the general prediction was already foreseen and provided for by the Spirit in the word of the prophet. The sum of the prophecies of Zechariah is the re-establishment of the kingdom of Israel in its entire preparation, accomplishment, and connection; and with this such special historical notices are interspersed as were never before given, in order that the whole prophecy, as it draws near its fulfillment, may become concentrated. In the first section (chaps. i.—viii.) we have the whole history of the return from Babylon, with its principal agents and actors, as the type of the future return of Israel from its dispersion; and the view becomes ever clearer until it ends in a complete picture of the new Jerusalem (chap. viii.). The second section (chaps. ix.—xiv.) now entirely separates this great result from its type, and speaks plainly of the new Jerusalem seen in the remote future; instead of direct reference to the typical restoration the Spirit gives general surveys, and retrospective glances towards the time of preparation. If at last (chaps. xii.—xiv.) the retrospective views from the attained goal predominate, there lie on the other hand in chaps. ix.—xi. intimations of the entire history of Israel, until chap. xii. 10 is fulfilled.† Chap. ix. gives beforehand the most general view. The Lord governs all men and nations according to the plan of his counsel with respect to Israe (ver. 1). Purifying judgments upon the nations of the world run parallel and in harmony with the special protection which he affords to *his* house and people chosen before and out of the nations (ver. 8). In a *first* coming, marked by lowliness and peacefulness (which is plainly and significantly looked back to here), *the King* appears—he *first* (because Israel rejects him) builds up his promised kingdom among all *the heathen* (ver. 10)—he then returns again also to Israel (vers. 11–17). That ver. 9 speaks of the Messiah is so evident from ver. 10, that even Maurer could only render it: "veniet rex optimus maximus, Messias pacem daturus orbi terrarum, dominaturus longe lateque." But that this *King* appears here in *lowliness* is the principal idea (to which the learned commentators have scarcely given its due weight) of this prophetical passage. As such it stands alone in its kind; and its expressions must, for this reason, embody themselves in some visible symbol before the eyes of Israel.* The נוֹשָׁע,† *saved* ("having salvation"), which by the Sept. and Chald. was not understood, and therefore ungrammatically changed into the Active, is not equivalent to *victorious*—at least with reference to earthly weapons of victory, for the ass is intended exactly to contradict this—but is to be closely connected with the decisive עָנִי, "lowly." Let it be allowed, which *we* do not with many deny, that עָנִי and עָנָו to a certain extent run into each other, and that the πραΰς, "meek," of the Sept., retained by Matthew, is at least half warranted, there still remains for the Old Testament usage (especially that of the Psalms) the basis of "humility and meekness" (if עָנִי is made to include the latter), a condition of *distress* and *suffering*, a being humbled and brought low.‡ The righteous *King* is therefore first a meek sufferer, to whom *deliverance comes* first of all from his own sufferings, that he may thereby procure salvation and deliverance, in order to righteousness and peace, for all his people—thus, and no otherwise, does he *come* the first time. In order to furnish a complete and graphic picture of this, the prophet portrays him riding—not upon the war horse (Rev. xix. 11), but upon an ass's colt, as in olden time the judges (Judges x. 4; xii. 14; v. 10); and again because this ass, to which, by a redundancy of words, such strong prominence is

* Of this, the only true view of the matter, Hase gives a *caricature* when he says that, among Christ's reasons for this demonstration, there was perhaps the pleasure of showing to his enemies their weakness, and letting that which *at one time* he had positively *meant*, according to Old Testament prophecy, come to pass in him as a *dream* of its fulfillment! It is rather a new typical prophecy, that he yet remains the King.

† We are prepared with an interpretation of chap. xi. which will rescue it from Hofmann's confusion; and shall give it on Matt. xxvi. 31.

* Of which the Jewish interpretation could make no use; so that it explains thus: When Israel believingly receives the Messiah, then he comes in the clouds of heaven; but when they are not worthy of this, on an ass. See the citations in Sepp, iii. 183.

† Luther incorrectly, *ein helfer, bringing help;* instead of which the corrected Bible has *dem geholfen ist, one who is holpen.* The citation of Matthew goes beyond the δίκαιος καὶ σώζων.

‡ Passive of ענה; the form is קָטוּל=קָטִיל.

given, forms, so to speak, the point of the prophecy, *therefore* does Christ determine, according to the plan of the Spirit, to realize this prophetic figure. Thus must we understand Zechariah, in order to interpret the words of Jesus here (vers. 2, 3). John (chap. xii. 14–16) even mentions only the riding upon the ass, as the most concentrated fulfillment Matthew, in the saying of Christ, as afterwards in the narrative (ver. 7), specifies exactly the two animals which the prophetic word mentions. Mark and Luke have only the colt. That the prophet adds the וְעַל עַיִר, *and upon a colt*, epexegetically, is indeed true; as also that בֶּן־אֲתֹנוֹת* "the foal of an ass," is intended to strengthen the עַיִר, or colt, which in other places is often equivalent to חֲמוֹר or ass, in general—in the most proper sense a *foal*, which is still dependent on its mother (πῶλος νέος). Wherefore this, and what is the prophetical idea implied in it; what is then the significance of this particular which was foreseen only as a symbol? We find the plain answer in Mark and Luke, where Christ says further: A foal *on which never yet man sat*. This, as Maurer again observes, is actually indicated in the prophecy; and even in the citation in Matthew (which half *changes*, half accepts the text of the Sept.) it is remarkably caught up in the slight antithesis υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου (lit. "the son of *a beast of burden*"). Only an animal hitherto unridden is proper to the sacred dignity of the rider; comp. Num. xix. 2–5; Deut. xxi. 3; 1 Sam. vi. 7; 2 Sam. vi. 3, and many passages from profane authors, rightly adduced here by the learned. Observe now how the *Holy Spirit*—without regarding the objections of those sneering persons who will not allow that such things are proper to him—yet above and behind the consciousness of the prophet, points, in the expressions which he suggests, to a literal proper fulfillment; inasmuch as he brings in this subordinate idea, which was not otherwise of importance to the principal subject. Observe also why Christ, penetrating into the meaning of the Scripture better than the critics, gives directions for *both animals*, which the Father has made ready for him, *to be brought:* why the disciples, without thinking of Zechariah (John xii. 16), were unwittingly led to spread the garments over both (Matt. ἐπάνω αὐτῶν), and thus to take with them also the she-ass as belonging to the other, and to be used along with it.* *All this was done*, not merely in order that the not yet broken foal, when its mother was beside it, might behave more quietly, but that the whole prophetic passage might appear before the eyes of the daughter of Zion in a realized picture. He who will call this trifling, let him indulge his sneer against Christ. We rather perceive and reverently honor the holy earnestness of the King, who humbly *offers* himself, in this most literal fulfillment of a prophecy which testifies of him—in that he paints and *sets evidently forth before their eyes* (Gal. iii. 1; Luke xix. 42), how *he cometh to them.*

THE DEN OF ROBBERS, AND THE CHILDREN'S PRAISE.

(Matt. xxi. 13–16; Mark xi. 17; Luke xix. 46.)

Another יָבֹא (he shall come) stood at the close of prophecy in Malachi: The Lord shall come to his temple to purify and to cleanse the sons of Levi. Once already, at the beginning of his course, had Christ held this up before them in act and symbol; they, however, had persisted more determinedly in not abiding the day of his coming, they had not put away the offence, perhaps even had precisely at this time restored it by way of defiance. Here he declares and proves by his act, that he is at the end no other than he was at the beginning. He still works while it is day; he is not weary of testifying by word and deed in the still standing sanctuary—"once more he goes the way which he had loved as a child, up to the temple."† Nay, *once more*, his zeal breaks forth against the desecration of the temple; the place of worship still, though

* The Plur. for the Sing. by way of generalizing. Only such interpreters as Jahn and Michaelis could suppose blood asses with pedigrees to be meant!

† In August Thieme's *Ilmenaur Sermons*, p. 35.

* We prefer to let alone the typological significance which commentators, from the earliest times, have found in the two asses (Von Meyer: The she-ass is the Old Testament, the law; the foal is the new Church, the Gospel). That the she-ass was led along with the other not merely *causa pompae*, but was intended to embody the prophetic figure, is remarked also by Hengstenberg (*Christol.* ii. 135); as also that in the prophet there is a *gradation* in the expression. But we do not agree in this, that the climax (an animal upon which no man had ever yet ridden!) is intended to indicate *merely* greater lowliness, poverty. For the rest, it is well known what needless trouble many commentators have given themselves to account for there being two animals, and what subject for mockery this has afforded to Strauss. Schleiermacher also gives the reins to his fancy: "The she-ass no longer runs beside a πῶλος that is fit for riding—although it has not yet been used for that purpose—but has long since left it to itself." Neander is so bold as to make John xii. 14 (only one ὀνάριον) valid

soon to be destroyed.* Matthew represents the order of the events as if this cleansing of the temple followed on the day of the entrance into Jerusalem. According to Mark our Lord began to *look round about* upon all things with rebuking glance at the eventide; but "on this day of grace and joy delayed the complete execution of his righteous anger till the morrow." This notice of Bengel as to the harmony is quite sufficient [?]. More severe than on that former occasion (as we remarked there), he now speaks out plainly, and without softening the prophetical word, of the *den of robbers;* and with heightened emotion he combines with it another prophetical passage in most rebuking contrast. This word respecting the *house of prayer*, pointing back, properly speaking, to the consecration, 1 Kings viii. 29, is written in Isa. lvi. 7; Christ cites it as it is written, so that it is wrong to refer "*My* house" here to himself. *Be called* in truth—*i. e.*, really *be;* hence, in Luke, *ἐστίν, is*, is put for this. Mark, in order to complete the saying, forgets not to add, *among all nations;* and this also was very appropriate, as it was in the fore-court of the Gentiles that the money-changers and traders were.† In Jer. vii. 11, מְעָרַת פָּרִצִים, *den of robbers*, corresponds also by ironical antithesis to the *house* of the Lord, for the *den* of robbers is *their* dwelling. If we adhere to the most direct meaning of *λῃσταί, thieves*, then the profane trafficking in the temple would be compared to the division of the spoil of robbers in their den. But the corresponding פָּרִצִים in the original text means in itself more than this—viz., violent ones (as ravenous beasts, Isa. xxxv. 9), and passes over to the accompanying idea of *murderers* (as also the expression *Räuber* in German), see Ezek. xviii. 10; Hos. iv. 2; Psa. xvii. 4. Moreover, in the context in Jeremiah the shedding of innocent blood *in this place* is expressly spoken of, ver. 6, and רֶצַח, *murder*, at ver. 9 (comp. again Hos. iv. 2). Consequently Luther's "*den of murderers*" is quite right; and our Lord, by applying this word on this occasion, not merely chastises the murderous disposition and conduct of the dwellers in the temple in general, but now hints in the deepest sense, and more plainly than the first time (Destroy this temple!), at the now almost matured counsel of murder against his own most sacred person, which he well knew of. And this therefore Mark, ver. 18, and Luke, ver. 47, make immediately to follow.

The angry and rebuking zeal for his Father's house is at the same time accompanied by so much kindness, that the blind and lame, the wretched who need help, now as usual come to him, and he heals them.* It is the one unvarying love, the one unvarying testimony: "I am he who should come!" The miserable, and the little children, are not afraid of his anger; but malignant enemies are again angry even at his kindness. The miracles of healing—and the thanksgivings which probably followed them—the praises of those that were healed and others with them, waken in the *children* the echo of yesterday's homage, whose Hosanna, with the palm branches and all the accompanying pomp, so pleased them that doubtless they heartily joined in the cry yesterday, and are quite ready to begin it anew to-day.† Christ, with a sad kindness, lets it be done again; but the innocent cry of the children excites a blind fury in the high priests and scribes, because their conscience hears in it the truth which they would stifle. As several of the Pharisees yesterday expected that Christ would rebuke his disciples, and received for answer a proverb from the Scripture indirectly applied (Luke xix. 39, 40)—so the rulers of the temple venture to-day to put the bold question, *Hearest thou not what these say?* As if it were evident of itself that he must check this impropriety! Christ, however, is not weary of answering. With another question, *Have ye never read?* he puts to shame the adversaries, and recompenses their malice with a piece of instruction, profoundly pointing to Scripture, to their hearts, and the counsel of God respecting his kingdom—a lesson by which they might yet have become wise. He has the Scripture, especially since Luke xviii. 13, continually in his mind; at every step he directs his course by the light of its prophecy.

As he afterwards, Matt. xxi. 42, refers to an undoubtedly Messianic psalm, so now, with the same formula of interrogation, he refers not merely to a general truth respecting the

against the truth of Matthew's account; who, he says, has invented the two animals from a misapprehension of the passage in Zechariah (also the *αὐτῶν* and *αὐτούς*, verse 3, in the mouth of Christ!). These theologians have not understood the *ἵνα πληρωθῇ*.

* That Sepp, who is so often confused and arbitrary (and who has no right to sum up "a catalogue of the sins of Protestant theologians"), should suppose only *one* purifying of the temple, because "the second is in itself out of place, and takes away the significance of the first"—does not astonish us. But that Lange, following modern criticism, should in like manner hold that the occurrence, which might "easily be by degrees shifted from its place in the tradition," took place only once according to John—did surprise us; but he has since retracted it.

† Lange even finds here, that now in the *second* purifying Christ openly maintains the right of the *Gentiles* to the temple.

* Neander, indeed, does not altogether believe this account on Matthew's word alone, as it narrates "in an indefinite manner" and evidently "unhistorically;" what is true in it to him is only that the like did once take place in Jerusalem. Ah, if the sainted Neander could only now speak, and, for our sakes, retract these his follies!

† This alone and nothing further is contained in the simple account. Sepp in his usual manner (in which one must always prudently distinguish respectable learning from confused mythology) brings forward Jewish fables of holy temple-boys who, moved by the Holy Ghost, had received Jesus.

praise of God proceeding from the mouth of children, but to a psalm which, in the most proper sense, prophesies of him and his kingdom. In order not to repeat myself, I beg the reader to look into my interpretation of the eighth psalm,* where it is shown from the entire connection of the psalm that the ordained *praise*, according to the Sept., or rather the settled *power*, according to the original text, refers to the kingdom of restoring grace in the humbled and exalted Son of Man, to the destroying and putting to shame of the enemies, nay, of the enemy of God, in the most proper sense; and that the *babes* and *sucklings*, while not to be dissociated from the natural figure, are already in the psalm to be certainly understood spiritually of the same *μικροί* and *νηπιοί*, "little ones" and "babes," who are meant in Matthew xi. 25. "The outward fulfillment of the prophecy is, as oftentimes" (for example in the riding upon the ass just before), "only itself again a figurative representation of its inner sense." Neither Umbreit nor Hengstenberg nor De Wette can make me waver in this view of the whole psalm, and of this citation from it in particular; which is too firmly settled in the childlike understanding of the entire Church of the faithful from the earliest times, and too closely agrees with the prevailing application of it in preaching, not to be found true when a true exegesis is applied to it. De Wette, who is the master of shallow criticism, first, in complete contradiction to the light in which Scripture was understood by Christ and his apostles†, invents a "hebraism" which exists no where but in the fancy of a false theology, and then goes on to say that the Messianic sense of the eighth psalm vanishes and is lost. It is not however an isolated Von Meyer, or R. Stier, who understands this psalm in the sense we have assigned to it; but the simplicity of the faithful, which no learning can overthrow, has with one voice always so taken it. So Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 27; Heb. ii. 6; Eph. i. 22; and before him the Lord Christ in his supreme authority. What otherwise would be the intermediate link between the citation and the words with which it is introduced—*Have ye never known!*—which he ordinarily uses only when they are very definitely appropriate? And is it not theological in the genuine sense to receive such an interpretation as agrees with the apostolical testimony, seeing that Christ himself refers us to the Scripture interpretation of his apostles, which they had learned in his own school?

We cannot help, therefore, plainly seeing (as is declared in the Epistle to the Hebrews), that the Son of Man in Psalm viii. is *Jesus;* and therefore also, in the fact of Christ's citing from this psalm and from no other, a Messianic meaning in the cited words. Nay more, we are so bold as to affirm that the *Hosanna to the Lord out of the mouth of children*, which, in the outward special fulfillment, is again figuratively prophetic, is not indeed precisely meant by the words of the psalm. It was the truth thus symbolized which was meant; and this *special literal fulfillment* by the children themselves was seen beforehand by the Spirit, not otherwise than the riding upon the ass in Zechariah. There is a style of vague interpretation in which the *prophesying* word evaporates in the mist of ideal *presentment;* and it consistently maintains that *no where* in the consciousness of the prophets or in the intention of the Spirit is Christ seen and characterized as a historical person, and in his historical reality. But we ever assert, in opposition to this, that it is precisely the figure of the person of him who is to come in which *all* prophetic lines meet, in ever-growing accomplishment. Because every thing is really included in the person of Christ, the God-Man, the Spirit must prophesy of his person; and in the consciousness of the Spirit of Christ (1 Pet. i. 11) every thing of course is definite, concrete, special; the indefinite lies only in the human understanding. For what could be purely accidental, and not significant, not fraught with eternal truth, in the life of him who is God-Man, and in the relations of that life to the world? Where then the prophetic word surprisingly coincides with apparently accidental details and outward particulars of the fulfillment, in such places there is rather disclosed to our dull sight the profound congruence between prophecy and fulfillment which was absolutely inherent in the eternal decree of God. Thus does *Christ* look into the entire Scripture, which testifies of him; thus has he at hand, at every turn and step of his history, the fulfillment of some prophecy. He knows, and testifies, that those things were written of John the Baptist which they did to this Elias (Mark ix. 13)—how much more the things that were written of his own person! In the sacred farewell hour of the last supper he cites the 41st psalm with reference to Judas; in the intercessory prayer (John xvii. 12) he recurs again to the same prophecy; the being reckoned among transgressors in Isaiah he refers (Luke xxii. 37) most concretely to his then impending seizure and execution as a criminal, just as he refers a saying of Zechariah (Matt. xxvi. 31), if possible still more specially isolated, to his being forsaken by his disciples on this night. All these details carry indeed their *significance* in themselves; just as here Christ sees, in the Hosanna of the children, the power and honor which all his enemies cannot overcome, and which the Father will prepare for him out of the mouth of his babes. But for this very reason does he apply to this the corresponding word of prophecy; and *to the end* that this should happen to him *was the word written.*

---

* *Seventy Selected Psalms*, Second Part.

† This commentator goes so far as not to find the suffering Messiah at all in the Old Testament, and thereby to contradict to his face the word of Christ as he enters upon his sufferings, nay, of the risen Lord! See his most unedifying "*Beilage*—über die erbauliche Erklarung der Psalmen!"

THE FIG-TREE—THE POWER OF FAITH AND PRAYER.

(Matt. xxi. 19–22; Mark xi. 14, 22, 26.)

The weeping over the city at his entry; the anger at the desecration of the house of God; the cursing of the barren fig-tree—these three things are connected together in the relation of a climax. The eye of Christ already indeed sees beforehand the judgment of Jerusalem and Israel, when, first of all, he sheds tears of divinely-human emotion over its blinded inhabitants. Then, to speak humanly of the God-Man, he girds himself to renew by word and deed the testimony which is not yet to be abandoned, and which is yet to awaken and terrify some. In this, however, his holy judicial anger at last breaks out; that anger which will send forth his armies to destroy these murderers (chap. xxii. 7), must even curse those who would not receive the blessing. This so entirely fills his soul, that every where he has before his eyes only Israel, the barren ground that is nigh unto cursing (Heb. vi. 8). He sees it and prophetically curses it in the *fig-tree* which presented to him on the way leaves, indeed, but no fruit. The cleansing of the temple, and the cursing of the fig-tree—the former still an act reserved for the last day of visitation, the latter a warning figure for the coming that was to follow it—are parallel with and supplementary to each other; as also the accepting of the Hosanna and the tears over Jerusalem, the tears and the anger in the temple, the anger and the healing of the diseased, the saving love and the avenging wrath in the same divinely-human heart.

Mark has so exactly determined the chronology of this event from the most certain sources (vers. 11, 12, 19, 20), that we may adopt it in our interpretation of the account of Matthew, who here groups together in large proportion, and is careless of chronology in details. As he has already *by anticipation* made the cleansing of the temple, which belongs to the second day, to follow immediately upon the entry into the city (for the two days were as one day), so he records further (vers. 17, 18), only with general indefiniteness, that Jesus at that time passed the night (once and again) in Bethany, and that the cursing of the fig-tree took place πρωΐας, *i. e.*, "on the morning," or *a* morning, upon his return to the city. In like manner, at vers. 19, 20, disregarding the time in the thing, he connects together without interval the immediate withering of the tree and the words of Jesus to the disciples who observed it; although we learn from Mark, that not till the third day (Tuesday), was the withering which followed upon the curse *observed*, and that thereupon the words of Christ were spoken. The comparison of the two, however, ought to teach us what is most essential for our reading and hearing aright the doings and sayings of Christ, and that the first Evangelist has written his history not without freedom in the Spirit.

Jesus saw a fig-tree* in the way (at a distance); a single tree, probably belonging to no one in particular (μίαν again not merely equivalent to τινά), which, from the place where it stood, and still more by its adornment of leaves, attracted attention, and promised fruit. Christ, who, on his royal day of honor, had fasted in the sadness of his soul, and who also, on this morning, went with eagerness immediately again to the city,† felt hunger, and went up to the tree *if haply he might find any thing thereon*, as the leaves at a distance promised. For, in fig-trees, it is well known that the fruit ripens before the leaves appear: and although Christ might not look for fruit of the previous year, which had survived the winter, or late fruit (which could hardly have been allowed to lie on the way), he might yet expect to find early, unusually early,‡ figs: At all events the tree, as *having leaves*, which Mark specially notices, gave promise of having fruit also. Our Lord, however, found *nothing but leaves only*. The tree therefore was a barren one, which went all to foliage; it promised something extraordinary, and yet—had nothing, *just like the rest of the fig-trees at that time.*§ Upon this he said:

* Bethphage, indeed, derived its name from there being many figs there.

† This is more probable than, as Lange thinks, "a truly childlike longing" after his people, which led him to forget his morning meal.

‡ In the Heb. בִּכּוּרוֹת or בְּכוּרוֹת Hos. ix. 10; Isa. xxviii. 4; Jer. xxiv. 2, such as are particularly sought after.

§ This last might be the simple meaning of the much disputed οὐ γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς σύκων—even were we to translate, It was *not yet* the season of figs. "The vintage was not yet; the figs, therefore, were not yet gathered"—is not so suitable, for early ripe figs might certainly be plucked. But it may also signify, as Hammond first understood it, and many after him (so that in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, i 131, it should not be spoken of as a new interpretation): It was then no good season or favorable weather for figs, no fig-year. At all events the statement of Mark is not "somewhat inappropriate," but explains with an entirely correct γάρ why there were then no figs; this however is *meant*, Therefore the tree covered with leaves was a hypocrite, which promised something uncommon, and yet—was like the rest. This and nothing else is the *symbolical* fault of this tree, respecting which even Spener must needs express a theological difficulty (see the complete third edition, Part i. p. 13), and acknowledge that Christ had on this occasion divested himself of his omniscience when he expected fruit. A curiosity of more recent time is the observation of Fritzsche: ἦλθεν ἐπ' αὐτήν. *conscendit* arborem, non enim nisi conscensa ficu

Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward—or, *No man eat fruit of thee hereafter, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα!* He spoke it in the consciousness, and with the will that the tree he addressed must and would obey his word; the stern word of might and miracle broke forth like a lightning flash of judgment from the depth of his thoughts, which, in every object, found only the one thing, the inevitably impending judgment upon the people of God. Thus does he work the only miracle of punishment that is recorded of him (for in that of the devils in the swine there was no punishment, but only a permission); it is done symbolically, however, to the tree, as a testimony for men.* All sorts of reasons to account for this action of Christ, well-meaning, though very mistaken, have been forced upon it; as, for example, that it was in order to strengthen the weak faith of the disciples for the Passion-week, as indeed he immediately afterwards speaks of faith; or, to remove, by a manifestation of his divine power, the offence occasioned by the exhibition of his human weakness in the hunger which unconsciously sought food, etc. What is true in these conjectures is true only because of that manifold significance of all the words and works of the Redeemer, which must, from their very nature, belong to them; but of any conscious aim at such subordinate effects it would be wrong to speak in connection with this word, which was spoken only with one view, and sprang only from one thought, viz., *This tree is Israel!* Already, at Luke xiii. 6–9, had he uttered the parable prepared in the prophets (Hos. ix. 10; Joel i. 7), and his present action recalls this to mind.† There were *leaves* enough —words and hypocritical works; as if it were really the Israel which it was called to be, the people of God wonderfully ripened earlier than all other nations—but no *fruit!* We feel the depth of this symbol. It corresponds to the fact in this also (as Neander has well observed), that, notwithstanding the show of leaves, the internal unsoundness which must be assumed in the tree, was only hastened to a crisis that must have come in the course of nature. If in the parable just mentioned our Lord speaks, with the Baptist's word, concerning the *last* judgment as a *cutting down*, there meets us here, on the other hand, the curse of permanent unfruitfulness as a *first* judgment. May it not be said that Christ can at first punish obstinate sinners only by giving them up and leaving them to their sin, by rejecting and forsaking them? A striking prophetic word speaks also of this: "I the Lord have dried up the green tree, and made the dry tree to flourish" (Ezek. xvii. 24). Perhaps this passage also was particularly present to the mind of our Lord, for we may almost suppose that he on every occasion remembered every Scripture that was exactly appropriate to what he did. Enough that he himself tells us once more in Matt. xxiv. 32, what the *fig-tree* is; nay, shows to us (as will there appear) in the remote background the removal of the curse, the "for ever" of which—*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*—is therefore to be taken only with the Old Testament limitation.*

And the fig-tree *withered away παραχρῆμα*, on the spot, directly upon the word—so says Matthew, and hastens, passing over a day and a night, to the astonished exclamation of the disciples *when they saw it* (ver. 20); for the *πῶς*, *how*, denotes only such an exclamation, not expressly a question. We know that it cannot be the design of an Evangelist thus artificially to produce the appearance of a *greater* miracle (as we in our folly speak), while certainly the *παραχρῆμα*, *immediately*, here repeated to the disciples sounds as if the withering had taken place suddenly, in a moment. So should we understand it without Mark, whose account leaves us at liberty to suppose that the tree withered away *ἐκ ῥιζῶν* gradually, till the following day.† But yet we are only permitted to suppose this, for the disciples paid no further attention to the tree on the day before, they did not look for its *withering away*, which, indeed, did not expressly lie in the curse. How, then, if the *παραχρῆμα* of Matthew were literally true? If the tree not merely forthwith or momentarily *faded* or *began* to wither—but was withered at the very moment? We ought to learn, that it is all one here whether we suppose it to have followed in one minute, or in four and twenty hours; we should lay aside the foolish conception of greater or lesser miracles, nay, an idea of miracles in general, which is foreign to the entire Scripture, and to the Gospels in particular; and should think not so much of the registering of outward events and more of perceiving and understanding their spiritual import. *This* Matthew brings prominently out, he specifies the *withering away* of which the word of Christ had not spoken, but which was added for the more abundant fulfillment of that word, and as an outwardly corresponding proof of the certain curse that had been pronounced: "No fruit henceforward!" See how effectual thy curse

eam fructibus destitutum esse cognoscere potuit. To which again Hase says: "Then might the explainers of the miracle show beautifully how the tender tree came to be destroyed."

* Therefore neither did he "sin against nature" (for which reason Hase will not accept the account); nor did he show a "want of culture" (according to Strauss); nor an unbecoming revenge (according to Woolston); nor even inflict any injustice upon the owner of the tree. He performed a work of sublime power, prophesying in highest dignity.

† Without our being under the necessity (with Hengstenberg) of supposing the somewhat far-fetched reference, namely, that the figure, Micah vii. 1, was to be embodied.

* Luke xxiii. 31 has also a certain connection with Israel's withering, although, as being generally proverbial, it reaches further and deeper, and finds its nearer parallels in Ezek. xx. 47; xxi. 3.

† *From the roots upward*—this is more than if it were said, *Even* to the root—as it is very inaccurately rendered.

has been! the disciples say within themselves, and continue in this astonishment. They do not ask, Why hast thou done this, and what is it to signify? Christ therefore gives them no information on these points. In their exclamation lies concealed only the question, How can such a thing happen to a tree at a word of the Lord? and to this his answer corresponds.

He *repeats* to them (as we now know that he was always ready to do) that word, spoken at chap. xvii. 20, concerning the power of faith over nature and the creature, the omnipotence of perfect undoubting faith, which can command so that every thing must yield that lies in the way of its will.* Every opinion which dogmatically protests against the clearly confirmed analogy between the miracle-working of Jesus and that of his disciples, and which affirms that our Lord did not perform his miracles by faith, is to be rejected. How could he perform them otherwise, if he performed them as man? The faith of the Son of God, as the alone perfect faith, is rather set before us, in the Forerunner and Beginner, as a pattern of perfection (Eph. iv. 13). The connection here in the words, *Not only this which is done to the fig-tree*, is quite the same as at John xiv. 12, where the grand idea in its universality and depth will demand our interpretation. The ἐὰν ἔχητε in Matt. is again, as at chap. xvii. 20, to be taken emphatically—*If ye have* always your usual faith at hand, and ready for exercise, without disturbing and weakening doubt—this we learn from the imperative ἔχετε in Mark, which is to be understood only in this sense—*Have*, hold fast, keep, exercise and use only (your ordinary) *faith in God!* (Πίστιν Θεοῦ, is of course the Genit. objecti, as Acts iii. 16; Gal. ii. 20.) *Faith in God* stands, with strong emphasis, in opposition to *trust in the creature*, to that doubtful looking to the powers of nature and the creature which forgets or doubts the free power of God—as if those powers of the creature were any thing in themselves, as if it were not self-evident that they obey every believing human will that is in harmony with the will of God, just in the same way as they obey their Creator in general. Such faith in God is the innermost root and the living subsistence of all faith; faith in Christ also develops itself only from it, and rests upon it as its foundation. This our Lord declares also to his disciples (John xiv. 1) for their comfort and encouragement, presupposing the faith which they already have in God; just as here, Mark xi. 22, the πίστις Θεοῦ is first the faith in God's power, which was certainly not wanting to the disciples, but then the ἔχειν is to make it thoroughly living and perfect. We say, indeed, many or all of us, not without truth, "I believe in God!" but Christ says to us here, if *that* is really and entirely true, then are ye lords over the creature. As, at John xiv. 13, 14, *prayer* follows immediately upon the working of miracles, so here. For, in the first place, "prayer is the utterance of faith, and faith the soul of prayer" (as Rambach says); there can then be no saying with effect to the mountain, Be thou removed! without a laying hold on the power of God *by prayer*, in that command. Even when the Son, in his humanity, said, "Lazarus, come forth!" this was accompanied by the words, "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me!" Even those words of boldest faith which break forth from us with sudden vehemence, and in which we too bid mountains or trees (Luke xvii. 6) be removed, are only prayers at once expressed in act, expressions of faith suddenly seizing its object, not doubting that God at all times hears; and they are therefore a coincidence of the praying and receiving in undivided certainty. But because we, with our weak faith, seldom and with difficulty rise so high; because for us, sinners, is ordained the slower learning and exercising of faith in the way of prayer in particular; therefore does our Lord go on to speak of *praying*, immediately after having spoken of *commanding*. This, in so far as it concerns us, is as much as to say—And if you do not yet succeed with the former, give yourselves all the more earnestly to the latter. Every thing must *yield* to your faith, every thing must fall to your prayer of faith, so that ye shall receive it. Yea truly *all things*, πάντα ὅσα ἄν, as both Evangelists agree in expressing it; and as all the promises of Scripture and all the experience of believing suppliants have proved—since that most ancient promise of Job xxii. 27. God assuredly gives what we have prayed for, but in his own time, and often in a different manner and form from what we thought in our prayer; for his hearing is a true hearing, and on this very account, far above and beyond what we ask or think (Eph. iii. 20). But *we*, alas! often overlook and neglect the true *receiving*; we had faith for asking, but have not or do not hold fast the faith for receiving, as may be seen in the remarkable narrative, Acts xii. 15.

Finally, Mark alone (vers. 25, 26) adds a repetition from the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vi. 14, 15); and we credit the exactness of his entire narrative, and hold that Christ actually said this here. But why precisely here? Why does he call to mind this principal point in what he there taught concerning believing prayer? (as it is not to be supposed that, on every occasion, every thing that belonged to this subject was repeated). Just because there is a secret *doubting* in the heart which breaks and hinders the power of prayer, when the heart is not perfectly ready, conscious of its own guilt, to exercise forgiveness, when there is any ban of enmity and implacableness. This is what the apostle means in 1 Tim. ii. 8, Without *wrath* and doubting. This profound truth in general seems to us a quite sufficient reason for what is here added

* Whether, therefore, "this mountain" here spoken of was that on which the Temple stood, seems a very useless question in the case of a designedly literal repetition.

and we must regard it as too artificial to understand it in still closer connection with what was done to the fig-tree, as if it meant—Be not ye *angry* unduly at the sin of Israel, or of any one! Curse not the sinner as I have done the fig-tree! For the disciples could hardly yet have thought of the symbolical significance of this curse, as Christ also has not noticed it in his whole answer to them. But that he here graciously speaks again of *forgiving*, immediately after having *cursed* in holy anger, is a circumstance which always retains its important significance for *our* consideration of the whole transaction.

CHRIST'S ANSWER RESPECTING HIS AUTHORITY TO THE WILFULLY IGNORANT—THE BAPTISM OF JOHN—THE TWO SONS—THE WICKED HUSBANDMEN—THE CORNER-STONE.

(Matt. xxi. 24–44; Mark ix. 29—xii. 11; Luke xx. 3–18.)

Although our Lord, after the first encounter with his adversaries (who, while he continues the same, also continue the same in their enmity to him, Matt. ver. 17), no longer passes the night in Jerusalem, he yet resorts to the *temple* daily, as long as they leave him life—this the three Evangelists record only in a participial construction, as evident of itself. He *walks* and *teaches* in his accustomed manner: patiently as if he were beginning anew, calmly as if no danger threatened him; he *preaches the Gospel*, for which he is sent, as Luke once more expresses the general import of his teaching. Thereupon these poor priests and elders, who are not at all poor for his Gospel, repeat—shall we say impudently or timorously, ludicrously or pitifully?—that old question (John ii. 18) respecting the authority and attestation of what he did as a prophet. The more complete expressions, especially in Mark (comp. also Luke xix. 47, and Matt. xxvi. 3), leave us to understand a more or less official, formal inquisition, coming upon him with a sudden surprise. But their proud words are very remarkable. They persist in *asking* down to the last, even after a thousand-fold answer has been given; and yet they themselves know not how or what they shall ask. Ταῦτα ποιεῖς, "thou doest *these* things." What things, then? Was it the teaching, which was certainly not forbidden in the temple? or the healing of the blind and lame, so that they asked for signs in proof of signs? Had he not already shown many signs since the first Passover at Jerusalem, and in all the land, even to the raising again of Lazarus; *many signs*, as they themselves confess? Therefore, indeed, they dare not now put the question in the same form as at John ii. 18. Therefore they can only comprise all the three years of his powerful teaching and working in a foolish ταῦτα, *these things* (just like the τοῦτο, Acts iv. 7, where they again begin anew with the disciples), in which must be included, also, the manifest sign, ver. 17. They now again ask for proof in the face of a three years' exhibition of proof, after three years' telling and testifying he is now again to tell them! The double question is probably to be understood thus—What sort of power, right, and authority dost thou lay claim to (divine or human), whom dost thou give thyself out to be? And then, Who has given thee authority, who has commissioned and qualified thee to do these things, or who authenticates thee therein? But understand it as we will, it has scarcely a rational meaning. In their question they say, We know not! while they know it well. Therefore, Christ cannot answer them otherwise than by driving them to this confession, by convicting them ever more sharply, from this time onwards, of the charge, *Ye would not* (chap. xxiii. 37). This is the import of all he says to them in these last days; the last grace being also received in vain, and issuing, through their own fault, in their condemnation, so that they *are compelled to judge themselves*. This is the fundamental idea that pervades the whole of Christ's answers down to Matt. ver. 45.

He answers them by rebuke and threatening, *inasmuch as he appeals to their own consciousness and their own judgment.* He discloses to them, first of all, *rebukingly*, the *ground* of their hypocritical *unbelief*, with an appeal to their own *consciousness* (vers. 24–32); and then, *threateningly*, the *consequences* of this unbelief, which knows not, and refuses to know, the *doom* which their own *verdict* must pronounce (vers. 33–44). These are the two principal parts of the entire passage, which, when thus viewed, becomes an integral whole.

In the first half, the counter question of Christ respecting the testimony of John discloses to them the already incontrovertible ground and beginning of all the testimonies hitherto given; it detects in them the ground of their sin, that they knew but would not *say*, *i. e.*, *acknowledge* it: and thus ver. 27 contains already the first answer to their question, an answer appropriate to them and sufficient. Upon this—after they, by their "we know *not*," have acknowledged that they *do* know, and in order to hold up before them that they *would not*—Christ, patiently going back and really beginning again anew, appeals to the *testimony*, not of John himself merely, but in

addition, *of those sinners who had believed on him*—and thus keenly convicts the hypocrites who have yet not believed on him. First comes the *parable* representing their conduct as *individuals*, showing how each one for himself does not do what he says; and, here again, they must themselves decide (ver. 31). Pressing inexorably closer upon them there follows, to complete their confusion, the plain and direct *Fabula docet:* Ye have judged yourselves; ye are the impenitent ones, in comparison with penitent publicans and harlots!

Still not enough—*Hear another parable!* And they must stand still; held fast by a divine force, they cannot go away, they cannot interrupt him. The *second* parable depicts clearly to their view the consequence of this unbelief, which knows and yet will not know—the last capital crime against the Son of God, the guilt of which had already been incurred in their counsel of murder—and the *sentence* against them for this. As, in the similitude of the two sons, their conduct as individuals, as private persons so to speak, is described, so now our Lord sets before them, quite as much historically as prophetically, their *official* conduct *as a whole.* He *tells* them what their predecessors in office did to the messengers of God; and in like manner what they *will do* to the *Son*, who has been sent last. Thus they have the answer to the question—Who art thou, and who sends thee? Not only, however, does he in the parable put the confession into their own mouth (ver. 38), but they must pronounce the *sentence* themselves which he now emphatically *confirms!* The parable, which is likewise founded upon Scripture texts, is followed again by a figurative passage of Scripture (ver. 42); and then there is the direct and proper expression for this (ver. 43), with a return to the metaphor of the passage, and a reference to other kindred passages (ver. 44). Their present offence at him whom they rejected, their future sentence from the exalted one—is the end of the first discourse and answer; but it is at the same time only the beginning of an entire series of parables, answers, and threatenings, by which they are now (chap. xxii. 23) completely convicted, condemned, and *dismissed.*

Verses 24, 25. The three Evangelists agree in the designative ἕνα λόγον; but by this is to be understood not so much "one short *word*,"* as rather "one *thing*," a very simple *something*—as the continuation shows, *which, if ye tell me.* Luke, bringing out the sense more concisely, puts it in the form of a challenge: *Tell me!* Mark, still more strongly, has an emphatically repeated *Answer me!* before and after the question. Matthew adheres without change to the original form—If ye tell me this, then I will also tell you. *Ye hypocrites!* Ye are not in earnest with your asking and telling; ye asked this question three years before, as of me, so of one before me, and yet have not accepted the answer! Had ye believed him, ye would have had no need of further questioning. Who does not perceive, without many words, how properly and significantly our Lord here goes back to John the Baptist? He was not merely the last and latest prophet, who, although he did no miracle, was yet acknowledged by the people, and, on account of the people, by the rulers;* but, in addition to this, the testimony of this predicted *forerunner* was the plainly acknowledged beginning of the day of Christ: we have only to look back on the whole train of thought in chap. xi. Our Lord names the *baptism* of John, and certainly means by this (as Acts i. 22, x. 37, xviii. 25), the entire office of the Baptist, his whole commission and appearance, including his preaching of repentance and his testimony concerning Christ, see ver. 32. But, according to John i. 25, it was precisely the baptism with which he sought to baptize the Jews, as well as the Gentiles, the righteous as well as sinners, that was the principal thing which had the appearance of an assumption, and in which the authority from above was to be recognized. In the πόθεν, *whence*, Christ answers the question, *By what authority;* and in the ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, *from heaven* (which transcends all ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, *of men*, and is on purpose thus reverently expressed), he has, at the same time, given the first indirect answer to the question, Who art thou? (John xix. 9; iii. 31).

Verse 27. Thus had he caught them in their own net. There remains for them only one of two things: either to acknowledge the divine authority of the Baptist, from which all the rest then follows; or "to come into collision with the unanimous consciousness of the people," with a boldness for which, as Christ knew, they were unprepared—not, however, from the fear of God, but from the fear of men. The three Evangelists very strikingly represent the *thoughts* of their hearts—which were here certainly not uttered in words—as if they had been outwardly expressed; the hypocrites think only of what they might *say*, and what he would then *say;* not of what is right and true in conscience before God. And yet their conscience already pronounces their own sentence, anticipating the question, *Why* do ye not then believe him? This is a question from his lips which they would, at any cost, avoid; but our Lord gives the poor hypocrites afterwards a gratuitous answer to this so much dreaded question, seeing that they have already asked it themselves. For the rest, it is here pre-supposed, on the one hand, that the majority of the πρῶτοι τοῦ λαοῦ or "chiefs of the people" did not actually *allow*

* Certainly not, Only one word in reply to your two; for Christ's reply actually proposes *also* two questions, and besides, is calmly introduced by a preface, in striking contrast with *their* angry brevity.

* So to speak, an altogether new example of a prophetic *extraordinaria vocatio*, as Anton (*Harmon. Erklärung der Evang.*) expresses himself.

themselves to be baptized (Luke vii. 30)—although *Christ* (ver. 22), by the "*believe him*," does not mean so much this outward reception of the Baptist, as the repenting and coming to the Messiah; and then that the great majority of the people, although quite as impenitent, yet obstinately held John to be a prophet, especially since his death.* How, then, are they to escape from this dilemma, since it is equally hard for them to *confess* or to *deny* the truth? Taking hasty counsel of their cunning wisdom they find a third middle course, in which, however, their wisdom becomes mere folly. They, the great knowers, who in ordinary cases have their "*We know!*" always at hand, are, after their arrogant question, reduced to the shift and the shame of saying for once, in presence of the surrounding people, and in answer to a question which closely concerned their office—*We know not!*† This was indeed before Christ as much as to say, We know it well, *but will not say it*—in which many a so-called "honest doubter" resembles them, when he will not receive conviction. And to all such the same simple answer properly belongs: Neither do I tell you what ye wilfully ask, and what ye *only thus* "know not."

Verses 28–31. This first parable, with its interpretation, coming before the second, serves exactly the purpose of a transitional and intermediate saying, although only Matthew has preserved this also so completely. What think *ye?* Thereby Christ grafts immediately upon their confession, which they in vain try to conceal, the question, But do ye wicked ones *know* perhaps *this* which I am going to say to you, instead of an answer? This very simple parable, in which these supreme knowers having declared themselves ignorant are catechised like school-children, points back to the two sons (Luke xv. 11), as also to the saying on the Mount (Matt. vii. 21), (on account of which latter reference, the son says to the father, κυριε, "sir," comp. Gen. xxxi. 35). But the similitude of the "vineyard" prepares the way for the following parable; only that, in the first, the "working in the vineyard," which is afterwards to be taken in an official sense, still appears as the equal and general obligation of every one—of the publican as of the ruler in Israel (a circumstance which is, at the same time, not to be overlooked as a hint for the more extended application of chap. xx. 1). To do the will of the Father here signifies, in sincere faith and obedience to yield compliance to every message which God sends, to repent, to believe, to come to Christ. Keeping the commandments and fulfilling the law is here spoken of only as a point of contact in so far as this is the *first* expression of the "saying and not doing" on the part of the Pharisees (chap. xxiii. 3). Strictly speaking, our Lord means by the command of the Father, as he himself immediately after indicates, the preaching of the Baptist; viewed, however, as the conclusion and sum of all the calls collectively that had come to the Jews. The circumstance that in the parable one son is called after the other, is by no means to be understood as signifying a *succession of time*, for the ὡσαύτως, *likewise*, on which the emphasis rests,* could only thus be represented; on the other hand, the son who was at first refractory, and afterwards bethought himself, takes the first place as πρῶτος, because, according to ver. 31, this precedence (the προαγειν) properly belongs to him. Although it is sons who are spoken of (ὁ δέ), and grown up sons such as were fit for working in a vineyard, yet the name *children*, τέκνα, τέκνον is given to them, in order that the Father's right and love may appear all the more strongly. Was there not really, for the heart and conscience, such an affectionate tone of the Father's voice, even in the Baptist's rough, rebuking call to repentance? Although the first son answers so wilfully to his father's face, *I will not!* (without "sir" or "father," without any pretext such as "I cannot," Luke xiv. 20)—yet this *first* one is, at least, *honest*, both in his refusal, and in his subsequent change of mind; and in this remains his superiority as compared with the hypocrite. (Μεταμελεῖσθαι is the parabolic expression for μετανοεῖν.) The other answers with his ἐγὼ κυριε, "I go, sir," (=הִנֵּנִי, Behold I am ready, Acts ix. 10); not that he only afterwards resolved on following a worse course, but he speaks already with a falseness which is more hateful than any οὐ θέλω, "I will not." Even if it had been said in the same spirit as a foolish *child* hastily promises every thing in order to get away from his father, it would have been less culpable; Christ, however, does not mean here even those empty promises in which there is yet some truth, but the boldness of the hypocrite whose heart from the very first says, *I will not!* while the lips say, *I go!* The concluding question, severely as it shames them, contains, at the same time, in the background, a gracious invitation even to these hypocrites still to repent; inasmuch as the obedience, which was afterwards resolved upon, is en-

* Compare Matt. xiv. 5 and Luke xx. 6, πεπεισμένος; the people showed so determined an adherence to this conviction, that the leaders were afraid of being *stoned* if they contradicted it.

† As they also do not directly deny it, Hamann is, strictly speaking, somewhat inaccurate when he says—"The nearer they are to the truth, the more obstinately they deny it," and finds in their conduct "something of the miracles which Satan is able to bring to pass in our hearts, when we give place to him there." At bottom, however, he is quite right, as is said above.

* And with which the reading ἑτέρῳ is at all events to be preferred, since δευτέρῳ would press too strongly the succession of time. Of an *older* and *younger* son there is nothing said here (as some have thought, and have explained the *elder* of heathenism as being before Judaism). Such a reference would destroy the force of the simple representation of the two sons together.

couragingly accepted and acknowledged. We have no great objection to the reading ὁ ὕστερος, which is received by Lachmann, and defended and interpreted by Schweizer (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1839, 4); for it appears reasonable enough that these hypocrites, struck with shame at having such simple questions put to them, would not answer directly ὁ πρῶτος, but would say, half hesitatingly and abruptly, ὁ ὕστερος scil. ἀπελθών—that is, the *after one*, he who *afterwards* went and did the Father's will. Certainly this is quite admissible, and becomes even a striking confession extorted from them, that to do what is required, although it should be *afterwards*, is yet accepted;* but we still think, in opposition to Schweizer, that this reading and interpretation is not necessary, and that πρῶτος is not so very perplexing as he represents it. For if they did say this latter, we might then find in it, on the other hand, the unconscious acknowledgment that the ὕστερος justly stands in the parable already as the πρῶτος; and our Lord, taking up this, might go on to say, *Yes! so it is*, those who at least afterwards bethink themselves go before you as first!

Verses 31, 32. The popular turn which Luther gives to the words in his translation, "they *may sooner* enter into the kingdom of heaven"—does not deviate from the general truth, which however is only to be derived and inferred from the text, namely, that gross, daring sinners, at least honest in their open acts of sin, may sooner be saved than the wicked *hypocrites*, who are long hardened against the impression of the truth; of *whose* "good works" what Amsdorf says is perfectly true, that they are detrimental to salvation. But it has happened to Luther here, as often, that by a well-meant popularizing of the sense he has lost the proper idea of the text, that direct thought which he ought first to have *rendered*. Future eternal salvation is indeed spoken of here, in so far as the comprehensive expression "enter into the kingdom of heaven," and the entire parable, point back to chap. vii. 21; still, in this εἰσέρχεσθαι, or *entering in*, as in the Sermon on the Mount (see our interpretation of chap. vii. 13, 14), is already included the whole *way of righteousness*, repenting, believing, being converted, obeying—and not only so, but it is this that is *chiefly* spoken of. The προάγειν or *preceding* corresponds to the ὑπάγειν καὶ ἐργάζεσθαι, "go and work," in the parable, and to the πιστεύειν αὐτῷ, *believing on him*, in the explanation of it that follows. It expresses something already past: inasmuch as they *have done* the will of the Father, they have come and entered into the kingdom of heaven. Our Lord uses naturally only the present tense, προάγουσιν ὑμᾶς, in order to intimate a general truth which is here exemplified, and which goes beyond the most immediate application of ver. 32—viz.: So is it now and always; such people as the publicans and harlots go before such as *you!* This means, then, first of all (an interpretation of the πρῶτος and ὕστερον, which hinted at the same truth beforehand in the parable, whether we understand the one or the other to have been named in the answer), *They go before you, they take your place*, so to speak. But it also plainly signifies—They *show you the way*, they are your patterns and teachers, who should even now incite you to follow them; for thus is it afterwards in ver. 32 (ὑμεῖς δὲ ἰδόντες). If, in the Sermon on the Mount, the Pharisees were put on a level with the *publicans*, they are now placed far behind the *penitent* publicans, with allusion to the parable at Luke xviii. 10, 14; but, in order that this may be expressed with all emphasis and completeness, *harlots* are mentioned along with them—those gross "sinners" (Luke vii. 39), who were held in perfect contempt by the Pharisees; and both of these are mentioned, not without reference to the fact that among the apostles there were publicans, and among the zealous adherents and followers of Christ there were converted harlots. At the same time we know that avarice and sensuality, the service of mammon and adultery, were the secret sins of the Pharisees, corresponding with the two poles of all creature-love. The case is here again similar as regards Luther's translation, to what we noticed before—"John *taught* you the *right* way; neither of these two words is properly in the text, but a more significant expression, viz., He came to you ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης. The *way of righteousness*, or the way of God (Matt. xxii. 16), is the right way of true wisdom in the commandment and will of God (אֹרַח צְדָקָה, Prov. viii. 20, xii. 28, and דֶּרֶךְ צְדָקָה, xvi. 31, Sept. ὁδοὶ δικαιοσύνης, also דֶּרֶךְ הַשֵּׂכֶל xxi. 16, where Sept. ὁδὸς δικαιοσύνης; see again in Peter, who makes diligent use of the Proverbs, 2 Pet. ii. 21, where what is spoken of in the most proper sense is the way of conversion to God, the ἀποφυγεῖν τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου).* John came in, or on, or with the way of righteousness; *i. e.*, not merely did he *teach* and announce it to you in the preaching of repentance, but he *showed* it to you in like manner as a προάγων, as one who himself walked therein, and, moreover, in the way of Old Testament legal piety, which ye understand and which is so agreeable to you. For here, as we said above in the general survey of the passage, the testimony of John is combined with the testimony of those who *believed on him* (ver. 32, three times, precisely as at ver. 25, in the thoughts of the Pharisees). Now he says plainly: "Ye were not believingly obedient to the will of God in the preaching of John; ye did not even *repent afterwards*, when the believing sinners and sinful women

* Which the Lord God had long before graciously declared and certified to his people; for example Ezek. xviii. 21–23; xxxiii. 12–16.

* Pfenninger, therefore, is altogether wrong in saying: John came with the most righteous cause

showed you the way, and your repentance would even yet have been accepted.* Ye are that other son!" In order to the effect of this application, it matters not that, strictly speaking, the rulers and Pharisees did not answer, "I go, sir," to the preaching of the Baptist (in that case, the first coming of many, Matt. iii. 7, must be so explained). The parable has a freer range in its import, and means: *Thus is it with you in general* in your hypocrisy (chap. xxiii. 3), and therefore did ye say also, by your conduct toward John, "We have long since repented, we need no new repentance!" Therefore ye received not his testimony concerning me, the Messiah, that by coming to me ye might enter into the kingdom of God—which is, in conclusion, meant by the *πιστεύειν αὐτῷ*, or *believing on him*, according to their own thoughts, ver. 25.

Verse 33. The *ἤρξατο ἐν παραβολαῖς, began in parables*, of Mark denotes a *second* beginning of instruction mainly parabolic: our Lord speaks, as before to the people in Galilee, so now to the rulers in Jerusalem (Matt. xxii. 1), in parables, of which the Evangelists probably give but one or two principal specimens. The *πρὸς τὸν λαόν, to the people*, of Luke is somewhat less exact, and will only say *before the people*, so that they also heard them. Matthew is again the most exact in what immediately follows: "*Hear*, ye self-willed questioners, who know not, and yet know well enough; hear as a further answer, and for your further conviction, *another* parable—I have not yet done with you, leave me not till ye have heard it!" The foregoing parable was for them as sinners in common with others; this is for them in their office as leaders of the people, according to which they should have been only *προάγοντες ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης, preachers of righteousness*, while, on the contrary, they have, from their fathers even until now, shamefully rejected the messengers of God. Christ discloses to them their sin, announcing to them their judgment, and that of the whole people; but at first he lets them again convict themselves in the milder form of the *parable*. The figure of the vineyard, as the particulars in which it is carried out show, goes back to the well-known text of prophetic rebuke, Isa. v. 1–7 (comp. already iii. 14). There the first ל in לִידִידִי ver. 1, is equivalent to *for—Instead of, in the name of* my friend will I sing a song. Hence it is called שִׁירַת דּוֹדִי, a song of my beloved, which he himself is to sing, and in which he is to make a lament over his vineyard; for at ver. 3 the discourse passes into the first person (which the Sept. expresses from the beginning). Let it be granted that the עָזַק, ver. 2, means properly hewing and digging around (as the סָקַל beside it certainly means *elapidare, to clear of stones*; see chap. lxii. 10), still the words of Christ, as given by Matt. and Mark, allow all the more value to the *φραγμὸν περιέθηκα, hedged about*, of the Sept., as this is actually found in Isaiah, ver. 5, *primo loco*. Hedging round is the first thing which the idea of a כֶּרֶם, or vineyard, pre-supposes, hence taking away the hedge again is the first thing when it is destroyed and abandoned. *Hedge*, *tower*, and *wine-press*,* belong, in Isaiah, only to the development of the metaphor, and probably intimate nothing more there than in general, The Lord of the vineyard entirely performed his part towards it, see ver. 4. We can therefore abide by this here also (which seems to be recommended by the transposition of the expressions); for though the hedge plainly points to the law which separates the Jews from the Gentiles (Eph. ii. 14),† it is yet difficult to assign a distinct and separate meaning to the tower and the wine-press, which in the commentators run very much into each other. Melancthon comes nearest to the distinction, when he compares the apparatus for pressing out and obtaining the produce to the *ministerium doctrinæ*, and the prominent watch-tower which affords protection and ornament, to the *regnum et templum*.‡ A considerable alteration and extension of the basis given by the prophet consists further in this, that in Isaiah the vineyard itself is represented as unfruitful, bringing forth only בְּאֻשִׁים, *poisonous berries* ("wild grapes"), instead of grapes, while here prominence is given to an offence on the part of the *keepers* of the vineyard, who withheld the produce from the proprietors. Whether in the metaphor the *ἐξέδοτο*, "let out," which is the same in all the three Evangelists, means to let out for rent in money (Cantic. viii. 11; Isa. vii. 23), or for a return in fruit (like the Roman *partiarii*), matters little; yet the allusions to the fruit in *ὁ καιρὸς τῶν*

---

* "Must (*i. e.*, should, might) they not perceive the sanctifying power of God in John? That must be of God which leads the ungodly to God" (Braune).

* As spoken by Christ, who always pays due respect indeed to the word of Scripture, and yet claims an equal and not a merely subordinate authority for his own, the second and third are freely transposed. *Πύργος* is a watch-tower or watchman's house; *ὑπολήνιον*, in Mark (as Isa. xvi. 10; Joel iii. 13, Sept.), the vat or trough into which the pressed wine runs; *ληνός*, in Matt, the wine-press as a whole (Isa. 5 *προλήνιον*) which was *dug* deep in the ground with an outlet, through which the expressed juice flowed.

† The explanation given by some of the fathers, for example Irenaeus, is far too much of a merely outward kind, according to which the *hedge* signifies the boundaries of the Jewish land, the *tower*, Jerusalem—the *wine-press* as "receptaculum prophetici spiritus" would but ill correspond to this, being a transition to a different sphere of thought.

‡ Zeller (*Beugg. Monatsbl.* 1851, No. 9) explains the *wine press* of all the institutions for teaching, educating and training; the *tower* of all the institutions having regard to control, the administration of justice, discipline, protection.

καρπῶν and τοὺς καρποὺς (Matt. ver. 34), seems to prove that ἀπὸ του καρπου (Mark and Luke) is to be understood not merely of the former (καρπός, produce); besides, we think the delivery of the fruit *in natura* to be much more proper for the interpretation.* Only the three following propositions are properly of main importance for the sense of the whole: that God first of all performed *his part* in every respect by a manifold and complete preparation: that he committed the vineyard to certain *officials* in Israel, not, however, as their property, but that they might see to its bringing forth fruit; that when this also was done, he *went into a far country*. Observe, in the second of these, the acknowledgment of the office in respect of right and duty, which Christ here expresses just that he may rebuke their official sins; and in the last (as at Matt. xxv. 15; Mark xiii. 34; Luke xix. 12, the same thing recurs), the significant reference to a return of God after the first manifestation, for the purpose of trial and in expectation of finding fruit. Luke adds χρόνους ἱκανούς, which, according to his usage (chap. viii. 27; Acts viii. 11; xiv. 3), signifies a good, proportionably long, *due* time, as we say. It is the intermediate period from the first planting of Israel until the time when by right it could and should have ripened into fruit, from Moses and Joshua on to the first prophets, as is plain from what immediately follows. That these prophets came partly also before the time of David and Solomon, shows further that Melancthon's explanation of the tower by *regnum et templum* is not precisely to be referred to the kingdom and temple properly so called; but, if a special interpretation is to be given to it, rather to the setting up of rulers in general, and the first tabernacle of the sanctuary (Exod. xv. 17).

Verses 34—36. That there was also a *time of fruit* already under the old covenant, is evident; the Lord had done enough for his people to warrant his demanding of all, as the fruit of his sowing and planting, that piety which, in manifold degrees and forms, was actually found in a small company of saints. That the law might produce legal righteousness, the innermost principle of which, with all diligence in works, should yet be sincere humility and constant repentance—that the promise before and together with the law might find faith, and an expecting people be prepared for the Lord, such as the Baptist last of all would prepare, and as are represented in Zacharias and Simeon—this was what the keepers of the vineyard were to see to from the first, for this they were responsible, and this was justly required of them. It was especially required at that period when, after the *time of blossom* under David and Solomon, the season of fruit had now come by right in the fullest sense; although the application also to the former time may not be quite excluded. Those extraordinary servants, the *prophets*, who were more immediate *messengers* of God, and who are very plainly to be understood here by the servants, hold however a different position from those who were appointed to the regular office. It is a very remarkable circumstance, the attentive consideration of which suggests thoughts extending much further, that the maltreatment and killing of almost all the prophets (for only thus on the whole is it of course meant) is quite as decidedly affirmed in the New Testament as it is not recorded in the Old Testament, which is quite silent in regard to this in those very places where it should properly have been mentioned. For although, in the history of Elijah and Jeremiah, for example, there occur enmity and persecution even to the danger of death, yet in such passages as 2 Kings xvii. 13, 14; Jer. vii. 25, 26, xi. 7, 8, xxv. 4–7, xliv. 4, 5, we do not read of ill usage, but only of disobedience and contempt. Only in Neh. ix. 26 is it expressly said, "they *slew* the prophets." But what is recorded in the tradition of the Jews themselves along with the canonical word of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Amos and others, is generally confirmed by the Lord Jesus, not merely here in the parable, but in plain words, Matt. xxiii. 31–37, which Stephen afterwards quite as strongly repeats, Acts vii. 52; comp. also Heb. xi. 36–38.* The representation in the parable is of course not to be explained as specially historical, and when Matt. ver. 35 mentions *three* servants, of whom even the one who came off best was at least scourged, this number is only intended to indicate that there was no want of messengers (that the patience of the Lord was not satisfied with one messenger), just as the gradation in the ill-treatment from beating to stoning indicates what was done as the general rule. Mark and Luke, perhaps more exactly according to the original expressions of Christ, dilate what Matthew has compressed into one verse; the three servants are, however, mentioned also in their account. In other respects, which are not of essential importance, the representation is somewhat different: Mark gives prominence first of all to the "sending away empty" as the principal idea;† and he makes only the third to have been killed, while the second was mocked and shamefully handled.‡ Luke begins also with

* Zeller: They have cleared away *the produce* of the vineyard *in natura*, to deliver it into the storehouse of the Master.

* What, then, has made them so cruel? asks Anton here, going beyond the parable indeed, yet with justice, and he answers: The *vacuum*, the want of fruit; they would not let the *deficit* be made manifest. It vexes them when *visitatores* come who will have fruit! They *must* let such go away empty, therefore they become cruel.

† In connection with which it is to be observed that, in the parable, the fruits were kept back by the presumption of the servants; in the explanation, however (which was not to be presented here also), there are no fruits to be had when asked for.

‡ That κεφαλαιουν, Mark xii. 4, in no case signifies to behead or kill, is evident from the

the beating (in which all the three agree), but in the gradation of ill-treatment passes from that to the ἀτιμάζειν, *or shameful treatment*, and thence to the τραυματίζειν, *or wounding*; and he entirely omits the second sending mentioned in Matt. ver. 36, which Mark, at least, adds in the "and many others." We see here, as always, the same relative characteristics of the Evangelists: Luke least of all exact; Mark, in his graphic style, often making a near approximation to the original words of Christ, often again giving only a free representation; Matthew alone, although with condensed brevity, preserving entire the most important fundamental ideas. Thus, in this place, he alone has distinctively marked the two different periods of sending, which, at all events, must correspond with a historical view of the facts upon the whole. But we do not venture absolutely to determine when the second period, at which *more than the first* were sent, is to be understood as commencing; since the Old Testament history of the labors and testimonies of the prophets, before and after Samuel, only indicates much that is passed over. In general we might find the ἄλλους πλείονας, "many others," among the kings after the time of Elijah and Elisha, and the πρώτους, or *first*, with whom also it fared ill, in the entire period preceding that; see for example Judges vi. 8. If, however, we adhere exactly to the season of fruits before indicated, then a second sending must be explained as beginning after the Assyrian captivity with *Isaiah* and Jeremiah.

Verses 37–39. Here follows the answer — seemingly veiled by the parable, but at the same time quite plain and literal—to that question which was put at ver. 23: I am *the Son*, as ye *know!* At first, however, Christ does not represent himself to them as the promised Saviour and Redeemer; but as the last witness for the truth, the last preacher of repentance and grace, according to his prophetical office. This is quite in accordance with the facts of the case, in so far as the rejection of the Son, the last Prophet, and the Prophet in the most proper sense, was only a continuation and consummation of the rejection of all former messengers of God. Indeed, the Son, too, begins with Μετανοεῖτε, *Repent!* and so far is God from remitting or relaxing his claim to receive fruit, that Christ rather seals its legitimacy (as he afterwards himself produces new fruit in a new sowing of grace by the shedding of his blood, which, in this parable, lies as yet in the background). But herein is displayed the goodness and faithfulness, the patience and long-suffering of God, that "he sends even the first servants to the keepers without weapons, and now sends the Son himself, the witness of his entire readiness to be reconciled and to forgive, without terror and coercion"*—not yet to inflict the deserved punishment, but as a last experiment of goodness. What should he do more to his vineyard and its husbandmen? He had, besides the servants, only his *one beloved* Son; so he sends him also as the *last*, the same as if he himself had come to entreat the rebels! This is the very striking and affecting expansion of the idea in Mark; Luke represents the culminating point somewhat differently, and yet the same in so far as relates to the fundamental idea, inasmuch as he has a τί ποιήσω, "what shall I do?" before, in which God takes counsel with himself. The three Evangelists agree in their expression of the friendly pre-supposition on the part of God: *They will reverence my Son!* Thus condescendingly in the manner of men does Christ speak of his heavenly Father (in Luke with an ἴσως, "surely"); comp. Isa. lxiii. 8, where there is a similar expression. He will thereby teach that God makes trial of all goodness in men, just as if he knew not beforehand in what cases it will prove in vain; he thus portrays to the wicked ones what, instead of their wickedness, ought to have been their conduct, and thereby holds up their criminality all the more strikingly before their eyes.

For alas! the sad history proceeds further: They saw the Son and did *not* reverence him! Christ connects the events of the future that were now at hand, and only not yet accomplished in outward act, into one *history* with the past. For, in the murderous decree of the high priests against Jesus, which had now been in existence for a considerable time, in particular since John xi. 53, the awful deed was already as good as done: ver. 38 is really as much history as what goes before; ver. 39 views prophetically beforehand as present what happened a few days afterwards; while ver. 40 first points to the future consequences. That these wilfully ignorant "knowers," although they did not understand the sufferings and sacrificial death of the Messiah (1 Cor. ii. 8) in prophecy, yet, in other respects, knew enough concerning him to make their conscience respond to the testimony of the Baptist with a Οὗτός ἐστιν, "This is he!"—this Christ knew without their telling him; and he now begins, already before they have crucified him, to exercise upon them, as the Searcher of hearts, his office as Judge. They knew how to find at once from Scripture the newly-born Saviour, although they had no de-

---

ἀπέστειλαν. It is used here in the entirely new and special signification *in capite vulnerare* (Vulg.); Casaubon has directed attention to the fact that the verbs in ὁω and ίζω correspond to each other, and κατατρίζειν in Aristoph. and Laert. is only εἰς τὴν κατάρα τύπτειν. Lange quite correctly: "They handled him roughly on the head." On the other hand, Lightfoot and Usher would apply here the only other warranted signification of κεφαλαιοῦν (to reckon, sum up): They threw as a *mockery* of a "reckoning" stones at his head (instead of fruit)—but this interpretation is unsuitably artificial; if that signification is assigned to κεφαλαιοῦν, we must, at all events, explain it with Dupont and Lud. de Dieu: "They made short work and reckoning with him."

* Nitzsch's *Sermons*, third selection, p. 102.

sire from the first to go to him with the wise men; what Nicodemus afterwards, on his first coming to Christ, John iii. 2, says in his "*We* know," he says actually in the name of his colleagues, and as what they in conscience believe; how much more must they have been convinced after three years full of testimonies and signs! As our Lord then referred Nicodemus to the typical serpent in the wilderness, so now, even before he plainly speaks of the rejected corner-stone, there lies in his word an almost unconscious side-glance, in that Spirit who views all as a connected whole, to the typical history of Joseph, which, in its prophetical import, extending even to the final restoration of Israel, has long since been recognized by the simplicity of faith, but very little as yet by orthodox science. *Come, let us kill him*—so it stands in Gen. xxxvii. 20, literally according to the Sept. The coming forth of Joseph from the pit (brought about by God in opposition to the murderous counsel of his brethren), predicted as a mystical resurrection the inevitable fulfillment of those dreams which the envious also believed, inasmuch as they tried to frustrate them; just as now the murderers of Jesus know that he is Christ, even while they seek to destroy him. We are therefore to understand the apostolic words in Acts iii. 17, xiii. 27, with that limitation which the word of Christ here gives to them in the parable: they know not indeed the mystery of the atoning death, and in so far they did not yet know entirely "*what* they did," yet, on the other hand, they knew enough to make it a grievous sin in them to kill the Prince of Life, to reject him who proved himself to be the Messiah, the Son of God. Thus wonderfully is the counsel of God fulfilled by the hands of men; and that Christ here discloses and foretells all to them in this manner, belongs further to the testimony which it behooved him to make respecting his voluntary surrender of himself. Let us kill the heir, that his inheritance may be ours—is to be understood from John xi. 48: that we may not have to yield up our assumed power to him (as King Herod also after his manner had thought and done). To this counsel of the men belongs the great folly, the wicked delusion, of supposing that this was possible, that the Lord of the vineyard, and Father of this Son, would be without the power to justify the heir, and make good his right; it is the deceit of Satan, *whose* thought it is properly that is therein expressed. It is, at the same time, a fearfully foolish obstinate perseverance in evil which the parable here, almost plainly coinciding with the history, discloses—the great connecting chain of sinning and resisting, which extends from the fathers to the children (chap. xxiii. 31, 32), according to which Christ was already rejected in the prophets, and now from their rejection his rejection also follows by an unconcerted, yet deeply-grounded oneness of enmity against God, in the history of Israel, and of the whole world. What has happened from of old to the prophets in Israel, as also to all the wise men and witnesses for the truth among the heathen, now finds its fulfillment and consummation in the cross of Christ; the rejection of the Son of God is only the culminating point in the general sin of the world, which specially manifested itself in the obstinacy of the Jews. The *casting him out* of the vineyard* represents the delivering him up to the Gentiles, as also the putting forth of the crucified One out of the city and camp of God; the remarkably foreseen significance of which is further spoken of in Heb. xiii. 12. By this, in its deepest import, the vineyard was made desolate, the sanctuary laid waste, Israel's title forfeited, and a new society, regarded by them as alien and unclean, founded upon the rejected corner-stone.

Verses 40, 41. The Lord of the vineyard comes himself after they have killed the heir; he has done all for his vineyard that goodness and patience could do, and now he will and must also judge it. The very abrupt question, *What shall he do?* points back again to the passage in the prophet (Isa. v. 3–6), and summons them to *judge themselves*. In this connection with Isaiah, as also in the entire tendency of Christ's words to appeal to the consciousness and judgment of the hearers themselves (as we saw above), lies the proof of the fact, that Matthew alone is quite right in making the question of Christ to be answered by them in their confusion. (The two other Evangelists omit this by abridging, and represent Christ as also declaring the sentence which was confirmed by him. It is at the same time quite consistent with this that, according to Luke, several of the people who were listening (see ver. 9) may have interposed their *μὴ γένοιτο, God forbid.*) The convicted and thoroughly arrested hypocrites† must needs pronounce their own sentence; and they do it with fair pretence, carrying their hypocrisy to the full height, inasmuch as they affect an impartiality just as if they knew not at all that he was speaking to them! This answer is the most complete justification of the judgment of the Jews coming from their own lips, and already an anticipation of that fearful word, chap. xxvii. 25. We might regard it, too, at the same time, as the last, the only remaining form of divine *warning* addressed

* The placing of which circumstance *after* the killing in Mark, is yet only to be understood as in Matt. and Luke: *ἀπέκτειναν ἐκβληθέντα.*

† For certainly these persons themselves, according to the context, and not others of the surrounding hearers, are the speakers in ver. 41. Schleiermacher would regard this as either a *very awkward* change, or even explain it with Eichhorn as an incorrect understanding of the Aramaic; we, however, have found, from the very beginning of the chapter, the fundamental idea in this, that these persons thus rebuked and put to shame are compelled to pass sentence against themselves. By breaking up the connection as a whole, the interpretation often loses the most important, most decisive means of vindicating the text.

to men—"when they are warned of the deeds which they will do, when they are threatened with what they purpose doing, when they are brought to the point of pronouncing sentence themselves upon the works which they are just about to perpetrate."* But this view of it as an ineffectual warning (once more, so to speak, "they will yet take warning"!) entirely disappears before the judgment which it predicts. Only so much is certain here, "that they were not under any *necessity* of doing what they did, *because* he declared it to them beforehand"—it rather remains the sharpest conviction of their own guilt, that it might be said to them, Behold, I have told you before, and *yet* ye have done it! Thus do God's decree and man's freedom mysteriously coincide in the whole history of the world, and in its centre-point, the cross of Christ: God knew beforehand the free actions as free, and their result, contrary to their design, is only what God had already before determined (Gen. l. 20). For the rest, the κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει, *miserably destroy the wicked* (according to genuine Greek proverbial usage, which is very remarkable in Matthew), denotes strongly the just recompense. Erasmus well renders, "Mali cum sint, male perdet illos"—miserable they are, and he will miserably destroy them. Even the letting out of the vineyard to others must now be declared by themselves; thus must they depose themselves, and prepare the way for the immediately following words of Christ. Only Matthew again has the additional clause, pointing to the future—a prophecy also extorted by the Spirit from these reprobates, viz., *Who will render him the fruits* ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν, duly in future every year—still spoken parabolically.

Verse 42. Our Lord has reached the point at which he aimed in the parable; he now suddenly leaves it, and in the following words the stone of judgment already falls directly upon their heads. He repeats to the last his old familiar word, which has so often shamed and judged them—Have ye never read in the Scriptures? (Mark has *also this Scripture*—in addition, namely, to Isa. v., and many others which prophesy of the great guilt of Israel, and the great triumph of their rejected and yet exalted, their killed and yet living, Messiah.) The great enigma, now solved, of the *corner-stone*, which, from the resurrection onwards, finds an ever-growing fulfillment, and which pervades the entire New Testament from Acts iv. 11—Christ takes from the Hosanna-psalm, which was universally known among the people, and the echoes of which, as it was sounded forth on the occasion of his royal entry, were still in their ears. He then, at ver. 44, brings it again into connection with other passages from the same *Isaiah*, from whom he had just taken the text about the vineyard; for the connection of the γραφαί, *Scriptures*, which we even at this day are so slow to learn, is wonderful in our eyes when, in the cross and victory of Christ, we begin to view every thing as done *by the Lord*—as foreseen by the Lord. He does not at first *explain* the passage of Scripture, which was clearly evident to the eyes even of the blind; but, assuming for the moment that they understood it, he immediately adds ver. 43.

Must we, however, in opposition to the perverted and obstinate exegesis even of believing commentators,* begin to prove that the 118th psalm is Messianic, that the corner-stone of which it speaks is a real prophecy of the Spirit respecting Christ? We frankly confess ourselves to be often so vexed by such contentions with brethren who do not understand the *Scripture* that we lose patience; and, however unscientifically, are inclined rather to rebuke them with Christ, Luke xxiv. 25, until their hearts burn, and their burning *hearts* begin to read in the light of the pentecostal fire what is written. Already do the words added by the people to the Hosanna, Matt. xxi. 9; Mark xi. 10; Luke xix. 38, prove a Messianic interpretation as being then generally received, and which Christ could not employ as taken for granted if it were false. True, this wondrously profound song embraces, in the design of the prophetic Spirit, whose sublime sounds breathe upon us from it as surely as from any part of the ancient Scripture, the entire history of the triumph of the just, combining in one view the "not dying but living" of the *true* Israel and the triumph of their Lord and Head (as is done also elsewhere in the prophets); still, the fulfillment in the person of Christ is and remains the fundamental meaning, upon which the further application is built. He who will acknowledge in the Old Testament no foreseeing design of the Spirit transcending the human consciousness of the prophets, moving above the typical histories and relations in independent miraculous power, finds the just recompense of this false inspiration-theory—this denial of that very quality which characteristically belongs to the inspired writer, as rightly understood, especially in such passages as that now before us—in a most unworthy degradation of the words of Christ and his apostles to a mere play upon Old Testament phrases in moments of most exalted and holy earnestness. We *acknowledge* and testify, on the contrary, that our "Christian consciousness"—a more exactly defined one than that of Schleiermacher—resists throughout every interpretation in which the use of the words here cited does not coincide with their true meaning. This, and nothing else, was what the holy Evangelist Luke thought, when he wrote the question of Christ which, if not literally correct, must yet be so in the spirit: Τί οὖν ἐστι τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦτο; "*What then is* this that

* Nitzsch in the *Sermon* before alluded to, § 96.

* Ebrard understands Jesus to ask—Have ye never yet read of a rejected stone—so that he applies the history of that psalm, without doubt (?) David's history, only as an *example!*

is written ?" what else but a prophecy of me and my kingdom ?

The Lord of the vineyard *cometh;* but he cometh only in the same Son and heir who *rises again* from death. Other prophecies have manifoldly spoken of a *rejection* and subsequent glorification of the coming Messiah ; already at Luke ix. 22, xvii. 25, has Christ referred his disciples to these. The *builders* who reject him (בּוֹנִים, *οἰκοδομοῦντες, i. e.,* here the *master-builders* who select and arrange the stones), are partly the elders, high-priests, and scribe, who are there named by Christ, partly Israel as a whole, represented and led by them—*this generation* and people, Luke xvii. 25. Peter, in Acts iv. 11, gives prominence to the first and narrower sense by the pronoun *ὑμῶν, you.* The corner-stone is the foundation and chief stone of a new building;* for, in Psa. cxviii., viewed as a mystically prophetic festal song for entrance into the temple, it is a building that is spoken of, which, at the same time, is the true house, people, and kingdom of God (so that it is unnecessary to compare with this the remotely related phraseology in which princes are represented as corners and corner-stones of the people, Zech. x. 4; Isa. xix. 13; Judges xx. 2; 1 Sam. xiv. 38). The same thing which in the psalm is called רֹאשׁ פִּנָּה, *κεφαλὴ γωνίας,* "*head of the corner,*" is, in Isa. xxviii. 16, אֶבֶן פִּנָּה, *λίθος ἀκρογωνιαῖος,* "*corner-stone,*" as Paul and Peter in like manner retain the expression of the Sept. The three Evangelists preserve also precisely the old rendering (with the attraction at the beginning, *λίθον ὅν*), according to which *αὕτη, this,* the Hebraistic expression for זֹאת, stands as neuter: *This* is done by the Lord; *this* is wonderful in our eyes (not, as many wrongly infer from 1 Pet. ii. 7: *This stone* is, notwithstanding, a precious stone of wonder in the eyes of *believers*). In *our* eyes: this the enemies also *must* say, see the fulfillment in Acts iv. 13. Yes, in the eyes of the whole world, the Church built on the crucified Jew (see Ullmann's *Apologetik*), the glorifying of the rejected One, which was the doing of the *Lord*, is the great enigma, miracle, and sign, of the world's history. They had marked this stone with contempt and cast it away, so that no man ventured to lift it up ; but God has raised him up, and made him the foundation of the building against which even the gates of hell do not prevail. God sends his only-begotten in the flesh to sinners—his highest *grace!* The sinners crucify him—their horrible *sin.* And yet grace triumphs over sin, nay, out of it prepares the *salvation* of the world !

Verse 43. First of all, indeed, they who have rejected him must in their turn be rejected; and salvation passes from the Jews to the Gentiles. The word which now follows takes up the expression "become the head of the corner" from what goes before, and returns at the same time to the parable of the vineyard with a plain interpretation of it. This interpretation, in the free expansion of the figure, deviates from the prophetic basis ; for. in Isaiah, *the vineyard* is Israel, therefore laid waste and abandoned ; here, however, it is the institution and planting, which has hitherto been in Israel, but is now given over to others—*the kingdom of God.* It is taken from you builders or husbandmen, and therewith, from the entire people; for the former building without this corner-stone must certainly fall. The *ἔθνει, nation,* which stands opposed to Israel, denotes not the *Gentiles* in common (as Luther has it); but a new people of God gathered from all nations, the true people of God which does not reject the offered grace, the Church which does not again pervert grace through self-will (Acts xv. 14). For it is said of this people, *ποιοῦντι καρποὺς αὐτῆς, bringing forth the fruits thereof;* in which expression the *ποιεῖν καρπούς,* "*bring forth* fruits" (instead of *ἀποδιδόναι,* "render," ver. 41), now leads back to Isaiah, and *αὐτῆς,* "thereof," referred to *βασιλεία,* or kingdom, speaks of the fruits of the kingdom of heaven, *i. e.,* such as are worthy of this kingdom, such as are proper to it.

Verse 44. Mark makes the discourse of Christ break off with Psa. cxviii. ; Luke, contrary to his wonted peculiarity, says nothing in this place of the transference of the kingdom to another people. But he does not omit the *concluding word* respecting the *stone,* he rather brings this into close connection with the passage from the psalm. Christ also proves the Messianic significance of the psalm by bringing into connection with it other passages in Isaiah, and last of all, a decisive prophecy concerning the kingdom from Daniel, and that too (as is particularly to be observed) with an expression, *ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον τοῦτον,* "upon *this* stone," which pre-supposes and affirms the *identity of all these stones* that are spoken of here and there in the *Scriptures.* Can you believe, orthodox theologians, and Christian commentators, that the Son of God has here trifled with an arbitrary combination of Old Testament phrases ? Was he one who could do this ? Was the tone of his feeling on this occasion such as could have done this ? Or, if not, what then remains but that all these *Scriptures* cited by him, with such holy judicial earnestness, belong to that which is written by the prophets concerning the Son of Man ? The transition or the return from Psa. cxviii. to Isaiah is immediately effected by the allusion to Isa. xxviii. 16, where also mention is made of a precious corner-stone of the sure foundation of all believers. If, in this passage, the idea as yet only embraces in general the proffered refuge and security in God, although of course not without a glance at the Messianic salvation in the background, there is a nearer and more direct reference to the coming Mes-

* And so this answer of Christ at the end is substantially parallel to that first one at the beginning, John ii. 19. Break down—I build up again! Reject —the rejected becomes a new foundation.

siah in the other saying, Isa. viii. 14, 15, which the Lord distinctly cites here. In this latter passage *Emmanuel* is promised to the people, and such a promise is already given beforehand that in faith they could and should triumph with Emmanuel; but Jehovah of Hosts becomes, as Emmanuel, a sanctuary and asylum only to the few disciples, the multitude falls through unbelief into darkness, and there happened then typically what was afterwards to be the designation of the true Emmanuel at his birth (Luke ii. 34), viz.: The Lord and God of Israel becomes to them a stone of stumbling and rock of offence (Isaiah נִשְׁבָּרוּ, Sept. συντριβήσονται, here συνθλασθήσεται, which indeed is the same thing). Finally, however, in order to speak quite plainly, Christ, by the association of direct contrariety, connects with this citation that prophecy of the kingdom in Daniel, Dan. ii. 34, 35, 44, concerning the stone that comes without human hands, that becomes a mountain filling the world, and *bruises* all hostile kingdoms and powers (Dan. הֵדֵק, Sept. ver. 44, λεπτυνεῖ καὶ λικμήσει, as here). In Daniel, just as in the psalm, ὁ λίθος οὗτος, *this stone*, is not merely the person of the Messiah, but, along with him, his people and kingdom; only however, in so far as, and because, it is founded upon him, does every stone of the entire building participate in the nature and quality of the foundation-stone. And does not our Lord interpret precisely thus here, when in τὸν λίθον τοῦτον, "*this* stone," he connects his words as well with ver. 42 as with the βασιλεία, or kingdom, ver. 43? By his impressive conclusion, therefore, he will say neither more nor less than what corresponds to the true inmost sense of the passages of Scripture, manifoldly combined by him into one: As it begins in the rejection of my person, so *will it continue to be* with my kingdom upon earth, in which I continue to live and conquer; always new *offence* on the part of those who reject to their own hurt, but at last a certain and complete *judgment* upon all who are obstinate in resisting. For *this stone* is, as רֹאשׁ פִּנָּה, "head of the corner," at once the under foundation and upper cope-stone of the building, whoever (of Jews or Gentiles) henceforth stumbles on the firmly-laid foundation, and falls upon it as a stone of offence,* he *shall* indeed *fall* and be broken, instead of being built and established upon it; but he upon whom the full weight of this foundation of God, which also remains as the one key-stone (2 Tim. ii. 19), falls, shall be crushed, broken, and shivered to pieces. First, then, there is the self-condemnation through unbelief in the Saviour in his low estate (who in his kingdom of the cross is still the crucified and rejected One before the world); afterwards the judgment of God through the victorious might of the exalted One, in his perfected kingdom. The first *breaking* is still of a warning and salutary kind; for he who falls upon the stone may yet become wise, so as in repentance and faith to set himself up on the same stone on which he fell. The *grinding into powder* is irretrievable ruin. "In the first punishment the corner-stone appears at rest, and, as it were, passive; in the second, it is active and in motion. The corner-stone at rest is Jesus as he now reveals himself to us in the Word and Gospel, where he does not judge, but waits for all to come to repentance. The corner-stone grinding the wicked offenders to powder is Jesus as he will reveal himself in the judgment of the world, in his power and glory."† Take heed thou who hearest and readest this! Art thou called a Christian, then the rejected corner-stone lies every where in thy way, and thou must either in faith build upon it, or in unbelief fall upon it. But woe to thee, if it should ever fall on thy hostile head!

* As here Schleiermacher admits that Christ has "worked up" a former parable.

THE MARRIAGE OF THE KING'S SON.

(Matt. xxii. 2–14.)

This is a more expanded repetition of a parable spoken already at an earlier period (at an entertainment on a Sabbath day in the house of a Pharisee, (Luke xiv. 16–24), and one of the most striking examples of the fact, that the wisdom and love of Christ condescended to such repetitions.* The connection in which these two kindred parables occur is, in both cases, one of the very exact kind, such as show it to be historical: in Luke the whole is a manifestly progressive development, from ver. 7 onwards; while Matthew here by the πάλιν ἐν παραβολαῖς, *again in parables* (ver. 1), and the formula of continuation (ver. 15), closely connects this parable with these last sayings of Christ to his enemies, which are all to be conceived of as more or less public. In Luke, as before (vers. 7–14), the pride of the guests and the self-interest of the host are humbled

* Artificial, and contrary to the fundamental idea in Isaiah and Peter, is the sense in which some have understood it, viz.: Whosoever would *move it away* as it were—with the whole force of his bent body—so that *fall upon it* would be here the Hebr. נפל, equivalent to *set upon it* with hostile intent, to attack it (Roos).

† Schmieder, *Zeugniss von Christo in Predigten*, p. 252.

and rebuked; and now, in the parable that follows, he proceeds to check the false claim to a participation in the supper of the kingdom of heaven (ver. 15), artlessly interposed by one who seemed to think that the matter was settled by an edifying exclamation! In answer to this the Lord says: "Ye are not yet sure of this! Ye are invited indeed to this supper, but unless ye come in the right way, by renouncing the world, ye shall not taste of the supper, but others shall do so in your stead!" This is in that passage of Luke the simple principal point of view; and, only after the introduction of the "publicans and sinners" in the place of the Pharisees (ver. 21), does Christ, in a short word, ver. 23, prophetically anticipate the calling of the Gentiles, while he immediately breaks off again at verse 24, and returns to the beginning and the occasion of his discourse. Here, on the contrary, it is the main design further to announce and confirm the *transference of the kingdom of God to the Gentiles*, mentioned at chap. xxi. 42, 43; and, viewing this generally in its historical progress, to show *after* the former parable *what will then further take place*, when the *Son* nevertheless receives and retains *the kingdom*. From this will appear the pervading points of difference between the two parables. In Luke it is as yet with general indefiniteness only the great supper of a man; in Matthew it is the marriage or inauguration feast of the king's son. There it is only one servant who calls, and who represents the general idea of invitation; here there are servants repeatedly sent, as in the foregoing parable. There the guests merely excuse themselves and stay away; here (with a brief allusion to what was there said, ver. 5) they again maltreat and murder the servants. There it is the poor and the infirm in the city, and then all that are without, who are called in place of those first invited; here the invitation goes forth at once to all the world. There the abrupt conclusion is that those who were invited shall not taste the supper; here there is a sentence of punishment upon the murderers and their city. There the house is filled with the new guests; here the view extends further so as to show how, even among those who are called, there are many who will not be chosen.

Verse 2. The *householder* of the preceding parable appears now as *King;* and this of itself marks an advance and transition to the New Testament period which the commentators, in tracing the connection of these two parables, have, for the most part, mistaken. For, although the *kingdom* of God, the theocracy, was already with the Jews, it was yet only in a preparatory and typical form over the one family, and the setting up of the great kingdom took place, properly speaking, only in the Messiah, when he came: The *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*, "kingdom of God," was, at the same time, nay predominantly, matter of *prophecy* and *expectation*. Now, however the rejected stone becomes, notwithstanding, the corner-stone; the Son who was slain lives and ascends the throne. For *this* accession to the government, this inauguration solemnity is certainly meant by the *ποιεῖν γάμους*, *making a marriage*. *Γάμοι* (as nuptiae = *γάμος*, afterwards ver. 8) often, indeed, in other places, signifies simply (like the German *Hochzeit*, originally a *hohe Zeit*) a feast or banquet in general, as Luke xiv. 8; and regard is had to this signification in the *τὸ ἄριστόν μου*, *my supper*, ver. 4. (The Sept. puts *γάμος* for מִשְׁתֶּה, Gen. xxix, 22, and Esth. i. 5, comp. *δοχή* Esth. i. 3; but, at Esth, ii. 18, the rendering of the same מִשְׁתֶּה by *τοὺς γάμους Ἐσθήρ* is intended to denote more definitely the marriage-feast of her who was raised to the rank of queen). *Here* at least, in the parable of Christ, it is quite as wrong to adhere exclusively to the idea of the *feast* (as Syr. משתותא) as it is to develop the strict idea of the marriage or nuptials, after the manner of many commentators and preachers, often with an excess of improper trifling. The marriage of the *King's Son*, solemnized by a feast of joy, is his accession to the throne, since, according to oriental and Old Testament conceptions, the people are united with their ruler as by marriage. The King, and the King's Son to whom the kingdom is given, are the same of whom Psa. lxxii. 1, and Psa. ii. prophesy; his marriage is to be understood from Psa. xlv., where also the people who are brought to him are represented as the bride, comp. 1 Chron. xxix. 22. Still, on the other hand (as more recent commentators in avoiding one mistake have fallen into the other), the figure of the marriage is not entirely to be set aside, as a mere figure for the inauguration; it retains at the same time its truth, as indeed Christ in other places frequently speaks of marriage, and even the Baptist spoke of the bridegroom and the bride. For something must correspond to this figure, and where would be the *bride*, if she were not the invited guests and subjects themselves? Only, indeed—and this is of importance in opposition to the improper conceits in which many here indulge—no single guest by himself is called the bride or a bride, so that it might be proper to speak of brides; but the people as a whole, the Church, is the bride of Christ, and every guest so, in a certain sense, really only as an invited guest, and one who takes part in the marriage.* This great marriage, with all its preparation, extends through a long period, from the coming and presentation of the Bridegroom down to the last marriage-feast properly so called; from the beginning of the kingdom to its consummation. Hence afterwards in Matt. xxv. 1–12 the end is represented as the proper marriage (as Rev. xix. 6, 7), and here also, at the close of the parable, the coming of

* Precisely for this reason it would not be proper in *this* parable to speak expressly of the bride—"for a bride is not called, but chosen" (Roos).

the King to his guests stretches thus far forward.*

Verses 3, 4. The view which we have taken of the beginning of this parable—in so far as, further prophesying, it connects itself with the conclusion of the preceding one and continues the history of the rejected Son—shows the impropriety of the interpretation generally adopted, according to which the *servants* here are again the Old Testament prophets. Olshausen understands *both* sendings thus; Grotius finds, at least in the second, the apostles and Evangelists; but even the first servants invite to a marriage already prepared, and an inauguration of the *King's Son* just about to begin. This Son, who, in the former parable, was as yet himself only a *servant* who invited others—the last and greatest prophet—is now the exalted *Lord*, to whose presence the servants with kindness and long-suffering invite those to whom they are sent. Did not this take place in the apostle's sermon concerning the crucified One to his crucifiers, as chap. xxiii. 34 presently foretells? Observe the important difference between the two parables! Formerly fruits were *demanded;* now an *invitation is given* to the supper. There was also an invitation to come in faith, a holding forth of promised grace, contained as a New Testament in the bosom of the Old, together with the demand for righteousness, *i. e.*, sincere and earnest penitence in reference to the law—but *this* is not meant by Christ in his second parable, in which he advances further. For here, as at chap. xxiii. 34, all that he means to say is: God will begin again to preach to you after my exaltation, but ye will do to *my* prophets and messengers precisely as ye did to those that went before, and to myself! In the expression καλέσαι τοὺς κεκλημένους, "to call *those that were bidden*," at the very outset, the entire Old Testament, with all the calls that had been addressed to the Jews as the pre-elected guests of the kingdom of God, is *pre-supposed* (comp. Luke xiv. 16, 17, where, after a first ἐκάλεσε, there follows *at the hour of supper* the same εἰπεῖν τοῖς κεκλημένοις). The custom at that time, and yet prevalent in eastern countries (in the west existing here and there as a popular custom), of inviting twice—first as it were nominating the guests, and then calling them again to the feast when it is ready*—affords a simple and suitable figure for the relation between the Old and New Testament invitation addressed to Israel.† The first gracious and covenant word, viz., "Ye are my people, the called of the present and future kingdom!" they had complacently received, and they imagined themselves to be *the guests* who could not fail to sit down at the table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But the *coming*, the true coming according to God's method of salvation—they failed in that! This was already evident from the preparatory demand of the prophets for the true readiness; and it is now at last fully evident when, after God has made all things ready, they obstinately persevere in not willing and not coming. It is clear, then, that the guests here marked out beforehand are the Jews collectively, as vers. 7–9 also proves; on the other hand, in Luke xiv., the idea of certain persons invited before others is that which is more prominent, so that there, at ver. 21, the publicans and sinners stand in contrast with the Scribes and Pharisees, who, according to their own opinion, were, without more ado, entitled to the resurrection of the just. But why is there here also in the New Testament sending, as in the foregoing parable, a twofold call, a πάλιν ἄλλους δούλους, "yet other servants?" This cannot be without its significance here, any more than there. We think the first servants in this parable are John the Baptist, with his call to come to the Messiah and Bridegroom; and *joined with him* the *Twelve* and *Seventy*, who continued his preaching concerning the kingdom of heaven being at hand, in their first mission to the cities of Israel. This is the interpretation lately given by Helferich ;‡ and, in fact, we should have felt some surprise had the Saviour no where expressed a special condemnation of the unbelief in this first and evangelical preaching of his forerunner, and of those whom he sent before himself. He does this here, and at this point the two parables, which are connected by the link of continuation, run into each other; as was actually the case in the *transition* from the Old to the New Testament. The former parable has represented the Baptist, and even the Son himself, as the finishers of the Old

* The distinction made by some, recently also by Meyer, between ἄριστον and δεῖπνον, the morning meal and the cœna properly so called, seems artificial. For, although certainly the δεῖπνον, Luke xiv., plainly points forward to the future "eating of bread in the kingdom of God" (ver. 24, φάγεται), yet the ἄριστον also in Matt. ver. 4, comprehends the entire meal with the final perfect enjoyment, even on to the decision of the judgment, and *afterwards;* for when the unworthy are cast out, then properly the supper begins. We are certainly not to understand festivities of the same day following each other (at the beginning, and as a foretaste, the morning meal, then the principal entertainment). Christ himself contradicts such a distinction of the words used by him, when at Luke xiv. 12, 13, he speaks of ἄριστον ἢ δεῖπνον as a δοχή in general.

* In particular was this a custom among the upper classes at Jerusalem. Sepp cites *Echa rabbathi*, 4. 2: "Quaenam fuit gloria Hierosolymitanorum? Nemo eorum venit ad convivium, nisi bis vocatus."

† Not in accordance with the text therefore is the idea, otherwise true, which some find here: According to eternal love and election those called were already held as guests before the calling. Or again: "I have prepared a marriage-feast; a marriage feast needs *guests*, call 'the guests' hither, for whom I have prepared it."

‡ Namely, F. J. M. Helferich of Dolgesheim. See his original *Sermons* (Frankfort, 1841), which, in spite of their many faults, we yet strongly recommend on account of their fresh life, and their quaint originality.

Testament message, which *required* something of those to whom it was addressed, and this was the one side of the truth; to supplement it, however, the other side must now follow, according to which the Baptist, and the apostles and Evangelists who were analogous to him in their first mission, invite to the kingdom which has just begun, to the marriage which is just about to be celebrated. (Christ's own call, "Come unto me!" remains here properly in the background, as the plan of the parable requires. In Luke, chap. xiv, on the other hand, the one servant was actually the Son in disguise; his invitation, with its result, however, was certainly also that which is there represented—consequently the same as Matt. ver. 5.) This interpretation is not confuted, but rather confirmed, when we see how the first invitation is called only a καλέσαι εἰς τοὺς γάμους, or "call to the marriage;" on the contrary, at the *second*, properly the apostolic invitation, not only is the hour of the banquet near at hand, but now *all things* are, properly speaking, *ready*. But that this last preparation of the feast consists in the atoning, sacrificial death of him who was slain—this mysterious and innermost truth, Christ, of course, as yet conceals, and has only hinted at it in the preceding parable.

The first result, *They would not* come! by no means denotes a first stage of rejecting unbelief, the "lowest degree" as exemplified in the indifferent who have only no inclination to come and nothing further—as most preachers say, and even Dräseke in his excellent three sermons on this parable. But it is the disclosure, as yet in a general style, of the state of things which the unbelieving resistance of the people, from their fathers downwards, had brought about, such as must become manifest in the days of Jesus the Son of Man; it is the same which, after having led them ever nearer to it, he leaves with them at last, Matt. xxiii. 37, but which he had also frequently said to them since John v. 40. They would not, *i. e.*, simply, they *did not come*, and that through the fault of their own not willing; because the promised kingdom pleased them indeed, but not the divinely appointed way of coming into it, because they desired a Messiah, but not the actual Messiah as he now appears to them. Afterwards, vers. 5, 6, this οὐκ ἤθελον, "they would not," is by no means intensified; but the persons spoken of are now first more exactly distinguished according to the two classes of the merely negatively indifferent, and the positively hostile.

The guests, who had already made their unwillingness so manifest, continue nevertheless, in the eye of God's long-suffering, to be, and are again called, *the guests;* and as if he cannot suppose or give credit to so horrible a thing, he sends the apostles in a last season of grace before the judgment to say, Will men then show such contempt to their God and Lord, as they would be ashamed of were it done to a man; namely, that he should have prepared a banquet, and that the *guests* should not come to it? Therefore, "*Tell* them which are bidden; tell them once more in true and faithful words; perhaps all that has gone before has not been rightly done, or not rightly heard and considered, perhaps the poor people may yet bethink themselves, may yet become willing and come." Oh, how love constrains the King to dispose of his banquet, to win and keep his rebellious subjects! All former unwillingness is to be forgiven, a new Behold! displays the gifts of grace, prepared through the atonement of Christ, in all their entire sufficiency and glory. All that is needed is to *come*, and that every one should bring nothing with him but his poverty and sin, only even yet to kiss and to acknowledge the King's Son; *all things* are yet open, now (Luke xiv. 17, ἤδη) for the first time all things are perfectly *ready*. This now is certainly the apostolic, and no longer the prophetic invitation. The carrying out of the metaphor of a banquet by the slaughter of oxen and fatlings, points back to Prov. ix. 2, 3, as our Lord ever delights in throwing the light of fulfillment upon Old Testament words—τεθυμένα, "killed," however, does not necessarily indicate a sacrificial meal (for θύειν has the same signification with σφάζειν, as, in the New Testament, John x. 10 proves, and Prov. ix. 2, Sept. ἔσφαξε τὰ ἑαυτῆς θύματα for טִבְחָה טִבְחָהּ). When God furnishes and prepares for his only begotten Son the feast of the kingdom, the pleasure and honor of bestowing salvation upon sinners, what a fulness of glory must there be in the enjoyment of it! But those who will not have the Son do not come, and if they remain in this state of mind they must certainly be judged as obstinate *rebels*. The grace of God in Christ is a grace which overtakes the sinner, which is all-sufficient, which repeatedly invites and *urges*, but it does not *compel;* for those who resist it there remains the condemnation, *Ye* would not, although *I* would with all earnestness and long-suffering zeal!

Verses 5, 6. The ἀμελήσαντες or *careless*—which is a milder expression than to *make light of* or scorn—are those indifferent ones who are sunk in earthliness, and with whom "the remnant" are contrasted as making a hostile resistance. Already have the first class of guests their *own* farm and merchandise, which stand over against the "*my* supper" in the invitation immediately before; indicating the sinful cleaving to the things of the world that characterizes them, and consequently the root and germ of the same feeling of pride in which afterwards the false guest despises the wedding-garment of the King. "I myself have my garment; I make ready my own feast; I have even to celebrate my own wedding"—for Christ here briefly calls to mind the excuses of Luke xiv. 18–20 (I *must* go elsewhere, I *go* elsewhere, I *can* not, *i. e.*, I *will* not come). The one has already his property and land; the other is still eager on making gain by his trade and merchandise

Tell those who are thus indifferent to the call of God, that all which they call their own profits them nothing, and as a vain thing cannot save them; follow them upon their earthly ways with this testimony, and with the entreaty that they will accept the gracious gifts of the King—and they will in the end show themselves to be also positively hostile, and all the more angry and insolent the more kindly grace has been offered to them.*

Verse 7. What, in the figure of the ἄνθρωπος βασιλεύς or king, is an exhaustion of long patience and a sudden outbreak of just anger, is in the Lord God one and the same with his holy love; nay, the burning anger itself testifies to the fervent love of the all-sufficient Creator towards the creature who obstinately refuses all his grace and goodness.† If thou wilt see a most special testimony to the true *wrath* of God, which broke forth after the times of long-suffering, and in due time, then look at the destruction of Jerusalem,‡ and see how the wrath of God is come upon these Jews "to the uttermost," εἰς τέλος, (1 Thess. ii. 16, *i. e.*, עַד־כָּלָה, ἕως τέλους, Dan. ix. 26, 27). The Lord refers precisely to this prophecy of Daniel, in which he already properly breaks through the parable with the prophetically present explanation. As at chap. xxiv. 15, he mentions the abomination of desolation, so now he says, πέμψας τὰ στρατεύματα αὐτοῦ, "he sent forth his armies," which corresponds to the עַם נָגִיד הַבָּא, "people of the prince that should come," of Daniel. We, therefore (in opposition to Hengstenberg's and Hävernick's not unanswerable reasons), abide by Luther's rendering: And a people of the Prince—the וְעַם נָגִיד יָשִׁיחַ—(if not, *shall come*, or be sent by him, yet) who *comes* to judgment through the people sent by him. Just when the *Messiah the Prince* appears as the *Messiah* cut off, he comes again as the *Prince* to destroy the city and the sanctuary. The Romans, as hostile hosts, serve the judging Lord and God of Israel, at the same time, as angels of judgment;* it is these alone (with their eagles, Matt. xxiv. 28, comp. Luke xix. 43), and not higher hosts of God or angels, that we are in the first place to understand as meant here. *Their* city, no longer the city of the king: this is said by way of rejecting them, as afterwards (chap. xxiii. 38), *your* house!

Verses 8–10. But now, that grace which will not have the feast made ready in vain begins anew to call other guests and subjects to the most gracious King. Oh how tenderly, and with what gracious sorrow, does the angry King immediately say, The guests were *not worthy*—as if sinners would have been worthy and deserving had they accepted the first invitation! This is his strongest expression of anger and complaint; he "chides them on the score of honor," because they have robbed him of the prerogative of being gracious to them and bestowing salvation upon them. I wished to bestow upon them honor as my invited guests, but this had no value for them! (See the fulfillment, Acts xiii. 46, and compare the earlier expression, Matt. x. 13.) The servants also who were killed still live; they arise ever anew, for the great King can furnish for himself, even out of his few faithful ones, servants enough for continued sendings. And now first is fully introduced the great and wide kingdom; the new mission goes forth εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα, "into all the world" (Mark xvi. 15), beyond the city, and the circle of those first invited, far off to the "*ways* of the Gentiles" (comp. Luke xiv. 21, 23). This we take to be the right sense of the διεξόδους τῶν ὁδῶν, which occurs only here in the New Testament. Others understand it of cross-ways, as being special places of concourse; but it appears to us more suitable simply to understand it of the roads, *going out* in all directions from and beyond that which had been hitherto the circle of invitation. (In Ezek. xlviii. 30, תּוֹצָאוֹת הָעִיר is by Aquila, Symmach. and Theodot. rendered by διέξοδοι.) *Good and bad* we understand simply from the foregoing, Whomsoever ye find, whomsoever they found—therefore equivalent to "without distinction and respect of persons," invite *all* who will come. This is not already "a going beyond the parable to the application" (Von Gerlach), if it is only suitably understood and explained. Although Pfenninger, with apparent point, observes that both words are always used of men only in a *moral* sense, yet it would be a very unsuitable anticipation to define the *good* here already in the invitation. For it is not as *good* that they are all invited; and those who are at last the ἐκλεκτοί or "chosen" have first become so as κλητοί or "called" (by the garment they have received). So, in chap. xiii. 48 (which is wrongly cited as parallel to the present), the good and bad are not discovered till the

* Does the Gospel, then, throw people thus into anger? Yes, if a man wants to be angry with another, nothing may irritate him more than to seek to overcome and gain him with love. It is even more tolerable to people to be reproved on the score of all the ten commandments. They perceive well *what they must rid themselves of* if they are to make earnest work of this call (C. H. Rieger).

† If I were to give one an invitation, out of mere civility, to dine with me, while I was not in earnest, I should not be angry if he refused. And, O man, if thy God merely spoke a word of courtesy, if it did not proceed *from the deepest depths of his heart* when he thus calls thee to blessedness, he would then certainly not be so angry at thee for despising his supper (G. K. Rieger).

‡ Of which the burning city here is not merely "a dark hint" (as Lange thinks). For the rest it is not denied, that this first and foremost type repeats itself in destructions and judgments of all kinds until the final burning of the world.

* Only this is meant here, not any hint already at the circumstance that now the Gentiles are called to the service of Christ.

separation; before this only ἐκ παντὸς γένους, *of every kind*, ver. 47, was said. By a proverbial expression, therefore, good and bad are sinners and the *so-called* righteous, the godless and the respectable together—this, indeed, is a *moral* sense which may be represented in the parable by eminent and obscure, respectable and vulgar, etc. If we look back to chap. xxi. 31, it will be evident that we must seek the guest who is detected as having despised the wedding-garment, only among the "good." Thus the wedding-chamber (for which ὁ γάμος itself is significantly put, for the principal idea is that of the prepared joys and pleasures) does not remain empty; but has become full of ἀνακειμένους, of guests actually come and waiting for the banquet. All these enjoy already somewhat of the royal favor and honor, the gathering meanwhile goes on until all are assembled, there is yet room for every one who has sat down; this is the wide intermediate period in which Christendom, called from among the heathen, now stands. At last, however, *the King* himself appears, of course with, and in his Son, on whose account the feast is made, and the festivities are now to begin. And now the King must again discriminate, for unworthy guests may not stand before his presence—whether it be that from the first they would not come; or that they have come in a wrong way, having hypocritically intruded themselves into the company, while in heart they are proud despisers.

Verses 11, 12. To the second act of the parable, which is now added, corresponds a similar Jewish proverb about such as venture to enter the palace of the King in a dirty and loathsome state. Our Lord, however, takes his similitude directly from the Scripture, Zeph. i. 8, where, indeed, the קְרוּאַי, "guests," ver. 7, who are sanctified for the great *sacrifice*, do not correspond to the guests of our parable, but are the executioners of the Lord's anger on the day of judgment; those, however, who are clothed with *strange apparel* (an expression that is singular in the Old Testament, and remarkable), are the same as the unworthy guest here. There it is especially princes and kings' sons who, in their pride, make a display of their own splendor, or, in their apostasy from Jehovah, let themselves be honored and dressed in purple by strange rulers; while Jehovah will see his own people only in the apparel of his kingdom, decorated only with the favors and honors which he has dealt out. The custom which still exists in the East, and is mentioned from the earliest times in the Old Testament, of presenting festival garments, is well known (Gen. xlv. 22; Judg. xiv. 12; 2 Kings v. 22). These passages contain a sufficient answer to "the objection, that the existence of such a usage in ancient times cannot be proved"—an objection, moreover, which, although it were better grounded, is declared, even by Neander, to be insufficient, inasmuch as we may infer from later customs that similar ones prevailed in the earliest ages. Neander suggests it as a difficulty that Christ did not expressly note this circumstance, and reprimand the guest for his contempt of the offered garment; but we are of opinion that this is very evidently *pre-supposed*. That the missed *wedding-garment* can only be such a *caftan*, offered by the rich king to all the guests, *is self-evident;* for where otherwise could such as were brought in from the streets obtain their worthy garment?* As the king clothes his guests, the bridegroom his bride (Psa. xlv. 10), so does God himself clothe us with the robe of righteousness and the garment of salvation (Isa. lxi. 10). We may and we must, when he calls, come just *as we are*—but we may not, if we would see *his* face and enjoy his last feast, *remain* as we are. In the way, or rather in the fore-court and anteroom, something takes place beforehand which no one can refuse with impunity, and from which no one can withdraw himself without being found out. This parable, which is designed prophetically to announce the entire counsel and way of God with Jews and Gentiles, becomes complete only when carried out to this decisive point. Olshausen's doubt whether the second part of the parable applies to the Pharisees is easily disposed of. For, in the first place, Christ speaks not merely for them, but for all people and all disciples also in all future time; and then the thought could not but force itself on the conscience of the Pharisees—Such people as you, with your own honor and righteousness, will yourselves never be tolerated by God in his kingdom!

The King comes to *view* the *guests*, *i. e.*, now already ἀνακειμένους, or reclining at table, therefore κλητούς, "called," and not merely κεκλημένους, "bidden;" and this entrance and inspection takes place on account of those confident ones who sit and imagine that they will participate in the feast because they have come! Yes, they have come, but not as loyal subjects—they sit at the table, but it is as despisers of the grace of the one Lord and host. Scarcely has the King entered when such a one falls under his eye, who is therefore named as a first specimen of the *many*, ver. 14. It was indeed told to him, as to all the rest, that every one must put on the wedding-garment offered to him; but his own dress appeared to him sufficient, and in this he has intruded himself, thinking that he may offer this to the most gracious King. He has not indeed despised the feast, but will enjoy it along with the others; however "he wants to belong to the number of the happy, while he will know nothing of terms or conditions" (Dräseke), at least of the one principal condition, namely, that he renounce what belongs to self. What belongs to *self*, however, is before

* Lange says very truly: "This striking feature of the parable would create no difficulty even if there existed no trace of the recorded custom. The poorest man gets his festival garment if he is called as a favorite to the court." Even in the west this custom quite generally obtains.

God sin; the wilfully hypocritical pride of goodness is in his sight the worst shame and nakedness. That Christ, by the man who has not on the wedding-garment, means in the first place a despiser on *such* grounds is clear, although we may suppose at the same time a further reference to all to whom in any way the wedding-garment is wanting; for the parable is not meant to say *every thing*, but only brings forward a principal feature and breaks off. What now is the garment? One might say, The course of life, the works—if that is understood aright, as it is meant in Rev. xix. 8. But quite as well may we say, with Luther's marginal gloss, This is faith—but faith that is genuine, loving, sanctifying; as Wesley very well expresses it, "the righteousness of Christ, first imputed then implanted." To have put on Christ, as the apostle says: *If so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked* (2 Cor. v. 3)—this is, and must ever be, however, a matter of the inner man; in the last instance only known to ourselves, and manifest to the Judge of hearts. Therefore we do not find here the servants exercising this discrimination; they merely offered the garments according to their commission, and turned away from the door such as were evidently for coming in beggar's rags without any change of raiment; many others, however, passed before them in the crowd whom they could not discern. The King's eyes of flame see differently, and as he sees the unworthy guest, so he judges him. The still half-friendly ἑταῖρε, "friend," just as at chap. xx. 13, is certainly not meant either here or there in a bitter and derisive sense (see chap. xxvi. 50). Even in the mouth of the Judge there is still the condescending, convicting question; and a sufficient answer and excuse would still be accepted, if such were possible. "*How* camest thou in hither, how hast thou dared even to enter, not to speak of sitting down, *without having* on a wedding-garment? Thou knowest well that this was prepared for thee according to the right and favor of this feast, and that thou hast despised it."* This is the sin which alone is judged; not the first sin with which we come, but the not receiving the grace that covers and cancels it.

Verses 13, 14 The διάκονοι, *ministers*, different from the foregoing δούλοις, *servants*, are here the angels, as in chap. xiii. 39, 49. The man bound by these strong ones can make no resistance; just as when struck dumb before the countenance and word of the King he could not justify himself. The outer darkness, with the weeping and gnashing of teeth, was already spoken of, chap. viii. 12; it recurs again at chap. xxv. 30 (xxiv. 51). Thus far the King in the parable; the concluding saying is added by the Lord Jesus in his own person, taking the place of this King;* just as in Luke xiv. 24 he himself spoke the concluding word. We are already acquainted with this saying concerning the few who are chosen; as in chap. xx. 16, addressed to the disciples, and here to the Pharisees in the presence of all the people. After this parable there is no need for a word being said against the *gratia irresistibilis* of an absolute decree, which is only put by violence into the words. In like manner the πολλοὶ κλητοί or κεκλημένοι, "*many* called" or "bidden," are certainly in the first place only in antithesis to the ὀλίγοι, or *few;* and what is meant to be said is, It will happen to many as to this one here described! That our Lord, according to the original decree and its final execution, calls *all*, is also in the parable at least provided for in the wide commission, Call *whomsoever ye meet!* Say to no one, Thou art not meant and invited! but if any one asks, I also? let your answer be, Yes, certainly, all, all, whosoever will come! But as the Gospel is preached gradually to all in *due time* (1 Tim. ii. 6), as the calling of many is not manifest on earth, we cannot therefore speak *historically* of a calling of all. *This*, at all events—with the reserve which the Scripture generally maintains regarding the state of those who are not called upon earth—the πολλοί, "many," here might indicate; for the narrative of the prophetic parable hardly reaches to the last end of the ways of God—the general and last judgment properly speaking.

CHRIST'S ANSWER RESPECTING THE TRIBUTE TO CÆSAR.

(Matt. xxii. 18–21; Mark xii. 15–17; Luke xx. 23–25.)

The preceding formally official question of the unbelieving Jews, with which after three years full of rejected testimonies and signs they would begin anew, had issued ill for those who put it; the Respondent had shamed *them*, arrested and caught them in their own judgment. Notwithstanding, part of them, here called the *Pharisees*, acting always with the same unity of compact and determined resistance, lay a plot, in the incorrigible folly of their evil hearts, for entrapping *him* by words which they would craftily tempt him to utter! He has not yet said enough to them; they are bent upon bringing yet greater shame upon themselves. Such questioning in order to entangle and take him in an answer had

* The negation μὴ ἔχων indicates this knowledge, as Winer rightly observes in his *Grammar*.

* Thus we see that the *King* (ver. 11) is the Son who ascends the throne, whose oneness with the Father is thus indicated.

indeed been an accustomed device of theirs (Luke xi. 53, 54). But now, in these last days, the evil one especially tempts them to this scheme; not knowing that all the yet remaining testimony for the truth was only thus to be obtained for the world from the mouth of Christ. What is said in Psa. xli. 6–10 must go on fulfilling itself.

On this occasion, it is properly speaking the *Pharisaic* party, as such, which in a formally deliberative assembly, *συμβούλιον*, contrives the new artifice. The rulers keep themselves for all issues wisely in the background, they only send *their disciples* as *ἐγκαθέτους*, or suborned listeners; these, however, are in cunningly-contrived fellowship with the people (in other respects hated by them) belonging to the party of *Herod*, who had just come to the feast at Jerusalem. (Of these Herodians we have already spoken, Matt. xvi. 6.) Ecclesiastics and politicians, orthodox and liberals, pietists and free-thinkers—all who, in ordinary circumstances, go separate ways, are here found in friendly combination against Christ. The knaves address the *Master* (the Pharisees, of course, being spokesmen, for *this* they will not allow to be taken from them), as if they would *learn* from him, and as if they would submit themselves to an utterance of his authority. The second word is again their "*we know*"—not indeed "that thou art come from God, the Messiah"—but "that thou art *true*, and teachest the way of God *in truth*."* Twice do these hypocrites and liars compel themselves to take into their mouths without shame the word which judges them; but this only aggravated their wicked falsehood, just as the devil speaks the worst lies even when he utters truth. "Thou judgest not according to men; and accommodatest thyself to no man"—as they indeed had often enough experienced! "When it concerns teaching the way of *God*, thou regardest not the person of *men*"—all this taken together is indeed the highest praise of a *teacher*, perfectly applicable only to the *faithful Witness* (Rev. i. 5). And it is here accorded to him by his enemies, who lie when they speak the truth, and who, on the other hand, must needs speak the truth when they think they lie. The wretches think they can cozen Christ with praise as if he were one of themselves; they imagine thus to be able to gain his confidence—as if he stood in this relation to them! As if he—seeing that the truth is in him—must not also know what is in false man! As if he would give his confidence to *these* men whom he has so long known, when they now all at once strike this new note! No poet could portray united falsehood and folly with more psychological depth and striking effect, than these miserable men depict them in themselves, by a word or two from their own lips, in the simple narrative of the Evangelists.

And now what will they learn from him; what is the question which follows this fine preface? It is in truth, in the then existing circumstances, a very puzzling question respecting the giving of tribute to the Roman emperor. "*Tell* us now, with thy well-known frankness, which we doubt not thou wilt show on this occasion also, here in the temple before all the people—tell us *ὀρθῶς* and *ἐπ' ἀληθείας* (correctly and in truth), *What thinkest thou*, what is thy doctrine on this point? Thou carest nothing for Cæsar; and nothing for these *Herodians*, if thou knowest them. Thou knowest that we Pharisees are not at one with them on this subject—judge now between us a true judgment. It is with us an important matter of conscience whether it be *lawful* or not; nay, rather, it appears to us Pharisees actually a sin to give tribute to Cæsar, to pay a poll-tax,* seeing that we already give our *δίδραχμα* (didrachm) to the temple of God, and that the people of Jehovah ought to be subjected to no heathen government."† After the first question, *ἔξεστι δοῦναι ἢ οὔ;* "Is it lawful to give or not?" in which the case is proposed, there follows in Mark the urgent repetition of the question, *δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν;* "Shall we give or not?" "We want a clear and categorial answer, Yes or No! to this 'burning question' about *paying* and *giving*, which is of so much consequence to all the people." With such ludicrous boldness do they expose themselves to the Holy One, who has already so often judged them and put them to flight; in the vain imagination that he cannot escape from *this* cunningly-twisted snare. Displease *one* party he certainly must, they think. For, should he say *No* (which was the answer they expected, and wished for), then the *Herodians*, who were favorably disposed to the dominion of the Romans, would be witnesses to the accusation against him; while the Pharisees would be ready, as "impartial, honest" people, to be joint witnesses with them in such a case; and the cry would go forth, he has decided that we should not *give* (comp. Luke xx. 20 with xxiii. 2). Should he say, Yes—then he would compromise himself with the people, who were expecting emancipation from the yoke of Rome. And if he should not answer at all, that would be equally little to the purpose. This is their plot, and they fail because their wickedness has blinded them.

Verses 18, 19. They do not need to wait, their answer comes immediately, but very contrary to what they expected. With one glance, and in majestic calmness, he tears in pieces their net, repels with becoming dignity the flattery of their lips; while he accepts

* In Luke it is somewhat a circumlocution: *ὅτι ὀρθῶς λέγεις καὶ διδάσκεις*, *i. e.*, Thou speakest privately and in particular every word, and publicly and in general all thy teaching—according to truth.

* In Luke *φόρος*, which, as distinguished from *τέλος*, indicates always personal taxes.

† Against the Idumean Herod the entire Sanhedrim, appealing to the passage in Deut. xviii. 15, had declared their protest.

the truth that lay in their words, and gives them forthwith to their face the desired proof of the fact that he truly speaks without regarding the person of men. "Why *tempt* ye me, ye *hypocrites?* Ye represent yourselves as tenderly conscientious people (Luke, δίκαιοι), and yet hide beneath this pretence the most perfect malice!" This first word, accompanied with the majestic glance of holy judicial anger, would have been quite sufficient to send them away speechless. But the Lord will not merely triumph over these enemies by such a direct demonstration of power; he will condescendingly *teach* them to the last, even when it is malice that bids him; he will yet obediently do the will of him who sent him to testify for the truth (John xviii. 37). Thus does his victory become a manifold and complete one; thus does his love beat down their malice, his humility their impudence, his wisdom their folly; thus does he bless his enemies with a salutary rebuke, if they would only receive it, and utter a great and most momentous word for Israel and for the whole world. That word he will utter in a thoroughly convictive and memorable way, placing it in concrete connection with something palpable, so that it may be no mere word. He will damp the warm and passionate eagerness of his interrogators—as was becoming to himself, and beneficial to them—before the utterance that requires hearing ears comes from his mouth. He will, finally, make the tempters themselves, taken in their own snare, produce the symbolical and real decision of their own question! Thus does he, in one moment of simple wisdom, discover more reflection than they have done by their long deliberation. "*Show* or *bring* me the coin with which ye (in spite of your scruples) pay the tribute!" Mark and Luke say at once δηνάριον, "a penny," which is the same thing. The former makes Christ use the word φέρετε, because they would actually have first to *fetch* and produce a Roman denarius; which Christ indeed foresaw, but yet in his *word* will not pre-suppose (as this would somewhat impair its dignity).* Meanwhile the expectation of the people is on the stretch; there is a solemn stillness which admonishes all who can and will give heed, to open their ears and their hearts.

Verses 20, 21. And he does *not* yet answer with the first word, does not say Yes or No, as they had asked of him; but puts another question in return—What money is this? *whose is this image and superscription?* We see how he catechises the hypocrites again, as simply as in that other place (chap. xxi. 31). They shall and they must continue to testify against themselves; and by the extorted answer, "*Cæsar's*," lay the ground upon which he suddenly takes his stand with the judicial word which, without Yes or No, more than sufficiently settles the whole question: *Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.*

If there be any one who feels, or will acknowledge, no fulness and depth of meaning in this wondrous word of Christ—we pity his feeling, his understanding, or his exegetical caprice. When Dr. Justus Jonas calls this Gospel (the 23d of Trinity) "the tronblesome Gospel which has bitten so many preachers"—we can understand this only of a pitiful anxiety on the part of poor preachers to find a definite and sharply pointed *sensus simplex* in the pregnant words for a short and plain sermon. But when the *Wandsbecker Bote* says—"*Andrew*,* what a fulness of meaning in all that comes from his mouth! It reminds me of those boxes, in which every one is found to inclose another"—we heartily agree with the observation. But we shall not be satisfied with merely remarking this; we shall venture to open the boxes one after the other, and to look into them; in other words, to consider and develop the fulness of the meaning in due order.

The first and most direct sense, then, in answer to the question (seeing that the imperial coin had been shown, and that this was what was spoken of), is certainly, *Render to every one his tribute!* This connects itself immediately with the proof given by their hand into Christ's hand that they have *two kinds of coin;* the Roman, with Cæsar's image and title, and the holy temple-money with another stamp. This proves two things: the right of Cæsar to his money; and the freedom of the temple and the temple tax, which indeed Cæsar had not yet taken from them. Olshausen speaks from exegetical caprice, which cannot reconcile itself to words being taken typically in many senses, when he boldly affirms that "every reference of the τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ, 'unto God the things that are God's,' to the temple tax of half a shekel disturbs the point of view of the entire narrative." For if τὰ Καίσαρος, "the things that are Cæsar's," means at all events first *the coin*, and then figuratively much more (which, in opposition to the universal preaching on this text in Christendom, he cannot and will not deny), the same must surely hold good of the antithesis in the other member. The jejune Michaelis is also right when he demonstrates this first sense. According to him,† there lay in this question something of the caustic, genuine Pharisaic scruple: "the *yearly poll-tax* belongs to *God*, who has imposed it upon us in his law, and we have conscientious scruples against *giving to Cæsar what is God's.*" But the emperor at that

* Bengel infers from what Mark further adds: ἵνα ἴδω—*that I may see it*—that Christ till this time had never had such money before his eyes; but this seems far-fetched and open to easy confutation. The expression simply means: We will see how the matter stands; give me the *corpus delicti* that I may examine and give judgment upon it.

* The above quotation is from a *dialogue* in the works of *Claudius*. Andrew is the name of one of the speakers.

† *Mosaisches Recht*, part iii., § 173.

time did not yet require, as Vespasian did afterwards, the half-shekel to be given to the capitol instead of the temple. Our Lord first of all indicates this: "*Such* money is not even received in the temple, it is in fact the coin of the emperor current among you; ye may with good conscience, nay ye ought, to give to each of your two masters his own tax and coin." A rabbinical rule says, "The coin of the country shows the master"—*i. e.*, actual subjection follows from the currency of the accepted coin. Accordingly Christ says to them in effect: Ye do not in other respects despise the emperor's money, ye acknowledge his dominion by your making use of it; if your conscience were so tender, then the difficulty must have occurred to you sooner, and such money should not at all have been used by you. This, then, is the first meaning, and that which lies most evidently on the surface; but is it, as Michaelis thinks, the sole, the entire meaning, "only more concisely and elegantly expressed," without τὸ νόμισμα or the coin? We protest strongly against this, and proceed still further to open the boxes.

A Dr. Am Ende preached from these words in the Krenz-Kirche at Dresden, 1756, before Frederick the Great, and drew from them as his theme the Prussian motto, *Suum cuique*. Quite justly; for in the τὰ Καίσαρος—τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, "the things that are Cæsar's—the things that are God's," with its *widening* circle of meaning, Christ really intends further to say this, and to mark the true distinction between God and Cæsar. He will show that the two services are quite compatible the one with the other, leaving no room for any scruple of conscience; as Solomon, Eccles. viii. 2, has said of the *king* of Israel (which indeed was not quite the same) and the *God* of Israel. The questioners have in a manner set *God* and *men* in opposition to each other; so that the answer, from this point of view, should allow nothing to Cæsar, because his dominion was contrary to the way of God with Israel. It is not so, however; and our Lord connects together the service of God and men, although in other respects he will know nothing of two masters. What a comprehensively general proposition is this! Even if, as he does not say exactly τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *the things that are men's*, we should understand no more than all *human ordinance and authority* (1. Pet. ii. 13); for so much our Lord will certainly include in what he says as applicable to all nations—those also which are not Israel, and whose rulers are not precisely called Cæsar. But of course he *separates* by a just *suum cuique*, even while he *connects:* to give to Cæsar what is God's, or *vice versa*, he will certainly not permit. And how so? This is just what the hypocrites do, even when they suppose they do it not, and Christ rebukes them *for this* first of all. Make the true distinction between the things which pertain to Cæsar and those which pertain to God! Make not the kingdom and government of God over you to consist in outward things, such as paying or refusing a tax; do not confound politics and religion by the unseasonable application of theocratic ideas, seeing that, as ye know, the dealings of God with his Israel have often enough been by foreign dominion. Only we must here guard against a misunderstanding of this saying, which was formerly more frequent than it is now, namely, that what is outward and earthly should be, as it were, thrown over to the state, as being of no importance. Thus our Lord would be made to say: "Ye have enough to do with God, ye who, as true δίκαιοι or 'just persons,' would act according to my advice. What matters to you the tax of Cæsar, and such other things? Only *surrender* without concern every thing earthly and outward, money and land, body and life, to your king, whoever he may be, how much soever of these he will have, and keep the soul for God!" No! far be it from our Lord thus to degrade government, thus falsely to sever the outward from the inward!* He teaches quite as decidedly on the other side: "Seek and maintain the *true unity* in your duty and obligation toward God and man! Serve Cæsar for God's sake, who has placed him over you, as once he did Nebuchadnezzar over your fathers." Thus does it harmonize with Jer. xxvii. 6–11, xxix. 7, and Rom. xiii.; 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14, as also John xix. 11. To be a dutiful subject of Cæsar, and to be an obedient servant of God, are *quite compatible the one with the other*, so far as, and because, God has given dominion to Cæsar; consequently, to give Cæsar his own for God's sake, means properly, only to obey God. Thus does Christ decide—in cases of collision arising from hypocrisy, self-will, or fanaticism—against all carnal zealots or falsely spiritual Quakers; while it is evident that the very same words decide upon every genuine case of collision in which the obeying of God rather than man must take effect.† The second clause, in which he gives the confirmation of the first, continues indeed at the same time the *limitation*, expressing the true limits of obedience. This inner connection of the two clauses thus apprehended leads, however, again a step further into the depth of the meaning.

The distribution of the clauses by Wesley is not altogether wrong: Ye Pharisees, render to Cæsar his due! Ye *Herodians*, especially render to God his due! This, however, is only the application that lies on the surface, for

---

* Rud. Matthäi calls the Lord's saying "a command which indeed suppresses the subordination of Cæsar to God, but *not* the separation of God from Cæsar."

† Mendelssohn (in his *Jerusalem*), however, was very wrong when he thought, this utterance of Christ exhibits an evident case of opposition and collision of duties! No, the counsel which Christ here gives is truly no Pharisaic advice to serve two masters, to halt between two opinions, to carry the tree on both shoulders—as Mendelssohn received answer from Hamann (*Golgotha and Shelhimini*, in Roth, vii. 63).

Christ will certainly say also to the Pharisees, nay to all men, *Give to God what is God's!* If now we consider *this* word first in its own depth of meaning, and bring it into its own analogous relation to the question respecting the *image* and *superscription* in the first parallel clauses, new and important thoughts will result, which, indeed, Christians even from early times have not overlooked. The striking question asked by our Lord respecting the *image* cannot have been without special purpose and significance; it was by no means intended merely to bring out the proof of this particular coin being *Cæsar's*, for we know the manner in which Christ is wont to connect spiritual truths with outward and sensible objects. He who will not go beyond the coin, must also, for example, limit Luke x. 41, 42 to the meat. But there Martha understood better what was the one thing needful; and here the Pharisees are astonished at the way in which Christ, in every answer, baffles and rebukes them. Therefore, "That which bears *Cæsar's* image is, as belonging to Cæsar, to be given to him; but that which bears *God's image* belongs to God!" At first, indeed, it might appear as if the answer of Christ really said nothing, and as if now the controversy properly begins, as to what *is* God's and what *is* Cæsar's. But why did the hypocrites not proceed to ask this? Because they had still a conscience! The Lord speaks for and to the *conscience*—therefore he can and must be understood! This is, in general, his manner. Here, with all its depth, nothing was simpler or more natural than this sudden advance which he makes; for it is the capital doctrine of Moses, at the very beginning, that *man* was created after the image of God. The usual dogmatic account of the entire loss of this image, however, is not found precisely either in Moses or elsewhere in the Scripture; but rather the opposite (see Gen. ix. 6; James iii. 9; Acts xvii. 29). The comparison of the entire man to a stamped coin is one which came from the lips of Christ once before, Luke xv. 8, 9 (which will be explained subsequently). Here, however, he speaks not in the first place of a restoration of the image (as Clemens, *Strom.* vi. 644, ὁ δίκαιος νόμισμα κυρίου γενόμενος καὶ χάραγμα βασιλικὸν ἀναδεξάμενος, "the righteous man, who is the Lord's coin and has received a royal stamp"), but of the stamp as being still there, and on account of which the *rendering to God* is required. Cæsar is satisfied with money and goods, obedience and honor rendered in the outward act; but God requires the whole man, the entire heart in every act. Ye men, give yourselves to God!—thus does Christ teach the whole way of God for all in truth. Chiefly, ye *men of Israel* (who, as belonging to God, would refuse yourselves to Cæsar), who, in addition to the image, bear in yourselves a special *superscription*, which holds forth that image and makes it known.* They desired that he would show them the way of God; he willingly does so, even in answer to *such* a request, and it is the same way of righteousness which the Baptist had already preached to them. Yet not as if, with Ebrard, we were to take the word too superficially as meaning —Give *repentance* to God, that is his tribute and due! No, in repentance, in faith, in obedience, give *yourselves* entirely to God. "Thou must give thy money indeed to Cæsar, but thyself to God; for what will remain over for God, if every thing belongs to Cæsar?" (Tertullian, *Idol.* c. 15.) Ye belong to yourselves just as little as does the tribute money which is due from you. What a significant answer to these hypocritical zealots, who (to speak again with the *Wandsbecker*) have something to ask regarding the silver image of Cæsar, but nothing about the image of God! Herein, finally, the last idea opens itself up as the innermost *kernel* of the complete, altogether sufficient answer; namely, the explanation *why* this seeming contradiction to their dignity as the people of God is imposed upon them, why what is relatively not right has come to be right, why Israel should and must pay tribute to the Roman emperor. *If ye had done the second*, then the first would not have been required of you: If ye had given to God what is God's, then ye might have been quite free to serve only this your King! "That ye have two masters is the penalty of your sin" (Von Meyer). Is not this again the clear doctrine of Moses and the prophets; is it not the way of God with Israel, ever and anon since the period of the Judges, that the departure from Jehovah has been punished by subjection to a foreign power? Here again *Claudius* speaks with surpassing excellence: "In general, the question as a whole was a very awkward question; and just the same as if an adulterer were to ask whether it is right to pay the penalty affixed to the crime of adultery." This principle of God, this rebuking demonstration of that principle, stretches back to the setting up of the Israelitish kingdom with Saul, which was originally not according to the will of God. They had even then rejected the Lord their God, that he should not be King over them; God gave them a king in his anger, and made this the occasion of a new display of grace and glory, in the abundant vouchsafement of his gracious guidance under David and Solomon. But this people never accommodated themselves to the way of their God. Already, in the wilderness, when God said, Go up that ye may possess the land! they would not; but when he said, Go not up! then they went and were smitten (Num. xiv. 40–45). When God was their King they rejected him; when he gave them over to the hands of strangers that they might know what is the service of God and what the service of the kingdoms of the countries (2 Chron. xii.

* Although image and superscription may also be understood severally of the feeling of God remaining in every man, *and* the knowledge corresponding thereto, now indeed very indistinct.

8)—then they rebelliously resisted, instead of seeking deliverance from the Lord in repentance. In particular, the questioners on this occasion were, properly speaking, such as were inclined to submit to the authority neither of God nor Cæsar; and yet the dominion of Cæsar had been imposed upon them on account of sin, to bring them back from sin to God. Verily this answer of Christ's was truly scriptural, conformable to the law and the prophets, theocratic, orthodox, and to be received without contradiction.*

See, now, in this type immediately referring to Israel, but of general application, how the wise and faithful Master, as Teacher of the whole world, here actually in one or two plain words, which merely take up the matter as it lies *before* him and lay open its inner significance, gives the true answer to the ever-recurring question of proud, obstinate man, who seeks a false freedom in what is outward: Shall we pay tribute, obey, be subject to, emperors and kings? In this answer every thing on every side is duly proportioned, and the inexhaustible text developes itself ever anew and ever richly as an answer, according as the question is put. The *question of right* is turned into a *question of history: How* came we under such dominion? Again, grasping this still more deeply, it becomes a *question of conscience*, running thus: But *wherefore?* And an oppressed people must *begin* answering the last, to which "neither historical nor juridical knowledge is requisite."† All revolutionary spirits have here their answer, which teaches them that reform must begin from within and work out, begin with the one thing needful; condemnation is pronounced equally upon so-called passive resistance refusing to pay tribute, and upon active insurrection, from which it in fact does not essentially differ. All who lust for a republic (in the period of the new covenant, when the theocracy, plainly shown to be an impracticable attempt so long as sin remains, has given place to the kingdom of Christ) are referred not only to the image upon the coin, but at the same time (which is also implied in this) to the image of God in the earthly majesties, to the necessity that εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω (let there be one sovereign) of there being, in general, one safeguard and security for order and unity in lawful intercourse, as every one cannot stamp the coin. All Papists, who, with their church as a self-constituted unwarranted theocracy, would swallow up the state, and all Hegelians, who would let what is called the church be absorbed in the state, receive their answer here respecting the true relation determined by Christ between the two; the same doctrine which the reformers, and before them the apostles, taught, according to the mind of Christ, concerning the right and distinction of worldly authority. But all servile Herodians, and flatterers of princes, together with hypocrites before God, receive the admonition to be subject *only* in so far as it is right in the sight of God; and for conscience sake to pay to Cæsar also the tribute of testimony to the truth, by reminding him that power has been given to him from above, only for righteousness. In short, "the ultras on all sides are justly repelled by this short answer."* Oh that they would not merely let themselves be repelled, as was the case with these tempters: They were astonished, *left him* (as he had left them, chap. xxi. 17), and *went away!* Here, again, they received the one, first and last word of the Son who came to seek the fruits! *Give yourselves to God!* But this they will not hear, they will not go this way of God, they will not know and learn this truth; therefore they go away, instead of becoming the honest *disciples* of this *Master.*

ANSWER CONCERNING THE RESURRECTION.

(Matt. xxii. 29–32; Mark xii. 24–27; Luke xx. 34–38.)

The *Sadducees* were certainly not present on this occasion to hear how he had stopped the mouth of the Pharisees; therefore their mouth is still open, as if inviting him to deal in like manner with themselves. On *the same day*—*i. e.*, still in these last days, when all these things happened, and during which no one would be behind in attacking him—they brought their question for his discomfiture; and thus drew from him for the world a great word, the profound answer to all unbelief in the living God of the living. These were those who, with error equally bold and foolish, said that there was no resurrection of the body; and, thence, according to all the ideas entertained among the Jews (and according to the truth of God's word, which does not separate the two), that there was, in general, no immortality, no continued existence of man after death as πνεῦμα, or spirit; see Acts xxiii. 8.† They bring before him as actual

* As Lex expresses himself on this point in Otto's *Denkschrift des Herborner Seminars* for 1849.

† See Zeller, *Monatsbl.* 1840, No. 12.

* The *Friedensbote von Hamburg* (in Hoffman and Campe, 1822, p. 68.)

† This is plainly meant there; not that in general they deny "spirit," in the sense in which the word is now used with us, *i. e.*, "the reality and truth of the spiritual world."

history a curious case, which was at least possible, in order to put their question in the keenest form—a case which was probably not then for the first time imagined, but which was already a common and hackneyed jest against the resurrection, as indeed the like are current enough among the Sadducees of this day. *Moses has said:* thus they begin their incontrovertible demonstration (although cunningly, scarce suppressing a smile, they afterwards only put a *question*), that Moses, in this as in all his laws, could not possibly have pre-supposed a "resurrection." Seven brothers had all married one wife successively, without issue: all those who followed married in order to raise up seed to the first; *i. e.*, according to Moses' meaning, to raise up, so to speak, his after-growth out of his grave*—beneath which, however, according to the design of the wilful inquirers, there lies a half-restrained sensual sneer at the whole Mosaic ordinance. They all died, however, without effecting their object, for the woman was barren; last of all the woman *died* also, as, indeed, all men die. And now, if with this dying all is not over, as we say, then in the *so-called* "resurrection" (Mark, ὅταν ἀναστῶσι, ironically for εἰ—on the so-called last day, in which we would so willingly believe, if thou wouldst solve our doubts in regard to it), how strange will be the claim of seven men to one woman; whose then will she be? The same question might be asked in the case of every second marriage of a widow or a widower; but they take their stand here upon the *commandment of Moses*, and *therein* lies the emphasis of their question: Did Moses, then, when he made such ordinances for this life, take for granted another life after this, and prepare such confusion for that life? We may well admire the patience, gentleness, and wisdom of the Lord Jesus towards this folly, when we hear his answer!

Verse 29. The same thing which he here at first answers to these fools, who *honestly* made a show of their folly, he might, in a deeper sense, say also to the Pharisees; indeed he said it to them in a certain sense as often as he referred them to the Scripture, which was read, but not known or understood by them. Yet there is a well-founded difference to be observed in the expression. With keener rebuke he concedes to the Pharisees a certain *knowledge* of the Scriptures (possessing the key of knowledge, Luke xi. 52), although, indeed, not the *true searching* into them which is first of all required (John v. 39); at all events, *their* error is more manifestly shown to be a culpable error, a *not-willing*. In the case of the Sadducees, on the other hand, although with them also the more deeply underlying ground of their *ignorance* and *error* is only to be found in the evil will, he yet alleges against them, first of all, the milder charge of neglecting all, even the least searching of the Scriptures, an inconsiderate passing over them without the thought that *there* is the *Scripture*, consequently also the power of God. Wherefore it is that he says so often to those Pharisees—Have ye readers and knowers of Scripture never read or known this or that? While to these Sadducees he says only—Ye read the Scripture not at all with understanding as ye ought! To those he says beforehand *Ye hypocrites*—to these, as parallel with that, *Ye err*. Thus does he give to every one his own; to the "enlightened," with their pride of better *knowledge*, he ascribes precisely the worse *error*.

This *erring* which, in a spirit equally gracious and severe, he ascribes to them, was not merely the special error as to the resurrection,* which they had frankly brought before him (with a sincere conviction, and in so far better than those hypocrites), but the fundamental erring as regards the knowledge of the *living God* in general, of which, as he soon shows them, their *saying that there is no resurrection* was only the natural result. Not to know and acknowledge God in his eternal power and godhead—this is pre-eminently and, properly speaking, the innermost error of the unbeliever. From that proceeds all further folly of unbelief; all ignorance of every doctrine which stretches beyond the life of the senses; all despising and transgressing of the divine commandment, which has power and meaning only for immortal men; all theoretical rejection of doctrine, and practical violation of morality, as these go necessarily hand in hand, not merely in the consistently developed Sadducees of the time of Christ, but in all who are like them in every age. Now it is true that the voice of the living God ever speaks in reason and conscience, even to the natural man who has corrupted himself through the lusts of error (Eph. iv. 22), and goes on corrupting himself, seeking death in the error of his life (Wis. i. 12)—and in so far it might be said also to the heathen, Ye err because ye know not the truth which is yet in yourselves. But our Lord speaks here to the Sadducees who live in Israel, and can talk of that which Moses has said; therefore he at once calls the superadded *revelation* of the truth by the true God, *Scripture*. Where this Scripture is, with the outward knowledge of its existence, there the sole and essential reason of every error in divine things is nothing else than the not knowing this Scripture: this has been proved in a thousand ways down to our own day.† In this first word (omitted by Luke) of

* As Lange rightly explains it.

* Or after all even (according to Hase, himself not knowing the ancient Scripture)—the *Sadducean*, probably old Mosaic (therefore truly orthodox!) supposition of a *kingdom of shadows*, which Christ refuted here, not with Scripture, but *only with dialectical adroitness!*

† Καὶ γὰρ ἐντεῦθεν τὰ μυρία ἔφυ κακά, ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν γραφῶν ἀγνοίας· ἐντεῦθεν ἡ πολλὴ τῶν αἱρέσεων ἐβλάστησε λύμη, ἐντεῦθεν οἱ ἠμελημένοι βίοι, ἐντεῦθεν οἱ ἀκερδεῖς πόνοι (Chrysostom).

the answer, the *μὴ εἰδότες*, "not knowing," in Matthew is designed at all events to indicate the *reason* of the erring; as Mark gives prominence to this in the form of the question, *οὐ διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾶσθε;* "Do ye not therefore err?"

The revealed word of God then takes away all error by its truth; and in particular this word, as being written by the Holy Ghost, and summed up in the Scripture—let this *axiom*, here unconditionally expressed and taken for granted, in the mouth of the true and faithful Witness, be well considered! All philosophy and all so-called theology which has no Holy Scripture—which is not built upon this foundation, and does not learn what it knows from this source—is, when it opposes the existing Scripture with *λέγειν μὴ εἶναι, with saying what is and what is not*, a foolish not-knowing, a great error. When Christ puts the Scripture, rightly known, in opposition to all error, he thereby declares it to be itself *free from error* and *infallible;* namely, in its unity and totality as *ἡ γραφή* which cannot be broken (John x. 35). He says here indeed *τὰς γραφάς** in the plural; but this is partly to bring to the recollection of the Sadducees the other Scriptures, besides those of Moses, which were still more misunderstood by them, and partly to point to the necessity of connecting one Scripture with another—as is done by himself in this very instance—whereby alone their complete truth can be ascertained.† Already in the article *τὰς* the unity is sufficiently expressed. This unity, however, distributes itself over the entire multiplicity of the canon: this entire canon, then, existing and accredited among the Jews, Christ here *confirms*, in all its separate books, when he says *αἱ γραφαί*—speaking of course of the same writings which were so called at that time. Let this, too, be well considered! All that is true of the one saying of God in Moses, which he here interprets as indeed *ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*, according to the power of God, is therefore true of every saying and verse of the Jewish canon, which he has beforehand comprised in *τὰς γραφάς*.

Ye err! This he, in whom there is no error or sin, testifies against the erring ones, sadly accusing them, loftily judging them! This is more than if one professor should now say to another, "You are mistaken, doctor, as it appears to me." Against *his* "Ye err," there is no appeal; whoever, then, declines his authority, in order first to inquire whether the Lord Christ may not himself err—let him see whither he will carry things, and where he will stop by so doing! *Ye err because ye know not the Scriptures!* The second word in this utterance, spoken by him who has, from his youth upwards, learned all truth from these *Scriptures* by the Spirit—not acquiring it indeed in the regular course of the students of that day from the teachers, whom as a youth he had perplexed by his questions, but yet all the more truly *learning* it, so that he is now more learned than the learned (John vii. 15). He speaks thus, all whose thinking and speaking, from the first to the last word of his mouth, moved upon the deep basis of Scripture and amid its unlocked treasures; to whom the Scripture had been his rudiments, and would be his prayer-book on the cross. When he puts the unerring Scripture in opposition to all error, when he declares these books to be *true* in the same word which says to the people who preserved them, *Ye do err*—more is thereby affirmed and decided than by all the well or ill meant *locis de Scriptura*, and theories of inspiration propounded by dogmatists and reformers and apologists, or their opponents. But the *third* word comes in addition to the second, and belongs essentially to it, as giving ground and emphasis for us to the decisive affirmation, so that we may understand *wherefore* and *how* the Scripture is to be learned and known—ye know not the Scripture *nor the power of God!* All commentators who, hastily passing over this, find here only a reference to the *ἀνάστασις* or resurrection that was denied, are themselves deeply in error, overlooking the fact that *Scripture* and *power* are here in the first place correlates, as letter and spirit. Our Lord certainly means to say: These are indeed books written by men, in the language of men; but yet, unlike other books, in them the power of God witnesses and attests itself, in this word and letter lives and speaks the Spirit, in the *γράμμα* is the *πνεῦμα*. This, then, is the order and connection of the ideas: The power of God, in which the Scripture is written; of which, therefore, it testifies; and according to which it is also to be understood and interpreted (2 Pet. i. 20, 21). (See shortly after, Matt. xxii. 43, *ἐν πνεύματι.*) If the Jewish Scribes, following the expression of Josephus, called it alone true wisdom to be able *τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων δύναμιν ἑρμηνεῦσαι* (to interpret the force of the Holy Scriptures)—so thinks also the Master in Israel; but he in the true spirit and the true power, and they, the erring ones, in slavish adherence to the letter. One can become a *τὴν δύναμιν τῶν γραμμάτων ἑρμηνεῦσαι δυνάμενος* (one *able* to interpret the *force* of the Holy Scriptures) only by yielding up his heart to God: in proportion as thou renderest to God what is God's, will he show and give to thee what is his, and what is to become thine, even himself as *thy God!* "Our eye must be directed to God and his mind; this gives to the Scripture the power which it always has in itself" (*Berlenb. Bible*). "Beneath all the letters of the Scripture lies the Spirit: he who takes all together with upright heart will not

* Not *τὰ ἀληθῆ τῶν γραφῶν*, according to the apocryphal understanding of the words, as if it were intended "to distinguish what is false in the Scripture from what is true." Indeed Hilgenfeld makes out precisely this to be the genuine form, altered in Mark!

† *Οὐδεμία γραφὴ τῇ ἑτέρᾳ ἐναντία ἐστι* (Justin Martyr).

miss the Spirit. But they miss it who separate what stands connected, namely, the Scripture and the power of God" (Oetinger). Therefore, more particularly, because every word of the Scripture proceeds from the Spirit and mind of the ever-living God, so also, in its innermost sense, does it return to this, that we should live before and in God, otherwise the Scripture, as the word of God, would be in contradiction with itself. *According to the sense of the Spirit the entire Scripture aims and points at eternal life*—certifies the denied resurrection. Hence the word of Christ here declares the same thing which Augustine has otherwise expressed: "Oculi in tantum vident (in Scriptura) in quantum moriuntur huic sæculo; in quantum autem huic vivunt, non vident (the eyes see in Scripture in proportion as they die to this world; but in proportion as they live to this world, they do not see).* Unbelief knows not the eternal power and godhead of the living personal God out of and above nature, therefore, also, it knows not the supernatural power and meaning of the Scripture, in which the *I* of this God speaks to us, reveals and imparts itself to us. But the power of God is an omnipotence which quickens what is dead (Rom. iv. 17; Acts xxvi. 8), and the raising again also of the flesh is performed by the same Spirit who speaks to us and dwells in us (Rom. viii. 11). It is by the power and in the power of God (1 Cor. vi. 14; xv. 43). Certainly, "the resurrection is no process of nature, but a miracle of omnipotence." It is not metaphysical reasons drawn from the simple and indestructible nature of the human soul, it is not proudly speculative dreamings which make the spirit of man to be God, or such like, that Christ here lays down as a basis from which to confute the Sadducees of all times; but the will expressed in the word, the power attested by the word of him who is the ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν, "who alone hath immortality" (1 Tim. vi. 16), but who hath said to man, "I am thy God," and therefore man also lives. "Man should see the *possibility* of the resurrection in the power of God, and the *reality* or truth of the fulfillment in the Spirit of the entire Scripture, in which it has been promised as the aim and end of the Divine decree" (Kleuker).

Oh how severely does this interpretation of Christ (not at all like Dopke's *Hermeneutics of the New Testament* "*writers*") rebuke the pitiful error of all those blind critics who can hardly find an immortality in the Old Testament from the beginning, nothing more at best than a notion about a resurrection which found its way into the Old Testament from heathen sources! The *Law* of Moses, as such, if we look in the first place at the isolated letter of it, knew only of cursing and blessing within the limits of the earthly life, and a very proper point of view from which to regard this has already been plainly shown by Warburton: it was the most striking legitimation of this law for the carnal people that its threatening and promising were to come into operation directly upon earth. But inasmuch as the living God, the Eternal, by this immediate distribution of reward and punishment, placed himself in most direct intercourse with his son Israel, this temporal rewarding and punishing could appear only as the *pledge* and *type* of an eternal. For that which God gives or does, in blessing or cursing, cannot be confined within a span of time. Can we suppose that the Lord, who visits the sins of the fathers upon the children, should have prepared no judgment for the fathers themselves who are spared upon earth, or, on the other hand, that the piety of his faithful ones should have its entire reward in—long life and prosperity on the earth? The letter of the law, which raised this question, thereby already indicated in the spirit the answer. The "life" promised by *God* through Moses must already have been life *eternal;* as Christ acknowledges and confirms (Matt. xix. 16, 17), not as an after-interpretation, but as the opening up of the sense belonging to every word spoken by God according to the power of God. So Calvin, in his two excellent chapters "de similitudine V. et N. T. and de differentia unius testamenti ab altero" (*Institt.* lib. 2, cap. 10, 11), with penetrating clearness, lays down as the first of the three principal reasons for the "similitudo vel potius unitas:" "Non carnalem opulentiam ac felicitatem metam fuisse Judæis propositam ad quam *demum* adspirarent, sed in spem immortalitatis fuisse cooptatos; atque hujus adoptionis fidem illis fuisse tum oraculis, tum lege, tum prophetis certo factam." Likewise Pascal says: "In the promises of the Old Testament every one finds what lies at the bottom of his own heart, temporal blessings or blessings of the Spirit; the first, however, with, the second without, contradiction." The key to the enigma of Job's history, which Moses had already in the wilderness known and written for Israel, is to be found in Job xix. 25–27, where Vaihinger, again *erring*, finds an immortality without a resurrection, which is inconceivable not merely in the entire Word of God, but even in true philosophy.*

But if any one will begin from below and inquire concerning the "Hebraism," rather than concerning what God says to this people from above, let such a one hear a man whose writings still wait for their proper disciples, the profound thinker Molitor. "The supposition that the ancient people of God lived only in the outward, and had no idea of immortality, is in every case extremely inconsistent. *Granted* that Moses had borrowed the idea of his law from the Egyptians, and that the whole Mosaic legislation was merely the project of a great national leader, it would,

*Zinzendorf: "Reason digs beside it, levity sweeps past it, pride flies over it."

*[Molitor] *Philosophie der Geschichte oder über die Tradition*, 1. 202. Frankfort-on-the-Main. 1827

in fact, be *incomprehensible* why, even as a politician, he did not introduce into his legislation rewards and punishments after death, especially as faith in these had been taught not merely in the Egyptian mysteries, but had even been a common popular idea in Egypt. To a people, however, who, in the midst of heathen nations, could be inspired with the sublime idea of rising to the one only invisible God (without form and likeness)—to such a people the faith in immortality cannot have been so high and remote a thing, but must have been quite congenial to their inmost nature. This faith is even so natural to mankind generally, that there never was a people altogether without the idea of a future life, otherwise they must have been sunk to a level with the brute creation." Far beyond what is implied in the phrase, "gathered to their fathers," which is said even of those who were not buried with their fathers—far beyond the popular conception of the dark realm of shadows parallel to that of the heathen—far beyond this reaches the view of an Abraham, whose God the Lord was, and who spoke with him as with a friend from whom he can conceal nothing. Resting in his God as a child on its mother's bosom, he knew most assuredly by simple *faith*, without much γνῶσις, or scientific knowledge, that the mother will not readily destroy her child. In the offering up of Isaac he even rose in *thought* to the requickening of the body by the power of God. But Abraham's God could set before the seed of his chosen servant, as the end of their faith, nothing less than the eternal recompense, instead of the enjoyment of sin for a season. All *concealing*, and thereby removing of the limits between the present and the future life in the promises and threatenings of the law and the prophets, was not so much a withdrawing as rather a *bringing near* of the future life to the present, a certain embodied descent of the eternal recompense into the sphere of time. The hope of life in God after death "rested on the inward feeling of trust in that God who is love, and on the conviction of its being impossible that all the glorious manifestations of his grace towards those who honor and love him could be wasted only on vanishing shadows. It was the Spirit of God, then, which assured them also of eternal life."* They said, "Thy mercy, O Lord, endureth for ever;" and to the sigh of the soul, "Forsake not the work of thine own hands," the answer was given, "I cannot and will not forsake it!" Quæ divinitus injuncta illis fuit vivendi conditio, assiduum erat exercitium quo admonerentur, se omnium esse miserrimos si in hac modo vita felices essent (Calvin). And this inner spiritual† experience of the faithful, strengthened and exalted from time to time by addresses and monitions from God, was the *secret tradition* of the δύναμις θεοῦ in the γραφή or Scripture. With all this, however, we will not deny the difference expressed 2 Tim. i. 10 between the Old and New Testament, between the struggling, misgiving faith of the fathers, and the clear, firm footing which we have in the resurrection of our Saviour from the dust. "It was quite the reverse with the Israelites" (from what it was with the heathen who believed in an existence after death in general, yet not in a coming to God), "inasmuch as with the former, faith in a *living God* takes the *first* place; and the faith in a future life, necessarily included in this, very seldom appears, and not at all as a *doctrine*, but, as it were, grows and increases with the ever more clearly manifested promise of the Sun of Righteousness, and in the fulness of time shines forth with full splendor."* The reader will pardon this excursus against the Sadducean error, as concerned with Old Testament exegesis; we do not think that we have thereby disgressed, but have merely referred the emphatic "Ye do err," which Christ here speaks, to those to whom it properly applies at this day; and at the same time supplied all the fundamental ideas necessary to the understanding of his subsequent exegetical inference—viz., God is not a God of the dead!

Verse 30. Ye *Sadducees* then do err: since, in the power of God, the Scripture holds forth an eternal *life*, there is, then, also a resurrection of the *body;* for, without the body, there is as yet no life of the entire man.† After his introductory words, with which every thing was already said, Christ now, in the first place with unoffending calmness, speaks of the certain *resurrection*, in opposition to their ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει, spoken in mockery, and accepts the word from their sneering lips in simple earnestness. (Mark has also ὅταν ἀναστῶσι, precisely as the mockers had before spoken.) After this comes a still more special proof from Scripture: ὅτι ἐγείρονται, that the dead rise again. But while Christ here annihilates at one blow the ridiculous difficulty of the Sadducees, he at the same time refutes the carnal conceptions of the Pharisees; for the Talmud sometimes speaks of those who are raised, with as much grossness as the *Koran*.‡

* J. G. Müller, *Vom Glauben der Christen*, ii. 202.

† For assuredly "those only can speak of immortality in a purely religious way who have already in themselves the higher life which alone is worthy of the victory over death" (Schleiermacher, *Reden über die Religion*, p. 202).

* Krummacher, *Die christliche Volksschule im Bunde mit der Kirche*, p. 291.

† As the reflection in 2 Macc. xii. 43 fol., knows as yet of no other *continuance* after death, than what consists in waiting for the *resurrection*. When Judas cares for the dead as still alive, he has precisely the resurrection in his mind. [The passage in the Book of the Maccabees speaks of Judas as "collecting two thousand drachms of silver, and sending them to Jerusalem, that a sin-offering might be made: and this was a praiseworthy act, since he had in mind the resurrection."]

‡ For example, *Sohar:* A woman who has two husbands in *this world*, is, in the other world, given to the first.

The resurrection taught by Christ and the Scripture certainly does not restore the present flesh and blood, which cannot inherit the kingdom of God. Whatever *hath sprung from the fall*,* and exists in consequence of death and in connection with death—such as the present union of the sexes in order to the generation of new mortals—that is *done away with!*† Here Luke has a more exact and noteworthy exposition of the saying which is simply abridged in Matthew and Mark. *The children of this world:* that is, as the antithesis shows, not in the same sense as Luke xvi. 8 and elsewhere; it does not mean that those who are in other respects worthy of attaining to the other world, *i. e.*, the children of God, should not marry on earth,‡ but that the saints in the flesh marry and are given in marriage, so long as they have not yet *become partakers* of that life in the spiritual body. Where there is no more "dying" (as in the case of the seven men and the woman), there is no more need of a propagation of the race, no more quickening the seed of a mortal life from the work of the flesh and of *death*. (On this analogy between generation and corruption, information may be obtained from physiologists, as Schubert.) *Children of God*—this means here the completed *υἱοθεσία*, or adoption, including also the body (Rom. viii. 23; 1 John iii. 1, 2), and is parallel with *children* or heirs, partners of the resurrection, to whom the children of death stand opposed (children of God and of the resurrection—in other respects there are no longer *children* and parents). At the same time, according to the usage of בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים, *Sons of God*, the expression reaches beyond this so as to comprehend the likeness to the *angels*, the assurance of which the first two Evangelists alone have preserved. They are not *ἰσόθεοι*, *equal to God*, but *υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ*, "Sons of God;" nor have they, as the saying now runs, *become* angels, and yet as glorified men they are certainly *ἰσάγγελοι*, equal to the angels. As the *angels*—those powers of God that streamed forth in personal form in the first creation, of whom, although they are mentioned in Scripture (even by Moses), you Sadducees affirm also a foolish *μὴ εἶναι*, or non-existence. Is this too an accommodation to current fictions, on the part of him who rebuked every error?§ He speaks, indeed, of angels as being quite as truly personal, as the actual persons of men who married in this world. But it is self-evident that he can, and does, understand this likeness to the angels only of those who are raised to blessedness. There is certainly, as Paul afterwards teaches, agreeing with the Pharisees, a future resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust (Acts xxiv. 15); or as Christ, agreeing with the prophets, expresses it, "a resurrection of life and a resurrection of condemnation" (John v. 29; Dan. xii. 2). The everlasting shame and contempt, however, does not deserve to be called a resurrection in the higher sense; but the condition of the body of the damned is a fearful mystery. Therefore also does the Scripture conceal it, and the New Testament speaks chiefly of the resurrection of the just (Luke xiv. 14). When the resurrection is spoken of in general it is called *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν*, a "resurrection *of the dead* (Acts xxiv. 15–21, xvii. 32; I Cor. xv. 12, 13, 21; Heb. vi. 2); the superiority, however, of those who inherit life is denoted by *ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν*, "resurrection from the dead," here in Mark and Luke (as in Phil. iii. 11, *ἡ ἐξανάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν*). That this *resurrection* properly speaking, of the just *out of* death, to the true, eternal life, takes place partly also in time as a *first* resurrection, is elsewhere taught; but whether all who are not condemned have already part in this first resurrection, must, on a careful consideration of such passages as 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24; Rev. xx. 4–6, 12–15, still remain a question. Consequently the *ἐκ νεκρῶν*, *from the dead*, is not, with Olshausen and others, necessarily to be explained of the priority of time—(from the collective mass of the *νεκροί* some are raised first)—it is already founded on the essential distinction, that the just are no longer *νεκροί*; while the unjust become in the complete sense of the term *νεκροί*, when they are raised to eternal death. If (with Nitzsch in his *System*) we reckon Luke xx. 35 as one of the passages which prove a first resurrection, it is yet in the letter one of the least distinct; and the *καταξιωθῆναι*, "accounted worthy" (just as at Luke xxi. 36), can also, in the first place, be understood only of the resurrection of the blessed. So much, however, our Lord plainly says, that those who are raised to blessedness in that glorious new world shall be as the angels of God *in the heaven* or *in the heavens*, *i. e.*, as the unfallen angels in their original and preserved glory before God. Hereby is at least assuredly affirmed, that the angels also are not (according to that unscripturally strange conception which corresponds to the equally inconceivable naked immortality of souls) mere "spirits," but have a heavenly *corporeity*; for how, otherwise, could those who are raised in the *body* be compared with them exactly in reference to this? Nay more, it can hardly be denied that the form of their bodies must be analogous to the heavenly form of man, although

* A new proof here of this truth indicated in Moses; for what is conformable to the original image of God in man, cannot be destroyed in eternity.

† As may certainly be found taught also in Jewish writings, differently from that adduced before; see the passages in Sepp, iii. 268.

‡ As the heretic Marcion perverted the passage, educing from it even a *Deus illius ævi*, who prescribes to his people *jam hic non nubere, quia non sunt filii hujus ævi.*

§ Somewhat as Bahrdt interpreted: "They shall then become such beings as you represent to yourselves in the angels," forgetting that the words were addressed to Sadducees.

not absolutely the same; see, in proof of this, Rev. xxi. 17. The first point of similarity lies certainly in this, that *they neither marry nor are given in marriage:* what is animal and θανατῶδες (mortal) in marriage passes away, only what is spiritual, angelic, remains. But this cessation of marriage is far from being the *sole* point of comparison; we are not at liberty even to understand that such as are raised shall be *without distinction of sex*, as the angels certainly are in the full sense; for there is a *physical* difference of sex entering into the entire being of the *human* individual, which can hardly cease. Immortal as angels, in a certain measure sexless as angels: this, however, does not yet exhaust the import of the ἰσάγγελοι, "like the angels," thus strongly expressed chiefly in Luke. "That our angel-nature should consist merely in celibacy, is as incredible as that crowns make kings, because all kings wear crowns."* The ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ, "like *him*," 1 John iii. 2, points even still higher up into the heights of glory, where the words, *it doth not appear what we shall be*, express all that we know or understand of it. Our Lord cannot as yet disclose the full mystery of the future state of man, from natural reasons of propriety; but it is to be observed, as showing the gracious gentleness of the Redeemer, that he here attractively holds up, even before these Sadducees, the resurrection which they denied, first of all, in its *glorious* side.

Verses 31, 32. And now first he turns to the universal and certain reality of the resurrection of the dead—ὅτι ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροί, "that the dead are raised up," in general. He has already borne witness to this in his own exalted absolute authority; he now condescends, so to speak, to the special proof from a γραφή or Scripture; have ye not read? How many an enormous error might be removed by the right reading of a single passage of Scripture, if it were understood according to the power of God! Here it is essential that no word be overlooked, or superficially read, for God's words are indeed deep. It might be said that on this account our Lord does not here cite a passage from the *prophets*, who also plainly testify to the resurrection even in the letter, as Isa. xxvi. 19; Ezek. xxxvii.; Dan. xii. 2; but a word of God in the writings of Moses which announces the resurrection in the spirit of the letter. In the book of *Moses*—as Mark specifies; and with still more emphasis Luke, "*even* Moses hath showed!" That the Sadducees, although their sect first arose after the closing of the canon, actually *rejected* all the sacred books, excepting the Pentateuch, was a statement of several fathers who confounded them with the Samaritans; this opinion after having been long received, has been recently refuted on good grounds. Josephus says only that they rejected the παράδοσις τῶν πατέρων or "tradition of the fathers," in opposition to the γεγραμμένα (or γραφαί), the written text.* But from their position and character it may still be conjectured that they held chiefly by Moses, and slighted the prophets, who were unintelligible, nay adverse, to their system and practice. This middle view, already propounded by Corrodi,† Paulus,‡ and others, rests on good ground, although it has not strict historical testimony. Even Neander thinks it very probable that the Sadducees at least subordinated the prophetical writings to the Pentateuch, and accepted proof only from the latter;§ Lange has adopted the same view; while Sepp, quite uncritically, determines to abide by the "ancient opinion." This passage, it is true, contains no proof of the rejection of the prophets by the Sadducees; but it hints at the neglect of them exhibited by the persons addressed. For our Lord, all other reasons also being admitted, appears to have special reason for confining himself to the book of *Moses* in dealing with these Sadducees, and for proving to them from it, in a manner entirely corresponding to their question, that even the lawgiver whose law respecting Levirate marriage they found to be incompatible with a resurrection, yet knew and testified of a resurrection. He could have directly rebuked the manifest and bold *contradiction* to *prophetic* testimonies respecting the resurrection, if there had not stood in his way the erroneous theory of the gainsayers, namely, that whatever does not agree with Moses is of no authority in the prophets. *Moses has said*—thus did their objection begin; in opposition to this, Christ puts before them a ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, or saying of God, which the same Moses had received and recorded. Moses has not merely given laws; God also has said many things which Moses says and writes. The Rabbinical formula of quotation, designating the section, ἐπὶ τοῦ or τῆς βάτου, "at the bush" (Mark and Luke), as Rom. xi. 2, ἐν Ἠλίᾳ (in Elijah) is not to no purpose; but it points, at the same time, to that bush as itself a significant emblem of miraculous preservation in the midst of destruction, given on that occasion when the God of the fathers appeared and spoke.‖ Moses calls the Lord by the same name as he tells us the Lord had called himself. Moses is acknowledged to be the author of the writings that bear his name. But what we read in his writings God has said; it had been actually spoken by God, and that not to Moses merely, but ῥηθὲν ὑμῖν, spoken to *you*—the Lord speaks it to the Sadducees, and even now

* Kleuker, *Menschlicher Versuch über den Sohn Gottes*, p. 179.

* See on this recently, Havernick, *Einl. in das A. T.* i. 74, as also Winer's *Realwörterbuch.*

† *Beleuchtung des Bibelcanons*, p. 110.

‡ *Komment. über die Evang* i. 196.

§ *Leben Jesu*, p. 56. In like manner in his *Church History* at the beginning, in spite of the arguments adduced against it by Winer.

‖ At that time, in the first place, Israel in the furnace of Egypt; but the prophecy of the symbolical vision stretches further.

to us. The inference, finally, which our Lord draws from the simple declaration of God—which they certainly had often read, and yet never thus understood—is by no means merely an inference supplementarily drawn from it, but rather the inmost meaning and kernel of the divine word which Moses also certainly understood. It is no mere *hint*, no mere *intimation* lying deeper beneath the surface, as the ἐμηνυσεν, "signified," in Luke is wont to be understood (with Luther*); but an open declaration and exposition of what this word was designed emphatically to say (comp. John xi. 57; Acts xxiii. 30; 1 Cor. x. 28). Moses, when he wrote down this word of God which he had heard, could evidently understand it of nothing else, and could mean to testify nothing else by it, than that before the God of the living even the dead, whose God he calls himself, must live.

This exegesis of Christ has been much slandered by ignorance, much censured by impudence, but, even by intelligent and believing readers, oftener admired than clearly understood. So much must be clear to every one on the surface: If Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob no longer lived, *i. e.*, if they were annihilated, as the Sadducees fancied, then the appeal to the promise which had been given to them also, far from being confirmatory of the faith of Moses and Israel, was rather a bitter irony on the part of God against himself: "I who have not delivered even those from death!" If this ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ or divine utterance is to be understood in any way worthy of God, then must the fathers still exist as *persons*, as their *names* indicate, inasmuch as he thus speaks of them. The ever-living One must otherwise be truly *ashamed* to be called a God of beings who existed only for a short span of time—as, already during the period of their lives, he was not ashamed of this, only because they desired an eternal salvation, and because he had prepared an eternal salvation for them (Heb. xi. 16). For, although the present tense which many lay stress upon, "*I am* their God"—not merely I *was*—is not found in the letter of the original text, it yet lies in its spirit: God fulfills even *to the fathers* his promise given to them, inasmuch as he redeems their seed, blesses them, leads them into the goodly land—and this is precisely what he means to say. But this very circumstance, that the fathers were already dead when God nevertheless called himself their God, is by no means, properly speaking, the nerve of the interpretation. It merely strengthens the argument; but, independently of it, the same inference must be drawn even from the word of God to the living Abraham, "I am *thy God!*" This is the deepest ground of the inference. I am in the habit of thus simply explaining it to my catechumens: If the king of Prussia were to say to a protege and favorite, "I am *thy* king!" this person might reckon on the king's entire power and favor, with all that he has, so long as he is king of Prussia. Therefore *thy God*—with all that I, as God, am and can do, *so long* as I am and continue to be God. In order to receive and experience this, the sum and substance of the divine promise, nothing less than eternity is necessary; for what the Lord blesses is blessed for ever (1 Chron. xviii. 27), he to whom God gives himself has therewith given to him an eternal life, so that he *lives to God*, as God is God to him.* Now from this there seems indeed to follow, in the first place, only a continuation of existence, and not a resurrection; but it only seems so until, in addition to the word "God," we rightly read the names Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The living God gives, by his power, life to his own; but Abraham's *soul* is not the entire Abraham, and without body Abraham is not entirely living.† So long as the body lies dead in the earth, the entire man is still reckoned among the *dead*. "In this condition, the expression, I am thy God! cannot be entirely fulfilled *in the man*; for God is not a God of the dead, but of the living" (Roos).

Again, on the other side, God's promise is, from the first beginning till the consummation, gradually fulfilled. It always has already a certain truth; and as Abraham still lived in the body of death before God (Gen. xvii. 18), so does he yet *live* also in the intervening period without body, because he is not without his God. This word testifies against a sleep of the soul, as Lavater rightly remarked; and in like manner against an "inactive repose" of the dead, as J. G. Müller says in reference to certain false representations of the "rest in God." But not *this* alone: the word applies in the first place indeed truly to the elect, and to believers; but it further includes all men whose God the Lord on his part offers to become; hence our Lord takes it as a proof of the resurrection *of the dead* in general—ὅτι ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροί, "that *the dead* are raised up." "God is not a God of the dead, but of the living," means finally: As surely as all men whom God has created as persons, and whom also as persons he wills to save, are God's, so surely are they not his as dead—even those who are relatively dead are not properly dead before him; hence Luke rightly concludes the idea with the words, "for *all* live to him." They *should* live to him, as all Israel, according to its calling (and—which indeed remains as yet in the background—all mankind), would if what belongs to God were given to him. They must and shall live to him, at least for the judgment; and every one, in the whole man, διὰ τοῦ σώματος (2 Cor.

* By myself incorrectly in the first edition.

* On this "centre-point of all the proofs of immortality" Lange speaks well in his *Philosophische Dogmatik* (p. 259)—which in other respects, indeed, we will not acknowledge.

† Nam ipse Abraham, quantus quantus est, et in quantum Abraham nominatur, *i. e.*, non Abrahae tantummodo anima sed etiam corpus, cui sigillum quoque promissionis inditum est, habet *Deum* (Bengel).

v. 10), must give account of this, that God has said to him: I will be *thy* God!

Our Lord, by thus naming the covenant-God —a designation which still continued in daily use among the Jews, and which God had given to himself—would chiefly remind the heretics in Israel, who had apostatized from the living God, of that first great covenant-word before and at the giving of the law, "I, the Lord, am thy God!" When a superficial unbelief would extort from him the wretched inference that the law of Moses has no regard to a living on, and living again, of the dead through the power of God—he in holy earnestness leads the erring ones by one stroke into the very central point of the matter, where the answer lies open as day to every one who still acknowledges a "God." Yes, the resurrection stands in connection with the *giving of the law*, in so far as precisely in the law the personal God makes men to be the ever-living covenant-children of the eternal God (see Lange, iii. 207). Thus does Christ teach them to understand the ancient Scripture—law and promise ever with and in each other—as on Sinai, according to the power of God; and he refers these miserable men, to whom the word "God" can certainly be only an empty name so long as they do not suppose they shall live beyond the short span of time, to the power of this single name for men, a name which includes every thing, not excepting the resurrection. Because the giving of the law by the first word upon Sinai, and the accomplished redemption of the seed out of Egypt, stand in closest connection with the promise to the fathers, Christ evidently places in the foreground the fundamental idea of the *covenant*, in which law and promise again become one—namely, that God calls himself the God of a man, and therefore in reality is so. If the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob is the one true living God —and this his only begotten Son here again solemnly testifies (comp. John viii. 54–56; Acts iii. 13)—then does the vindication of the honor of his name, that he is not a God of the dead, extend to the place where all to whom he hath revealed himself are represented as again alive before him; some, indeed, for the angel-like glory of eternal life, and the rest—? The Lord preserve us from having to experience the consuming fire of the living God, as the dead who cannot die!

In Mark we find still a conclusion which returns to the beginning: Therefore do ye Sadducees (*ὑμεῖς* as *ῥηθὲν ὑμῖν*) err *greatly* (properly *πολύ*); as in the article of the resurrection, so in many ways in all your other errors, and all for this one reason. But what would Christ say now to these who, more *consistently*, indeed, than the Sadducees, will acknowledge no living, personal, revealed God, and who substitute for the *power* of the manifest *God*, who graciously wills to give himself to man in order to eternal life, "the *hidden* essence of the *universe* which has *no* power in itself to offer resistance to the boldness of science, but must disclose itself at its summons"*—only however for a moment, so long as this individual *I* lives thus boldly. We cannot see that the highest courage of science consists in knowing human personalities without the *original Person*, by whom they are and live; for, Are living men but the changing soap-bubbles of a dead God? Is the universe no *uni*verse? We do not presume entirely to know and to judge of the hidden meaning of the Master; but to the scholars who deny the personality of God as distinct from the world, and the individual existence of men after death, so frankly that one can understand them—to the *λέγοντες μὴ εἶναι πνεῦμα*, those who say that there is no *spirit*, with all their noise about spirit, we say in the name of the Lord, This is no longer error, but—either a frenzy in which you have lost yourselves, no longer to know that *we live and move and have our being in him*—or there remains nothing else but Satan's conscious lie against his Creator, "*Thou* art *not* my God! *shalt* not be my God!" notwithstanding which lies, however, he, too, cannot and will not die throughout eternity, for even Satan as Satan *must* live to the judging God.

ANSWER TO THE QUESTION WHICH IS THE GREAT COMMANDMENT?

(Matt. xxii. 37–45; Mark xii. 29–37; Luke xx. 41–44.)

Although the Pharisees would be quite willing to see the Sadducees put to silence, they are yet not satisfied that this should be done by *Jesus;* his piercing answer provokes them anew to deliberate whether there be then no way at all in which they can get at him! One of their number, who had taken part in this deliberation (for so must we understand Matthew), brings forward a new question. He is a Pharisee by sect, a *νομικός* or *νομοδιδάσκαλος* (Luke v. 17; Acts v. 34), *i. e.*, one who knows and is a teacher of the law, by office (Tit. iii. 13); though, as this was only an inferior class of *γραμματεῖς*, or *scribes*, Mark terms him *εἷς τῶν γραμματέων*. *At the same time*, however—and it is quite consistent with this, and was observed by Mark immediately before—the man asks his question not with a bad but a good intention, from an

* So the motto to Hegel's *Philosophy* taken from his lips, in extracts by Franz and Hillert.

interest peculiar to himself, and with a satisfaction at Christ's former answer: this is precisely what qualifies him for being the ἐγκάθετος, or "spy," to the others who have thus pushed him forward. There is no necessity, therefore, of giving a different interpretation to the "tempting" in Matthew (as Olshansen says, "from a well-meaning spirit of inquiry"), but the expression must here certainly retain its bad sense. Matthew views the incident as a whole, and regards this question, apart from the disposition of the questioner, as belonging to all the πειράζειν, *tempting*, now set on foot against Jesus. The interrogator himself seeks instruction; the others however are ready in every case to *dispute* upon the answer, because they actually hold the question to be a disputed puzzle not to be solved.

Like a genuine νομικός, or *lawyer*, in disposition as well as in office, who would zealously carry out only the law (comp. this force of the title, Luke vii. 30, x. 25) and knew nothing higher, he brings forward as μάχη νομική (Tit. iii. 9) a question which was at that time much disputed—one of the highest importance indeed, when taken in connection with the true answer to it, but proposed by the present questioner only in foolish misunderstanding. Already, in the Sermon on the Mount, had Christ rebuked the distinguishing between *small* and *great* commandments, in so far as it was foolish; the fools, however, at the last begin anew with this, and give him occasion to say something else in opposition to it. Instead of being humbled by the spiritual requirement of heart-obedience towards the one God, in which the entire law is a unity, they had endless quarrels about the question: "If Moses has enjoined upon us 365 prohibitions, and 248 commands, making in all 613 different precepts and ordinances*—surely all these cannot be equally important, nor every transgression equally grievous! Which then are the important, and which the insignificant?" It was only indeed because they were conscious of transgressions that they asked such a question; they would gladly throw away at least some of these as trifling, and in their perversity they dealt thus precisely with the *weightier matters of the law* (chap. xxiii. 23). This inquirer, in order to test the wisdom of Christ, presents his question in the most keen and difficult form; for as he will have a single commandment specified to which Christ concedes pre-eminence over the rest—μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, *i. e.*, the absolutely great, the greatest ἐντολή above all the rest (Mark, πρωτη πάντων, the latter to be taken as neuter, the chiefest of *all* and of *every sort;* for παόῶν and παόῶν τῶν ἐντολῶν are only corrections which have arisen from not understanding this). These νομικοί do not even understand the *unity* of the law in the spiritual meaning and ground of all its single commandments; therefore, of course, they much less understand its *insufficiency* to make the sinful man righteous. Christ, however, again bears witness to both these truths, as he had already done in the Sermon on the Mount. In particular, he here again brings into clear prominence that fundamental law of perfect love which judges us; the fundamental requirement of the whole heart for God and our neighbor which *cannot be fulfilled* by us who are evil; and then he intimates whence alone the grace that is necessary in order to the *fulfillment* of the law can come, viz., from the *Christ* who has come in him. He teaches, in the first place, nothing new concerning the *commandments;* for when any one asks him about the law he never fails to refer back only to Moses. But what is overlooked and misunderstood he brings forth into its true light. Christ has no other answer to give than that which was rightly given by the scribe (Luke x. 27). But this answer was unfortunately very much disputed; there did not exist (as Lange thinks) as yet "a harmonious view respecting it in the Rabbinical theology."

Verses 37, 38. From Deuteronomy—from the authentic interpretation of the letter of the Sinaitic law already contained therein, which afterwards takes the form of an exhortation to repentance, and ends with the promise of circumcision of the heart—from this book does Christ adduce the one greatest, all-embracing commandment. Moses had already expressed it so plainly that all questioning about it appears as blindness, in that place where, with the emphatic "*Hear, O Israel,*" he announced at once the fundamental doctrine of the unity of God, and the one requirement of this God from his people. Thus (following chap. v.) the interpretation of the *first* commandment begins with and is founded upon the covenant-word, which is placed in the forefront: "*I am the Lord thy God.*" Mark, giving the citation in full, has the "Hear, O Israel," before it, which lays the foundation of what follows, and indeed belongs to it: even if our Lord had not here expressed it, he would yet bring it to mind, pre-supposing it in the citation of this well-known passage. As and because God is one, his law also, though consisting of manifold commandments, must have a unity flowing from his being and will; just as from the same ground the unity of the law and the promise is further deduced in Gal. iii. 20. The one God requires the whole heart united in itself (Psa. lxxxvi. 11, יַחֵד לְבָבִי) in one love, corresponding to his love and his unique loveliness. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, thou—the *entire man*, inwardly and outwardly, with spirit, soul, and body: that is the meaning of the Hebrew original, where

* So R. Simlai in the tractate *Makkoth:* The prohibitions correspond to the number of the days of the year, the commandments to the number of the members of the human body, the sum corresponds to the word תּוֹרָה (which, however, make only 611). See the specification in Beer's *Geschichte d. Juden*, 1, 246, 255 fol.

לֵבָב, *heart* (as in such references is frequently the case in the Old Testament), corresponds to the innermost part of the man or the kernel of his being (which is then more exactly called *mind*); נֶפֶשׁ, *soul*, corresponds to the unity of all changing moods or states, therefore to the *disposition* of the ψυχή (proceeding from the will); מְאֹד, *might*, to sum up all, corresponds again to all the powers and capacities, of the *life* both of the soul and the body, carried into outward action. The Evangelists deviate here from the (also not quite suitable) rendering of the Sept. with which Luke x. 27 is to be compared. Καρδία, "*heart*," is the correct rendering for the first; for the third, however, ἰσχύς, "strength," is not merely not quite so correct, but (dividing the original word into two) there is besides the explanatory διάνοια, "mind," which alone remains in Matthew. Since *heart* and *soul* have already been named, διάνοια can only signify what we found before in מְאֹד (hence we regard as profound and striking the too much overlooked remark of Grotius: διανοίας hic is est sensus, qui apud *Thucydidem*, διάνοιαν ἔχω πρὸς τὸ καλὸν τῆς πράξεως: id est, in id intentus sum. Idem autem valet, sive dicas pro viribus, sive *omni studio atque contentione*). Beck's interpretation amounts to the same thing, when he understands διάνοια of "the inner movement that impels toward outward objects, and works through them, the impulse of thought, and will, in its intercourse with, and relation to the outer world."* Luther means the same by his *Gemuth* according to the old usage, that is, my *mind*, all my heart and mind is in it, and after it. *With all thy heart*—this is for the rest clear enough, in whatever way we interpret the following expositions, and this first thing is, therefore, constantly repeated by Moses and all the prophets; only at 2 Kings xxiii. 25, is the original passage of Moses found complete with the מְאֹד. And the principal word, properly speaking, which embraces all commandments in its unity—viz., *Thou shalt love!*—This God himself spake at first from Sinai: To those that *love me and keep my commandments* (Exod. xx. 6). Consequently in 1 John v. 3, there is *in thesi* nothing peculiar to the New Testament, but there is certainly in *praxi* as regards the βαρεῖαι οὐκ εἰσίν, "they are not grievous." —*This* is the chief and greatest commandment; thus with simple majesty, in his decisive and instructive answer, does Christ testify, literally—the *first* and *great*. To the μεγάλη, "great," which was all that was in the question, he adds the confirmatory πρώτη, "first," which of course cannot mean the same thing, but rather furnishes the exegetical proof of the μεγάλη drawn from the place which that commandment occupies. For, this commandment lies already in the *first* word from Mount Sinai, as afterwards in the *first* commandment (according to the explanation of it given by Moses, and confirmed by Christ, that all things which the heart loves besides God and out of him are אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים, *other gods*); it in like manner stands again *at the head* of the Decalogue, repeated by Moses in an admonitory form in Deuteronomy. It is the first in order of rank, because the first in the nature of the thing, and, indeed, *should* be seen to be the first previous to all questioning and inquiring about the commandments! If Mark's version of the *question*, πρώτη πάντων, "first of all," were to be taken as literally genuine (which, however, we are inclined to doubt), then Christ gives a different sense to the expression in the *answer*, which would then in substance say: Canst thou then as a νομικός be only asking *this*; hast thou not read what the word of God and of Moses has *put in the first place?* Now what is there called the πρώτη *is* the πρώτη, the *primum* praeceptum is the *primarium*—"the commandment put according to God's arrangement, in the first place, is also the most excellent of all" (Olshausen). Nay, more, as we shall immediately see, it is the *only* commandment, the comprehensive sum of all existing or conceivable commands and prohibitions.

Verses 39, 40. And now can there be in addition to this a δευτέρα ἐντολή, *a second commandment?* Certainly; for although the first and sole fundamental commandment were sufficient to say and to enjoin every thing, it is yet not enough for the deaf ears and hard heart of man. If any man saith, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; but because we might all be such liars, *therefore* we have further his commandment from him, that he who loves God loves his brother also. The explanation of the enigma by which this commandment, at first represented as subordinate, as *second*, is then made *equally* valid with the first, and *one* with it, was a new answer on the part of Christ; furnishing more than the question required, but yet only thoroughly exhausting the point in question. The Pharisee presents himself with burnt-offerings and sacrifices, his fasting twice in the week, his tithe of mint, anise and cummin; and utters the most fearfully frank lie of all human lies: Do not I then love my *God* with all my heart, with all that I have and owe to him, and rather beyond what is required than too little? In opposition to this stands the other commandment respecting the love of our neighbor, from the transgression of which the Saviour elsewhere seeks to bring conviction home to them (Matt. xix. 18; Luke x. 30). God indeed can say, Behold I, even I, am he, and besides me there is no God! (Deut. xxxii. 39), but man must confess before God, There are *others beside me!* There are men like me before God who has created them also, and, in holy right, loves them all alike, men who are to be esteemed equally with me. Therefore, before God, and for God's sake, ought I to give up idolatrous selfishness; and as I

* *Bibl. Seelenlehre*, p. 58; comp. p. 110.

should and dare love *myself* only as God's creature, a vessel and instrument of his grace and honor, *in like manner* must I love my neighbor precisely thus, not more and not less, and also not otherwise. Therefore Moses had, in an earlier book and chapter, where, in the most proper sense, the instructive tracing back of the manifold commandments to their unity predominates, uttered the other great word which Christ now adduces and places beside the first: Thou shalt love *thy neighbor* as thyself, *for I am the Lord!* (Lev. xix. 18). If here, and in other places, the unity of the two tables of the law, the point of unity of all obligations and all conduct towards God and man, was distinctly *indicated*—yet this unity was first brought forward and made to shine in the full light of the New Testament by Christ. Already in the Sermon on the Mount, after adducing special commandments, He declares this word concerning the love of our neighbor in opposition to the Pharisaic addition which nullified it. Now, as a proper conclusion to all his teaching he says with the most perfect clearness—in opposition to the foolish manner of isolating and separating the enumerated ἐντολαί pursued by the *scribes and lawyers:* The *second* not merely follows the *first*, and is placed after it, but is *like* unto it! Properly ὁμοία, ejusdem indolis, *of the same nature and origin*, quite as fundamental and comprehensive; thus it is also a πρώτη, although again only a δευτέρα which is comprehended in the unity of the first. The law is not an aggregate of all sorts of requirements: "Thou shalt do this and that, and not do this and that!" as is the false conception of many people even at this day, but a living organism; as a whole (ὅλος ὁ νόμος) it is one *in these two* commandments, which are themselves again one through the one *love* of the whole heart towards God and our neighbor, towards our neighbor for God's sake. *As thyself* is not merely a limitation of the pre-supposed and existing natural self-love, as those think who again outwardly measure the words; but a complete removal and transformation of this natural selfishness, in which the slighting and hating of our neighbor was an essential element, so that a new love in God arises, which knows only the equality of all before God's holy right, in God's blessing love. Then (but not before) it is the loving thy neighbor *as truly*, and *altogether* as thyself; so that every thing which thou desirest for thyself from God and thy fellow-creatures, be also given and shown to them. God by no means requires and *commands* thee "to love thy neighbor *more* than thyself," for this goes beyond what is right;* nay it must be said, properly speaking, that all in this way which a spontaneously overflowing love can do, cannot be called *more*, inasmuch as I only benefit and satisfy myself and my innermost impulse of love in his sacrifice, just as God himself does in his most condescending love. Or, in giving thyself up for thy neighbor, dost thou actually *offend* thy true self? Then this would not be the reality of what is required; such love would not be the pure and proper *love*.

What Mark (probably following his own development of the thought, as similarly elsewhere) merely in repetition expresses thus, "There is none other greater commandment than these"—Matthew gives in what we must regard as the original expression of Christ, ver. 40. In *these two* commandments he has set forth the *Decalogue* as the permanent kernel of the law for all men, and designated it according to its *two tables*. The old controversy of the churches respecting the distribution of the particular commandments in the tables finds here its incontrovertibly clear decision, if men only could and would read it. Wherefore, then, *two* tables of the one law for the expression of these two fundamental commandments? The law is so entirely one, that not even its two tables are of two kinds, but the love of our neighbor also is required even by the first אֲנִי יְהוָה, "I am the Lord." Yet the second table is a second, because all true love of our neighbor springs from and consists in the love of God; and the saying of the moral Pharisees, "I love my brother!" is, so long as they hate God, the God who reveals himself, only the same inverted lie. The *five* commandments of the second table which are summed up in the second word we find written in Rom. xiii. 8–10: there remain for the first the five which speak of the one God; his true revelation without, and in opposition to, every likeness of him made and contrived by man; then of his name; his day; and his human representatives and images. On these two commandments *hangs* the whole law, κρέμαται* —this may be, as is generally supposed, a Latina locutio, as Fritzsche says: "In hoc utroque praecepto omnium, quæ in V. T. leguntur, legum cardo vertitur;" so that if we loose this one double band, the whole has nothing more to hold it together, and it falls to the ground.† It may have been a proverbially Rabbinical phrase, as Hartmann‡ cites from the *Mishna*, vi. 53, an analogous תלה. Christ, however, as also without doubt the Rabbinical saying, appears to us to point by the metaphorical expression to those symbolical tassels worn by the Pharisees on their garments, and enjoined by Moses as a memorial of the commandments: two as the two

* Therefore not as Sartorius expresses it: "One's neighbor in the place of oneself," which can only be understood of the *wrong* "self." But as Jul. Müller (*Lehre v. d. Sunde*, i. 147, note) rightly acknowledges: "There remains also a valid self-love."

* Vulg. *pendet*—hence Bengel prefers κρέμαται to the κρέμανται, certainly as regards the sense rightly.

† The Greek usage also offers something similar, as in Plato (*de Legg.* viii.) ἐξ ὧν κρεμαμένη πᾶσα ψυχὴ πολίτου.

‡ *Die enge Verbindung des A. T. mit dem Neuen*, p. 130.

tables, in each many threads, but bound together in one blue string, *i. e.*, "many commandments of one indivisible heavenly law of love."* Finally, all the law *and the prophets?* Just as is meant in the Sermon on the Mount (chap. vii. 12, and v. 17). And the prophets—who in the Spirit testify further of the fulfillment of the letter, as Moses the first great prophet does in Deuteronomy; *at first* here, in so far as they *demand* this fulfillment, insist on it, in order then to point to the fulfilling grace and the future Fulfiller.

For, as soon as the spiritual *unity* of the law is recognized by the man who no longer occupies himself with single commandments in order to self-justification, its *insufficiency* can and will also be perceived. Not any insufficiency or imperfection of the law in itself; for, who can conceive, command, or do any thing more perfect, any thing reaching higher and deeper than what these two fundamental commandments express? But *for us* the commandment is not sufficient to *give* us what we have lost in the fall—the *love* of God, and therewith the love of our neighbor. We are rebellious children and disobedient servants from our birth; as is declared by our trespass against that commandment which is the connecting link of the two tables, and which in another sense is called the *first* commandment (Eph. vi. 2). Not even the slavish fear, much less the childlike fear which is the beginning of wisdom, and which leads to love, is naturally present in us (Mal. i. 6), until at least a πνεῦμα δουλείας, or "*spirit* of bondage," is *received* (Rom. viii. 15); but only the evil, rebellious, continually sinning fear of Adam *after* the fall. And yet it is, *Thou shalt—love!* This, although right and true as regards God's inviolable claim, is yet, as regards the fulfillment, a complete contradiction; for love is a free matter of the *heart*, to be produced and forced by no *shall*. Precisely this unnatural "shall" is the handwriting which attests our *debt*, our bankruptcy; if there were love, then there would be no need of this, and still less of its being carried out into mere details—Thou shalt do so, thou shalt not do so—of which, properly speaking, as the manifold legislation of Moses in Israel is designed to show, there is no end to be found, and yet all in vain. Oh that they had such a *heart!* (Deut. v. 29; xxix. 4). Let this book of the law be a witness against thee! (chap. xxxi. 26). But the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart (chap. xxx. 6). This alone remains—as already Moses says as a prophet. "Moses gave you the law, and none of you keepeth the law; for ye seek to *kill me* (John vii. 19), with hatred against God and the Son of Man, in one and the same manifestation of your sin:" this alone remained in Israel when Christ came (comp. Acts vii. 52, 53). With all thy heart, with all thy strength—this does Christ require of us; but the whole head is sick, the whole heart is faint, there is no soundness in it (Isa. i. 5, 6). And if thou wert to treat thy *heart* as a *garment*, and to cleanse it outwardly in the mere performance of nothing but commandments; wert thou to carry the "categorical imperative" so far in thy virtue (which is to have all the more value the more it is extorted from an unwilling heart—Oh the perversity!) as to give up to the gracious God not merely ten pieces of the mantle out of the twelve, as Ahijah gave to Jeroboam, but 999 out of 1000, etc., *yet* would the Lord answer, I cannot take it, it is not the whole! And, properly speaking, the whole heart with all its disobedience would be withheld with the tenth or hundred thousandth part that was kept back. For בְּכָל מְאֹדֶךָ, *with all thy might*, means not "as much as possible"—namely for us weak, sinful men.

The Scribe frankly acknowledged that the Lord was right; repeated with all the delight of a new discovery the great truth long since known to him from the letter of the Scripture; and added, of his own accord, as a proof that he *understood* it, the words, "*This* is *more* than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices; love and inclination is what is required, not service and work; all that is outwardly brought as an offering to the Lord is ordained and accepted only on account of the heart." In this he answered νουνεχῶς or νουνεχόντως, "discreetly;" and therefore does Christ praise him, although (as Braune remarks) only with measured praise, which acknowledges the clear *insight* as good, and now exhorts to practical progress, to *entering in:* Thou art *not far* from the kingdom of God, thou standest with this knowledge at the door; set thy foot on the threshold of repentance, and come within to faith! (Si non procul es, intra: alias præstiterit procul fuisse.) "I alone am what thou yet wantest!" (Von Meyer). Mark x. 21.*

Do we now understand, without going further, how profoundly the question concerning *the Christ*, which the Lord Jesus propounds in the following verses, is connected with the answer respecting the law? The Lord now lives and moves with all his thoughts in the profound unity of his final and conclusive testimony to Israel and the world; whatever presses upon him from without he immediately weaves into this, and makes every thing a link of connection always leading back to the one thing. First: *Give to God* what is God's,

* Which interpretation given by Meyer we are inclined to prefer to that other in Lange, according to which the threads fastened together would be "the varying play of the feelings and thoughts." For, in Num. xv. 39, it is expressly said beforehand, "that ye may look upon it, and remember all the *commandments* of the Lord."

* Irenaeus gives an apocryphal addition (*Haeres.* i. 17), according to which Christ is represented as having said: "I have long since had the desire to hear such words, and have not yet found the speaker."

yourselves also with your whole heart—this was the *requirement of the law*. Then, secondly: This God, who entered into a covenant with us already in the law, *is a God of the love;* he has already said to the fathers, as also to Israel, I will yet be *your*—the sinner's—God, and *give* to you what is mine, what you have not, even to the extent of glorification in an endless life—this was the *promise*, the Gospel, in and before the Law. The third question, foolish as it may have been in its setting out from the external conception of great and small commandments, his wisdom so directs in the answer that he now at the conclusion combines the two, the Law and the Gospel.* He has announced the *law* in its two fundamental commandments, as, at the conclusion of the Old Testament, Malachi declares the same, chap. i. 6 and ii. 10 (comp. chap. iv. 4). He has testified that God is *love*, in the *highest commandment* which can only require the same love; forthwith he shows how the same love gives itself to sinners in the *highest gift*, in the only begotten *Son*. They durst not ask *him* any more questions (Mark, ver. 34), for he who will not repent in presence of the law does not ask willingly or earnestly about Christ; he, however, does not leave them, but asks the question himself, in order yet to allure them to grace.† "Here the great Prophet at parting represents the great sum of *the Law and the Gospel*"—we say with Bengel and all intelligent preachers on this passage.

Verses 41, 42. You have in your Old Testament something else than law and commandments. The Law and the *Prophets*—have I said? this, however, reaches further. The end of all prophecy, the centre-point of all the *prophets*, from which the proto-gospel in Moses begins, with which Malachi ends, is the *Christ* whom ye look for, and will not recognize in me. How think ye of this Christ? *i. e.*, not precisely, What think ye of the Son of Man, of me? although after all the foregoing testimony of our Lord, and, according to the consciousness of the Pharisees, it is almost the same. "*How think ye? i. e., For what*, according to your conception and opinion, is a Christ to come to you, and am I come?" Ah! this they knew not indeed, because they knew not the law and their sin. "*Whose son* is he?" Thus asks the Lord, because he already knows what *they* will say to this, and what he will then say—thus does he at once open up the way to his *theanthropic personality*, in which alone the grace and gift of God that redeems from sin and establishes the law, could be given.* *David's son*—the name denotes their *Messiah*, according to all their notions, besides whom they know or at least are willing to know of none other. "For although the super-terrestrial nature of the Messiah was not entirely unknown to the learned (chap. xxvi. 63; John vii. 27; xii. 34), yet the principal thing to them was the *visible world-monarch of the lineage of David*" (Von Meyer).

Verses 43–45. What David said ἐν πνεύματι, "in the Spirit" (of which we shall speak afterwards), our Lord here interprets in a literally grammatico-historical way; and this was the only possible way, for in this plain and direct utterance no spiritual interpretation is needed—the words and letters speak clearly of themselves. There is certainly a typical connection for this 110th Psalm in David's history (for that was still, generally speaking, the period of the type); and we long ago in another place thus traced it: "David restores in the conquered Zion the Salem of Melchisedek, as the successor of whom he may now be regarded; after all his sufferings and conflicts he fetches the ark of the covenant, acting as a priest, in order henceforth to dwell in, or beside the house of the Lord; he receives through Nathan that fundamental promise respecting the everlasting throne of the Messiah." But it is far wide of the mark to say (as in Hofmann's system), that the psalm can *only* in the first place speak of this type, in which alone the prophecy is afterwards to be sought and found. The spirit of prophecy rather makes these typical relations only a point of connection; inasmuch as he here (which is well to be observed) teaches the same king *David* himself to call *his archetype*—him who was to come—not his son or descendant, but *his Lord*. Our Lord does not now go further than the beginning of the profound psalm, though he includes also as a side-glance the threatening allusion to his enemies; that other word concerning the priesthood of Melchisedek the Spirit at a later period interprets in the Epistle to the Hebrews—the last three verses only the last days will bring into clear fulfillment. He does not expressly say that the *Holy Spirit* uttered by the mouth of David what he here cites (as is true of the *unconscious* typical references to Judas, Acts i. 16); but that *David* in the Spirit called him *Lord*, just as before Moses called the Lord a God of Abraham. Therefore he intimates that David himself meant to point to something by this—that he had plainly in his mind the thought of a divine dignity as belonging to a man (2 Sam. vii. 19; 1 Chron. xviii. 17). This appears still more strongly in Mark: αὐτὸς γὰρ Δαυὶδ εἶπεν, David *himself* calls the promised son

* When Braune designates these three questions as belonging to *politics*, *philosophy*, and *morals*, it is only the opinion of the *questioners* that is thereby denoted—and then it would be better to say *dogmatics* instead of *philosophy*.

† Luke has lost this entire connection; therefore he puts the testimony concerning Christ only as a continuation of a discourse of Christ without the intermediate answer.

* How lamentably is *this* signification of the fundamental and conclusive question, here appearing in the right place, evaded, when, for example, Hase can think that, "he *proved* to them his *dialectical* embarrassment by proposing a *sophistical* question on the Messianic signification of the 110th Psalm!"

his *Lord*. It is true that Christ says according to all the three Evangelists merely κύριον καλεῖ or λέγει, "he calls him *Lord*," and not expressly κύριον αὐτοῦ, "*his* Lord." This would have perfectly corresponded to the κυρίῳ μου, "*my* Lord," in the citation, and the υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, "his son," afterwards; and he might at the same time have pointed to ver. 5 in the psalm, where the אֲדֹנָי, "my Lord," actually recurs as אֲדֹנָי, "Lord." Still, this remains uncertain; and at all events the main force of the demonstrative question lies in this, that even David ascribes, in reference to himself, the name *Lord* to him who, in other respects, is his son.* The proof of the divine dignity lies, first of all, simply in the κυρίῳ μου, "*my* Lord;" then, as doubling its force, in the sitting *at the right hand* of Jehovah.† Jesus might certainly have adduced many other "prophetic passages which declare the divinity of the Messiah:" such as Micah v. 1, "the goings forth from everlasting" (which the high priests themselves testified of to Herod); Psa. xlv. 7, 8 (אֱלֹהִים together with אֱלֹהִים, similar to what we have here); Mal. iii. 1 (the אָדוֹן who comes to his temple); Isa. vii. 14, ix. 5 (the עִמָּנוּ אֵל and אֵל גִּבּוֹר); Jer. xxiii. 6 (even יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ). But he takes as being most suitable the passage which comprehends David's Son and David's Lord in one divine-human person; and Sir. li. 10, in the very remarkable words ἐπεκαλεσάμην κύριον πατέρα κυρίου μου, "I called the Lord the father of my Lord," so corresponds to that passage, that it is plain believers under the Old Testament well understood it, and appropriated it to themselves, nay even by diligent search without the prophetic spirit correctly carried it further out. The interpretation of this passage as a whole is not called for here, but belongs to a commentary on the Psalms; we have given it in our own, and now only observe how the concluding question of Christ, πῶς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστι, "How is he his son?" is intended to draw forth precisely that πατέρα, "*father*," of Sirach. "Am I then a blasphemer when I call *God* my *Father* and myself *his* Son (John v. 18)? David testifies the same of me as him who was to come; he who sits at the right hand is certainly the Son, to whom Jehovah as Father gives up the kingdom (Matt. xxii. 2), to whom the same divine dignity and honor are due, since only on this supposition can David already call him his Lord (comp. John viii. 56)." The question implies by a plain deduction both these things: "Can he therefore be *only* David's Son? And how is this Lord of David yet *at the same time* his son, as was *before affirmed?** Is he not then truly the Son of the living God who has come in the flesh; and is not the throne of David promised to him something different from what you would understand it, a spiritual kingdom of heaven which he will set up and govern from above (when ye shall have *exalted* him)? Is he not *man and God?* And (which in the final sense and aim of all this is meant to be indicated) *must* not the promised Redeemer be this in order to *redeem* you from the curse of the law?" (Rom. viii. 3, 4). Thus, in this last answer, does our Lord reach far beyond into future developments and fulfillments, while he here already lays down at least the same testimony concerning his person which he afterwards declared upon adjuration before Caiaphas.†

In truth, only the faith which, in the same Spirit by which David prophesied, calls Jesus Lord, and recognizes the God-man in him, can solve the enigma of the being of this Son of Man, and find the salvation and the righteousness which the law cannot give. *What think ye of Christ?* This has ever been since then "the vital question of the ages;" he who does not ask it has it ever anew proposed to him by him who is himself the answer. This is the heart-question, the life-question that decides all; avoid this question and deny the answer, if thou wouldst one day become a footstool with the enemies! "Yes, if it could

* With great injustice, therefore, does Neander maintain that "the argument of Christ remains valid, even although it could be proved that David was *not* the author of the psalm" (which on historical and exegetical grounds must be denied). Our "Rabbinical theology of the letter" against which he bids us be on our guard is, as we hope, also in accordance with the *Spirit* of Christ; our interpretation, it is hoped, refutes all such strange caprice as can take its rise and subsist only in the want of proper understanding of the word to be interpreted.

† Whereupon Bengel, with perfect propriety, mentions the just inference as regards the state of humiliation; "Ergo Dominus Davidis erat, *antequam ei diceret* Dominus: Sede."

* For thus far indeed Hofmann (who, in other respects, perverts the psalm and Christ's question founded upon it) sees the truth which lies clearly on the surface, and needlessly appeals in support of this to what Gerhard says: "These words treat not (merely absolutely) of the divinity of Christ, but of the taking of his *human* nature into fellowship with the *divine* subsistence" (*Weiss. u. Erf.* ii. 195).

† With a folly to *us* almost incomprehensible, or comprehensible only when viewed as the punishment of the rejection of the Scripture, the acute Schleiermacher passes by this dogmatical point, and so wrests the words as to make our Lord mean simply that he could furnish them with something to answer that would be embarrassing for the *Romans*. "As *they* interpreted the psalm *Messianically*, they could not answer otherwise than: David might call the Messiah at the same time *his Lord, because* this was to be a *far mightier king* than he himself was." Apart from the notorious accommodation to the exegesis of that time, as well as its being unworthy of Christ "that he should have proposed any question only in order to embarrass" as even Neander here says)—is there sense and understanding in the idea, that any one should call a future greater king than himself, on this account *his* Lord?

be said, pointing to Moses, Here is a greater than Christ! and pointing to the law, The office of the letter which kills and condemns has greater clearness than the office of the New Testament in Christ, which gives the spirit and preaches righteousness—if it could be said, The law has given Christ, the law is the end of Christ, the fulfillment of the Gospel, by the works of the law is man made just before God—then might one give the first place to the question, Which is the principal commandment in the law?"* But, because Christ alone by the Spirit makes truly alive those who are dead, and pours his love wherewith he has loved us, the love of God, into the heart, in order to the fulfillment of the commandments which have become new in him—therefore it remains that he, as the Son of God, who as man has redeemed us and as God sits at God's right hand, now and at the last day should make the great separation and decision between his right hand and his left. "If ye hate me—there is sure condemnation for all my enemies. If ye love me—then keep my commandments!" (John xiv. 15, where Christ takes the place of Jehovah, Exod. xx. 6; comp. John xvi. 23).

Thus has our Lord left to us the fundamental article of the simplest *catechism* in Law and Gospel, as his last *doctrine* according to the *Scripture;* thus has he confirmed and repeated the two fundamental ideas of the Sermon on the Mount, namely, the *requirement* of a better righteousness than that of the Pharisees in the spiritual fulfilling of the law, and the *promise* that he is come as the alone Fulfiller. The Pharisees contradict both, do not repent in presence of the law, and do not believe on Christ; therefore follow the now thoroughly prepared *woes* denounced against them, chap. xxiii.

But before proceeding to this we must be allowed a short and unavoidable digression, suggested by the ἐν πνευματι, "in the Spirit," which we have reserved till now against the γραμματεῖς, or *Scribes*, of the present day. Our Lord pre-supposes, as at that time generally acknowledged by the Scribes, and *confirmed* by his own recognition, that David, in Psalm cx., speaks of his Son, the future *Christ;* in like manner he takes for granted as a thing acknowledged the *divine inspiration* of the psalm, so that he can build the proof-question upon it. His ἐν πνεύματι (or, as Mark has it, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ), is none other than the בְּרוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ, "*in the Holy Spirit*," in the *Jewish theory of inspiration;* this is solemnly acknowledged by him, and taken for granted as a common *truth* between him and his enemies, and it therefore (although by ignorance reproached as *Jewish*) must remain also as the thoroughly Christian idea of inspiration. For it is that of Christ himself. He does not here declare it as something new that David speaks and prophesies in the Spirit only *in this psalm;* but he pre-supposes, with his opponents, the same prophesying by the Spirit throughout the entire βίβλος ψαλμῶν, or Book of Psalms (Luke xx. 42, comp. 2 Sam. xxiii. 1, 2)—nay, as shortly before, throughout all the γραφαῖς, or Scriptures. Here then is the *sedes doctrinae de inspiratione* according to *the* Teacher, whose authority exceeds that of all the Rabbins of that day, and all the doctors of this: what he here calls πνεῦμα, *Spirit*, is the δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ, "power of God," before ascribed to the Jewish Scriptures And can we, his disciples, call ourselves Christians, and Christian theologians, if we treat the Old Testament humanly, if we shun the offence of the prophecies in him now, as the Jews did that of the cross? We are called Christians, and so long as in this the name Christ and Christianity yet lives, it points us ever back again to the Old Testament. The dogmatical question, What think ye of *Jesus?* becomes, when it enters into the *true* "Christian consciousness," one with the exegetical question which stands here, What think ye of *Christ*? For Jesus has said, I am *this* Christ! The apostles preached that he is the Christ. Only on the *corner-stone* of the apostles and *prophets* is "the Church," together with its true consciousness, built. A Schleiermacherian theology without the Old Testament wants the ground-stone and cope-stone, so long as it does not advance beyond itself.

The *idea of inspiration*, in its strictness and purity as attesting itself by the *Scripture* (the one Scripture of the Old and New Testaments in common), is a *fundamental* idea of theology; and not until theology has again completely recovered this idea, now unhappily almost lost, can it again be a truly Christian and Biblical theology, both these being one. Not until the improper admissions and concessions even of believers on this decisive question come to an end, will their position, as opposed to the negative theologians, assume a fixed and decided form. It is, indeed, not agreeable to the present writer, "properly speaking to stand alone in an age"—as long ago Umbreit said of me, and recently Dr. Tholuck to the same effect—though it is even now *almost* true; yet, on the other hand, it is consolation enough to stand with Christ and his apostles. It may be that my Scriptural writings are for a while longer "to have the fate of being more rejected than examined."* But this cannot possibly last long; for the fearfully consistent opposition of those who are entire unbelievers will drive the orthodox, even for the sake of a like *consistency*, into the true stronghold, into

* *Friedensbote*, 1822, p. 1830.

* As yet, I am sorry to say, almost as much as possible ignored by the theologians of the chair; so that many pass through their studies and yet hear very little of me (or besides of J. F. Von Meyer, the great master of exegesis). A *different* class of readers, however, who are not ungrateful to me, is happily on the increase.

the Scripture and power of God, which alone is impregnable to the Sadducees.

The inspiration, in the more limited sense, belonging to the Scripture, which is to be distinguished from the Spirit in the thinking and life of the apostles and prophets in general—this *inspiration*, properly so-called, we steadfastly maintain, and without it we know and acknowledge no Scripture. The theory of the orthodox school, which has appeared since Calovius and Quenstedt, may on one side be very defective, inasmuch as, contrary to the evidence which science has now discovered, it sets aside human co-operation by the supposition of human passivity; but, on the other side, in as far as it sets up a specific difference between *revelatio* and *inspiratio*, it is most incontrovertibly right.* He who denies this has to do neither with Calovius and Quenstedt, nor with Von Meyer and Stier, but with the Lord Christ and all his apostles, not to say all the fathers and teachers of the Church from the beginning. Of Dr. Hahn's 24th paragraph in his *Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens* (text-book of the Christian faith), for example, an exact refutation may be found in Justin, Irenaeus, Origen, Augustine, etc., etc.;† apart from the fact that the proposition there laid down, to the effect that revelation and inspiration are *according to the Scripture* in substance not at all different, declares what is entirely false. The revelation and institution of the old covenant is not merely to be regarded as what generally speaking obtained and subsisted in Israel, not a spurious "Hebraism," which in a merely natural way accommodated itself to the historical development of the people; but it was specifically given and ordained by God through his servants for this people. More particularly, the ground of the canonical authority and supernatural import of their Scriptures is not what the Spirit of God wrought in general in these men, but what the Spirit in particular gave to them to write. David was not always "in Spirit" in the same sense as when he sang prophetic psalms. That their exalted activity, their being in the Spirit while composing these testimonies, stands connected with their whole general life in the Spirit is certain; and it is conformable with the psychological law of the operation of the Spirit of God in the human spirit. The one is as regards the other not a thing of indifference, for indeed they were *holy men of God*—but this is not yet *one and the same* with being specially *moved* by the Holy Ghost, *ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι* (2 Pet. i. 21); this latter belongs specially to the *ἐλάλησαν*, *spake*, *i. e.*, according to the clear meaning of the apostle, equivalent to *ἔγραψαν*, *wrote*. For to read here, "As the holy men *spake* so also they wrote"—is certainly an exegesis which thwarts the entire connection with other passages (see James iii. 2). Did, then, those imperfect men who offended in word commit mistakes also in their writings? And who will judge as to these errors? The Spirit in us, which we have in higher measure in order to this? Where, then, remains the idea of the *κανών* (canon);* which yet Nitzsch, for example, holds fast, although his affirmation, that infallibility belongs only to the whole as such, seems meant by him as going even beyond the truth? So long as I can read and think, nothing will move me from the conviction, that our Lord ascribes an infallibility to the *single γέγραπται*, "it is written," as such, and that *because* it is a *γέγραπται*.† Christ, when he says *Δαυὶδ ἐν πνεύματι*, does not mean to say that David was *always* in the Spirit, but he certainly means that *his psalms* were written in the Spirit; again he means this, not merely of the Psalter as a whole, but, of the most special אֲדֹנִי, "my Lord," and שֵׁב לִימִינִי, "Sit on my right hand," which stands in the 110th Psalm. The true theory of inspiration must, therefore, stand fast in that centre, from which in the New Testament the immovable word *ἡ γραφὴ* sounds forth; and in the mouth of Christ every *γέγραπται* receives its own *Ἀμήν*. And because the New Testament, as the completion of the Scripture, plainly puts itself on the same level of authority with that which it has before ascribed to the old Scripture (this every word breathes and expresses without special dicta, which, moreover, are not wanting)—so also is a special inspiration of *that which is written* here in like manner the only true conclusion. Although so many believing theologians still reject this, and (as for example Lange) declare the supposed "abstraction, whereby the inspiration of the writing is *separated* from the inspiration of the life" (but who is for making this separation?) to be "somewhat Talmudistic"—we yet know assuredly, and shall never grow weary of asserting, that all rejection of the specific miracle maintained in the *γέγραπται* is only to be wise above and against Scripture.

With respect now to *prophecy* in particular, the *substance* or *matter* of all prophecy in the Old Testament is that which God has determined, by the revelation of his Son, to accom-

* [On this point the English reader may profitably consult Lee's *Discourses on the Inspiration of the Holy Scripture*, Lond. 1854, N. Y. 1857.—Am. Ed.]

† And possibly very different from Tholuck's review in the new "*Deutsche Zeitschrift*," which makes short work of the subject. How many strong and decisive statements are there, too, against those friends of the truth who will speak sometimes obscurely and with wavering concessions!

* Nullo modo posset Scriptura sacra pro regula vitae ac fidei haberi, si scriptores sacri non alia gavisi fuissent *θεοπνευστία*, cum homines etiam pii et sancti falli queant variisque erroribus sint obnoxii (Buddæus, *Institutt.* i. 2, 10).

† Against Hofmann, who, in his "*Schriftbeweis*" (i. 567 fol.), will only admit the validity of the Scripture as a whole, according to its collective import, there remains this very serious question: What, then, is to be made of the special *γέγραται*—?

plish in the days of the new covenant, in the time of the fulfillment, or אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים, *conclusion of the days* ("last days"), and which therefore he announced beforehand in the time of preparation (Acts iii. 24). As the life of faith in the pious had, from the very first, no ground on which to rest without some expectation of eternal life with their God, in like manner all the temporal, provisional leadings and institutions of God, with reference to his people, have no δύναμις (power) and no τέλος (fulfillment) without the all-pervading reference to the coming of Christ. The looking forward to the coming of the seed of the woman, of the seed of Abraham for the blessing of all nations, of the Shiloh unto whom the obedience of the nations is due, of the Son of David who is to build the temple and kingdom for ever, of the Messiah, is, in a certain sense, one with the looking forward to the advent in general, as is rightly denoted by the *Jewish* theological עוֹלָם הַבָּא, or "world to come" (future, *i. e.*, Messianic, dispensation). This reference and annunciation consists, however, *partly* in the inner meaning and spirit of all the events and institutions in general, corresponding to the mind and character of the people, partly in *special testimonies* given from time to time. The latter, which is still to be distinguished, for example, from the true writing of history by the נְבִיאִים רִאשׁוֹנִים, earlier prophets, is prophecy in the more limited sense. And what is the *aim* of these special vaticinia which *announce beforehand*, through the succession of ages in regular development, and precede, like their shadows beforehand, all the events of God's hand, but especially, with constant reference to Israel's election, progress, and destiny, the kingdom of Christ, and *the history of his person*, on which it is founded? In the first place, to strengthen and call forth the expecting faith of that time; to ward off a false resting in what was merely temporary; and graciously to hold forth a pledge of the knowledge of him who was to come. Both those who immediately received these oracles of God (Psa. cx., נְאֻם יְהוָה), and those to whom they were further communicated, were, with anxious longing, to search into their meaning; for prophecy arose to satisfy this longing awakened within them *by God*, and did not arise in a natural way *out of* that longing itself (see Dan. ix.). The *principal aim* of prophecy, however, extended far beyond that imperfect understanding of its meaning which, even with the accompanying private interpretation of the Spirit, alone was possible, to the advent itself. That Israel might certainly know the Messiah when he came, if only they would; that Christ himself, as a man and an Israelite, might have a light for his path, a means of developing and confirming his faith, prepared by the Father;* that the believers of the New Testament might henceforth, in like manner, through the wondrous word of ages, fortify their faith in the unity of all revelations of God, even to the last in his Son, their certainty that he to whom they live is the one that was to come in the fulness of time, according to the eternal counsel; *finally*, that in the last days the ancient covenant-people, returning from their blindness, might be convinced by its holy letter preserved even till that time—all this is included in the design of prophecy.

The *source*, from which the predictions of the prophets in the more limited sense proceeded, is *not* to be found in the ἰδία ἐπίλυσις ("private interpretation") of a presentiment, conjecture or desire, which, although at first awakened within them by the Spirit of God, was yet further developed in themselves in a natural and human way. But it must be sought in the *speaking of God*, his word coming always *anew* into their human consciousness—which, even to the end of the days, when every *mystery* of God thus spoken is fulfilled and ended (Rev. x. 7), might be and was *intended to be* partly understood, and partly not *understood;* and which, precisely on this account, clothed itself partly in literally plain words, in words entirely understood by the prophets, partly, on the other hand, in dark hints, and in an *under-sense*, which only the Spirit of God himself knew and could interpret. The *Spirit of Christ*, as Peter says, was in the prophets, so that they must needs search into the words of their own mouth, and, on account of the darkness that hid other things, only abide by what had been revealed to them, namely, *that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister these things* (1 Pet. i. 10–12). But, because the word of the Spirit was yet a word coming through the mouth of men and the thoughts of men, therefore was the knowledge of these holy men themselves the *medium* of utterance employed by the Spirit; and that in a manner quite as conformable to nature as it was miraculous. Every prophet speaks what is given to him; far as it may reach beyond his time, it yet as a whole bears the peculiar form of his time and person, which the same God, by the course of nature and grace, has wisely prepared with a view to this. The prophet says, indeed, many things which he himself does *not altogether* understand, but nothing in regard to which he has no thoughts or reflections at all, and which is not in some way connected with his own consciousness. And thus, according to *this* theory of inspiration, the prophetic writings are truly "organic wholes, and living products of minds affected by the surrounding external and internal relations" (in the words of Bleek), if only we reckon

* And yet there are those who venture openly to impute to him a Jewish, and, on account of his humanity, national sphere of vision, in the belief and the understanding of the Scripture—to *him* who first brought to Israel and the world the full belief, the entire, true understanding of the Scripture.

among these internal relations the Spirit of inspiration very essentially *affecting* the mind.

The *Christ* of prophecy, about whom our Lord in the words περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *of the Christ*, asks, as concerning a *person* who is the same with his person (Luke xxiv. 26, τὸν Χριστόν, and ver. 44, περὶ ἐμοῦ), is a figure and form which is complete and consistent in its totality.* It is not, therefore, that (one knows not what) "ideal" Christ who is made up of all sorts of presentiments, half agreeing and half disagreeing with each other, such as many at this day speak of. These, indeed, have also a kind of "prophecy;" the idea of which, however, does not at all agree with the idea of this word that obtains elsewhere among heathen, Jews, and Christians, namely, "a foretelling of events, based on divine communication" (see also Acts xi. 28, xxi. 11). Scriptural *prophecy* in this sense, in so far as it stands in the canon, is a product of a higher degree of inspiration, and its most evident proof; just as that "prophesying," or inspired speaking in another sense, which the Scripture speaks of, indicates a concentrated and stronger working of the Spirit of God on the human spirit. It is nothing to the purpose that, in the original language of the Old Testament, there is no special term for the foretelling of the future. It has the thing itself, and the appeal of the true God to it as coming only from him; and that precisely where this prophesying appears more strikingly than it had ever done before, in *Isaiah*, for example, chaps. xlii. 8, 9, xlvi. 9, 10, which therefore the present false theory can no longer believe and understand. By right no one should give to a *presentiment* of the future, developed from the *human* spirit—*præsagium*—the name of prophecy or *vaticinium*, in the theological sense. On the other hand, this name is without doubt rightly applied to a vision given in *the first place* in the natural horizon of the present, and the sphere of the national life, to which, through the *providence of God*, a *typical character*, flowing from the general character, adheres; *namely*, when this Providence, specially taking care of the canon, has *before provided* the *expression* of this intuition in the γραφή or Scripture, and has, precisely by inspiration, given it a co-ordinate place with the more consciously direct prophecies. That the human consciousness of its meaning does not essentially belong to the idea of prophecy according to the more concrete use of the word in the New Testament, but that, all the more on this account, the idea of divine guidance and inspiration belongs to it, is evident from the case of Caiaphas (John xi. 50, 51). But the holy men of God were far from prophesying always unconsciously, and they never did so strictly speaking as Caiaphas did. This leads us into a province where the believing interpretation has been mainly combated and charged with the worst caprice—into the miraculous province of that which the Holy Ghost speaks, while the persons by whom he speaks do not fully understand it. Here "the difference between the immediate and the mediate, between the unconscious and the conscious in the human spirit," as psychology shows what is analogous to it every where, is, at all events in the province of the Scripture, to be well considered and rightly understood. If too great emphasis is laid on the unconsciousness —then, forgetting the Scripture-inspiration, one finds only such "presentiments as the pious writers themselves were not able to master, were not able clearly and entirely to express, scarcely even to stammer out." This, then, is held "from its very nature, to be ever something general, indefinite, floating in the air;" and so the testimony of the prophetic spirit adduced in the New Testament as in the highest degree clear, must be allowed to evaporate into an incomprehensible chiaro-oscuro, the exegesis of which is forbidden to every one. On the contrary, all that the *Holy Ghost*—so soon as we attach a definite meaning to this great word itself—has given to the sacred writers to say, remains most certain and definite, whether this be simply and plainly in their words, as knowledge destined for the Old Testament times, or whether it be an enigma lying deeper, reserved for the future. In the latter case, what is concealed becomes manifest, and the slight intimation, according to its original divine *intention*, is exalted into the light of distinct definiteness; *i. e.*, in other words, the Scripture is *opened* (Acts xvii. 3; Luke xxiv. 45), so soon as *the same spirit*, who there spoke mysteriously, now becomes the *interpreter of his own words*. We see, also, that Christ and the apostles cite and make use such h ponoetic testimor , without distinction from the others. "The formula ἵνα πληρωθῇ, *that it might be fulfilled*, is frequently applied to types *the same as if* they were prophecies"—says Nitzsch; from this it precisely follows, however, that they *are* prophecies, and the consciously prophesying subject is properly always in the end the Holy Ghost. As regards the *under-sense*, also, there is in it no essential token of its having been unknown to the inspired writer; this may certainly have been the case, but it may quite as well have been the contrary.* Only the man who holds no special inspiration will anxiously inquire what, and how much, the writers had in

* "Christ, the promised One, every where explains the Old Testament in the most essential respects of himself, and applies it to his own person, just as a man points to a picture which represents him" (Von Meyer, as editor of De Wette's *Psalms*, see *Krit. Kränze*, p. 396). Yet, as may be strictly proved by a genuine exegesis of the prophetical word, what Jul. Müller maintains is wrong, viz., "The Messianic prophecy of the old covenant respecting the incarnate Son of God was fulfilled, but at the same time *infinitely exceeded*." The fulfilled reality indeed exceeds the prophecy in clearness; in other respects, however—let one only read now in this clear light—it has *nothing* essential, which had not been already indicated beforehand.

* See my *Einleitung zu den Psalmen*, p. 8

their own thoughts in connection with their words—*a question which can now never be settled.* We should think that when such a one reads honestly and uprightly the wondrous word of the Old Testament, he must find so much that is uncertain, obscure, and full of prophetic presentiment, so much that is invested and played around by a second sense, as to make him despair of at all interpreting the thoughts in these words. But he who proposes the grand question, What does the Holy Ghost testify here? considers, indeed, the historically personal references and media in the human consciousness, in so far as they present themselves to him; where, however, the word, read in the light of the fundamental intention and special interpretation of the New Testament, begins to loose itself from the natural ground of the time when it was written, he, notwithstanding, continues to read confidently without troubling himself much as to what the prophet may or may not have understood concerning it. We have now to do not merely with "the *train of thought* of the ancient kings, prophets, and other *mere* (?) theopneusts"—in which the person, history, and kingdom of Christ were already comprehended in extenso and concreto (Tholuck's *Litt. Anz.* 1836, p. 181)—but with the train of thought of the Spirit, according to which David speaks *in the Spirit*, or *the Holy Spirit by the mouth of David.* We "bring certainly the full coloring into the shadowy sketch"—for, therefore, has the σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, "shadow of things to come," been given to us, in its wonderful adaptation to the εἰκὼν or image; he who has the original sees, of course, a true shadow-sketch in the light of this original, and *this is precisely now the exegesis of the Old Testament in the light of the New.* Moreover, we must not suffer ourselves to be induced to take, as the criterion, whatever a false theology, which does not even understand the Old Testament in a grammatico-historical way, may please to declare as being at any time the stage in the development of Hebraism on the whole, and, therefore, the sphere of vision at the time in the particulars. It is, for example, a mere dogmatical dictum of unbelief which will not acknowledge the "inner relations," when De Wette* says respecting the *piercing* of the hands and feet in Psa. xxii., attested by the *Masora*, "If David did not suffer it, then he *could* not say it of *himself*, and a presentiment of the particular mode of death which *another* was to suffer after him could not with these words come into his mind." Wherefore not, if it was revealed to him that not only his life and sufferings bore a typical reference to the great One who was to come; but also, in particular, that the Spirit of the Lord spoke of this One by his tongue? Why must that be called "unpsychological" in the highest and holiest sphere which, in a quite inferior degree, happens to the sons of men—even to many a doctor, in spite of all his exact thinking—namely, that they should often say what reaches beyond their own thought. It would be interesting enough to seek out in many a book of the present day the under-sense here and there put in by God. Göschel's exegesis in reference to Göthe goes, indeed, too far; in general, however, we all apply with justice the *same* principle of interpretation even to our own classics. And, to return to antiquity—one has only to look without prejudice at the wide natural sphere of the heathen oracles, and the oriental gnome-wisdom, in order to find in abundance even the grammatical double sense (this σκάνδαλον of the γραφή). Now that the wondrous word of the suggesting Spirit, employing and exalting *this* mode of natural utterance amongst men, comes to have, not, indeed, a "*spirit-like*" (as the reviewer in Tholuck's *Anz.* loc. cit. thinks), yet actually a *supernatural*, *miraculous* appearance, is at the same time founded so *naturally* in the fact of the great miracle of inspiration,* that not only in the citations of the New Testament does what is cited acquire for the most part exactly this appearance, but in general to the believingly devout reader *every sentence of the Bible* is at times thus spiritually transfigured. Thus is that *interpretation* of the Scripture which completely understands it, properly speaking itself a prophesying and seeing by the Spirit, and not a *mere* reading and investigating by means of human helps, as in other books written by men. Such interpretation, like all prophecy of the second degree, lets itself indeed be *judged* by the same Spirit, on account of the error that is mixed with it, but it must certainly decline to vindicate itself against merely human wrangling and disputation.

What, then, did David in Psa. cx. know of Christ, when, *in the Spirit*, he called him *his* Lord? This Lord himself, who also knew well about David, asserts, on the part of the psalmist, a knowledge of the sense of his own words, in the little word "*his*"—which is, at all events, implied in the expression "to *my* Lord," as has been said above. As Moses, according to Num. xii. 6–8, had some understanding of the secret and far-reaching import of his typical laws and institutions, so, still more, did David *know*, since Nathan's prophecy, that he himself, also a prophet, spoke beforehand, for example in Psa. xvi., of the *resurrection* of this Christ who was promised to him (Acts ii. 30, 31). In like manner, in the 2d Psalm, he speaks of a world-ruler who is "the Son" in an incomparable sense, in whom to *trust* for salvation as in God is no idolatry. He knew even that the Spirit of God speaks in his psalms in general of him who was to come. Read only 1 Chron. xviii. 17, and 2

* *Erbauliche Erklärung der Psalmen*, p. 29.

* For the inspiration of the Scripture is, and remains the *miracle* in the sphere of human thinking, quite as indisputable, and at the same time incomprehensible, as other wonders of a higher nature imparting itself to a lower. In this way it touches upon what is analogous to it in a lower degree, and is yet, *toto cœlo*, different from it.

Sam. vii. 19, aright as the words stand.* Consequently the ἐν πνεύματι, "in the Spirit," in the allusion to Psa. cx., does not, in any wise, mean a state of ecstasy in which David himself was carried to the right hand of God, and in which, not knowing the import of his own words, he speaks as if he himself had become his own Lord. Nor are the words "to *my* Lord" to be understood as "an Israelite's intuition of the glorious and efficacious fellowship of the king with Jehovah," *i. e.*, in another person than his own, as Hofmann thinks; for, on the contrary, Christ* here says that David spoke these words in his own person, concerning another, viz., *the Christ*. Yet it is not thereby affirmed that David knew and understood *all* that we can read and find in the inexhaustibly profound word of the Spirit by the mouth of David, now after the actual exaltation of the royal Priest to the right hand of God.

WOE TO THE PHARISEES.—ALL BLOOD UPON THIS GENERATION.—FAREWELL TO JERUSALEM.

(Matt. xxiii. 2–39; Mark xii. 38–40; Luke xx. 46, 47; [Luke xi. 39–52; xiii. 34, 35].)

We must once more, and for the last time, protest against the constant hypothesis of Olshausen, who consistently maintains the improbability that an entire discourse, such as Matthew here gives, was actually spoken by our Lord; and, moving in a *circle*, reminds us, here as every where else, of the usual manner of the apostles "thus to combine the sayings of Christ." We still maintain the same conviction as to the theory that Matthew has "with art and insight arranged into a new whole" the scattered sayings; we hold it to be an art forbidden to the Evangelist, a false insight on the part of the apostle, who must have known that it was not permitted to him to compile for the Church of Christ the formal discourses delivered by his and its Lord on his entering upon his work and taking leave of it, and then simply to say of them: Jesus opened his mouth and spake thus! The τότε, *then*, of Matthew, therefore, stands firm here also; as much so, at least, as the account of Luke, who informs us that Jesus had already spoken at an earlier period much of what is here said. Nay, Luke himself, as also Mark, at the same place where the discourse of Matthew stands, gives a brief hint about that discourse. When Luke, chap. xi. vers. 38, 45, 53, narrating ex-

* True, even the old translators take the אדני יהוה ("Lord God") in 2 Sam. vii. 19, as a vocative; but, although this certainly occurs at vers. 18, 19, 20, 28, 29, it yet cannot be meant thus here (the second time in the same verse!), because then the remaining clause ותאת תורה האדם ("And is this the manner of men?") would have no proper beginning. When Hävernick, with Schnurrer and others, would read, "that such is a law for men" (as Seb. Schmid, "idque ad legem hominis")—we reasonably ask, in respect of the sense, What? how so? and can find no tolerable idea corresponding to the elevation of this chapter. Equally unsatisfactorily does De Wette dismiss the readers of his Bible, "Such is the way of men"—namely, to speak thus confidentially (as according to Grotius, also Gesenius, Winer, Maurer), or even, Thus to care for their posterity! Zinzendorf, in his ignorance, may be satisfied with such an interpretation as, "Thou speakest with one, as a friend speaks with another"—but we cannot be so satisfied. The *question* of surprise, Is this the manner of men (namely, an eternal kingdom)? comes indeed nearer, but no such question is indicated in the text. It is enough to abide by that which Luther has hit in his marginal gloss: "Thou speakest with me of an eternal kingdom, in which no man can be king; he must be God *and man*, because he is to be my son and yet is to be king for ever and ever, which belongs to God alone." This future, as yet distantly future, Ruler of an eternal kingdom, whose Father (ver. 14) thou art to be, is God-man! Thus we have the true parallel to Psa. cx. Let תורה, *law* ("manner"), be understood of the new law, the new revelation, the new order of the covenant and kingdom; let the האדם which is strikingly brought into prominence, and used personally, contrary to the usage of this word elsewhere, not be overlooked; and then let the passage be read in full (with Schmieder, *Zeugniss von Christo in Predigten*, p. 291)—Of *an* Adam, who is Lord Jehovah, a new beginner of humanity and representative of humanity. If any one thinks that this interpretation of 2 Sam. vii. is mystically put into the words, we ask him how he will dispose of the parallel passage 2 Chron. xviii. 17 (original text. xvii. 17), where the sense maintained by us is still less to be evaded; it means evidently, according to the manner, form (the type) of the or a *man, who is on high*, who is Lord (and) God. The interpretation, "After the manner of an exalted man"—yields still less sense than the evasions before mentioned. Or, "After the manner of men, O thou on high, God Jehovah"—which is already forbidden by the remarkable accentuation.

* To whom Dr. Hofmann will hardly answer "*Thou errest*, for thou knowest not the Scripture and the weakness of men so well as I!" We are glad to find Delitzsch at one with us in the testimony that the authority of Christ (from which Hofmann tries acutely, but in vain, to release himself) here recognizes a designation of the Messiah as κύριος in the mouth of *David*. Thereby certainly "the chain of progression, as Hofmann has constructed it, is at once broken in pieces, the *exclusively* typical principle of his interpretation of the Psalms entirely shaken" (Delitzsch, *Biblisch-prophet. Theologie*, p. 186).

actly according to the occasion and connection there indicated, inserts the earlier kindred discourse of our Lord against the Pharisees and Scribes, it is *to us* not merely in the highest degree probable, but certain, that he is quite as right as Matthew, and Matthew quite as right as he—that is, our Lord (and this has a very profound significance, if only we will admit it) publicly repeated and arranged in this, his farewell discourse, what he had already, perhaps often, here and there uttered in private.* At least let tenable reasons be given against this, instead of an indefinite assertion of its improbability. Was not the case entirely similar with the parable of the guests who despised the call? We shall, therefore, interpret the discourse spoken at the entertainment in Luke as belonging properly to that time; yet we shall there, for the most part, have to consider and explain only the different position and connection of the particular sayings in relation to the concluding discourse in Matthew.

But we must not forget that even the formal apostrophe to Jerusalem as the killer of the prophets, and the announcement, "Your house is left unto you desolate! Ye shall see me no more!"—to remove which from its place in Matthew would contradict all sound feeling—is likewise to be found at an earlier period in Luke xiii. 34, 35, in definite connection with words going before, in ver. 33. What shall we say to this? It certainly bears very much the appearance as if Christ had spoken thus only once, and most naturally where Matthew records it; nay, we cannot quite comprehend Olshausen, when, with obstinate consistency, he curtly says of these words, "In Luke *they* have *without doubt* their original place!" How natural it is to doubt whether Jesus could there and then from afar have thus addressed *Jerusalem;* whether he could already have addressed a *farewell* to those who *would not!* When we find that Luke has, without regard to chronological order, interwoven with the so-called narrative of the journey (*i. e.*, the particular section chap. ix. 51, to chap. xviii. 14) much that was spoken elsewhere—for example as we found at chap. xi. 14–36 (yet only so that ver. 37 retains its truth in so far as something similar was then said), and perhaps chap. xiii. 18–21, as also other places—it is surely natural to suppose that in connecting also chap. xiii. 34, 35 with ver. 33, he *might* have anticipated. More than this, however, it does not become us to say; as even Schleiermacher, in his lectures on Luke (as my notes inform me), "could not do otherwise than let it stand as *doubtful*."† It is at least much more certain that Matthew is right in giving this as Christ's *farewell word;* and our feeling, sound and true as we think, rebels against the idea that he has presumed, on his own authority, to remove the earlier saying to this place where Christ *would have* spoken it beyond comparison more suitably and effectually. When again, however, we find that in Luke xiii. the words may well be understood (even ver. 35) in *another*, and at that time quite suitable, sense (of which later on Luke), if we only cancel the already critically suspicious ἔρημος, "desolate"—we can make up our minds to suppose, with Bengel, that our Lord had already, at an earlier period in Galilee, addressed Jerusalem in precisely similar terms, as the murderer of the prophets, when speaking of his death which was soon to be accomplished there; and, finally, that at a later period he purposely repeated, with reference to a more remote future, a word that was there meant for his triumphal entry which was soon to take place.

But to proceed with Matthew. According to his account, our Lord spoke here *to the people and to his disciples*, notwithstanding the address to the Pharisees and Scribes and the entire evil generation, which begins at ver. 13 and continues to the end of the chapter. This implies, first of all, that he *began* as we see by addressing the people (ver. 3), and his disciples (vers. 8–11); but it likewise denotes, that in fact the woes denounced against the Pharisees were meant less for them than as a warning to the people and to the disciples. Mark xii. 38 brings into prominence the still listening and unsusceptible people; Luke xx. 45, in addition to these, the disciples. Both Evangelists, moreover, not less concisely than profoundly, intimate this as the proper and innermost point of the entire discourse, when they begin it with a Βλέπετε, προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων, "Beware of the Scribes!" This connects itself (besides Matt. xvi. 6, and Luke xii. 1) exactly with the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vii. 15)—that Sermon on the Mount which (as we have seen) foreshadows in general, in its progress and conclusion, the progress and conclusion of all the teaching of Christ; to which, in particular (as we shall see), the woes here denounced significantly correspond, as contrasted with the blessings there promised. The sentence of condemnation which the Pharisees, *in the hearing of all the people*, must needs take away with them—so that by this publicity it already foreshadows to them the great judgment of that day—is meant to exhibit a most solemn *warning example* for all future times in the eyes of all the people, and especially the disciples of Christ (*i. e.*, as in the Sermon on the Mount, such as are so already, and such as on hearing it will become so): this is the main design and fundamental import of the entire

* Even Hase acknowledges this discourse as authentic, and thinks it to be "so conformable to time and place that it by no means has the appearance of being a compilation of Matthew." Schleiermacher, on the contrary, thinks that on this day there was no longer *time* enough for such a discourse.

† In his *published work* on Luke, however, he inclines more strongly to the opinion, that Luke has only inserted the discourse here.

discourse, *Let it not be so with you!* This must be said even here to the disciples of Christ; therefore, it is not merely, Beware of these and such hypocrites wherever you may meet them; but even, Take heed that *ye become not as they!* For, according to 1 Cor. ix. 27, there remains even to a Paul the threatening danger of continuing to preach outwardly to others whilst inwardly he is himself rejected, of holding forth the prize to which he himself does not attain.

As, at Isa. v. 8–30, there followed upon the parable of the vineyard a sixfold woe against sinful Israel, so now, in exact contrast with the Sermon on the Mount (to which we shall find besides many particular allusions), Christ utters *seven* woes, with a superadded *eighth*, against the hypocrites and blind guides at the head of this generation upon which judgment is about to fall This has not been arranged, here any more than there, by the "art and insight of the Evangelist." It would be folly, indeed, in us, as in Matthew, to trouble ourselves with the question whether Christ spoke every immaterial particular, and every thing literally as it stands here; *e. g.*, whether he mentioned the φυλακτήρια or "phylacteries" first, and not the κράσπεδα or "hems." We may certainly rely on this, that the *whole*, in its essential meaning, connection, and progress, corresponds through the Spirit of inspiration with the original discourse of our Lord.

It divides itself not less evidently than significantly into *three* parts. The first gives, by way of introduction and warning, the *description* of the Scribes and Pharisees, and that in contrast with the disciples of Christ (vers. 2–12). The second, as the kernel, properly speaking, comprehends the *seven woes* upon the hypocrites and wilfully blind, which are introduced by a sudden change of the address (vers. 13–28). The *concluding* part passes—in the *eighth woe*, which combines all the seven in one—from the persons hitherto addressed to the *entire* generation of *Pharisaic Israel*, upon which judgment is about to fall; and ends in the terrible farewell to Jerusalem and the temple, the city and habitation of God! (vers. 29–39). In harmony with chap. v. 20, in the Sermon on the Mount, the "righteousness" of the Pharisees—as it is there ironically called and rejected, that is, their unrighteousness and hypocrisy—is first of all depicted. "Those I mean, *who are so*"—says Christ, and thereby meets the question, which was yet a groundless question, viz., whether and how he can thus condemn the whole class and the whole sect. Those who are *not* so—he does not mean, and therefore does not condemn. He begins with the quite *general* mention of those who sit in Moses' seat (still, at the same time acknowledging the right and truth of the *office*), according to whose words in so far as conformable to that seat, the *people* are to act, notwithstanding they themselves do not thus act (vers. 2, 3). In this way is at once exhibited a more special delineation of their character as it appears outwardly in *their works*, and this in warning contrast with the *disciples of Christ*. They *do not* what they (more or less rightly) say; what they do however (their righteousness) is hypocrisy before the people (vers. 3–5). Examples which make this manifest are to be found in their affected holy garments, their sitting in the upper seats, and their love of titles (vers. 5–7). Now comes the strongly convictive, specially corresponding antithesis, applied from what is outward to the internal character: *Be not ye so!* (vers. 8–10). But ye know what I have said to *you* (ver. 11), as also *to them and you together* (ver. 12). The last sentence, that namely of ver. 12, comprehends both the Pharisees and the disciples at the close of the direct warning, and already prepares the way for the sentence of degradation upon those who sit on high, the *woe* that now breaks in.

The sevenfold woe divides itself into two parts; in the first of which there are four, and in the second three woes. The first four have respect to the pernicious *effects*, the last three to the evil *nature* of their hypocrisy.* They *rob* men of eternal salvation in the kingdom of heaven, under the pretext of being placed in charge of it—*nay even* of their earthly goods under the pretext of making prayers for their souls† (vers. 13, 14). They give to men for this the destruction of hell, or a character which deserves this (ver. 15)—and that by *false doctrine*, which (in every case as in these examples) puts what is unessential and outward in the place of what is essential (vers. 16–22). *Blind guides:* this sums up the pernicious outward expression of their hypocrisy, and stands therefore along with the "hypocrites" (vers. 23–25). Now first, pressing closely home, their evil *disposition* is denoted in a threefold woe: They neglect, in the most trifling outward observances, the principal thing (vers. 23, 24)—and that with *conscious* hypocrisy; as they cleanse the outside instead of the inside (vers. 25, 26), so they are themselves *whited sepulchres* (vers. 27, 28). The death in them which is now exposed forms the connecting link to the third and concluding

* By a similar division the promising *blessings* (Matt. v.) proceeded from the inward disposition to the outward expression; the rebuking *woe*, on the contrary, sets out from the outward expression, and proceeds to the inward character. The parallel, as *specially* carried out by Lange, between the blessings promised and the woes denounced, appears to us strained, and in some instances artificial. We think that such exact references would not accord with the solemnity of our Lord's holy wrath at the time.

† Ver. 14 is not to be put before ver. 13, for Bengel very aptly observes here, that the discourse must begin with the *kingdom of heaven* with reference to chaps. iv. 17, v. 3; we observe, in addition to this, that ver. 14 brings up a higher degree of turpitude in order to the *greater condemnation*. Still less is ver. 14 to be rejected as having been inserted from Luke, as Grotius thought, for Mark and Luke have here retained this περισσότερον κρίμα, as the principal saying.

part. This part, of course, again, begins in the first place with the Scribes and Pharisees, the guides of the whole people, in order to extend the eighth woe over *their* heads into a judgment upon the entire generation. They fill up with all their false holiness only the measure of the sins of their fathers; they pretend indeed to renounce the guilt of their fathers (vers. 29, 30), but yet are like them (ver. 31), nay fill up their measure in order to condemnation (vers. 32, 33). And thus does the entire generation fall with them into judgment: they will also reject the last messengers of Christ (sent *to them* only to afford a proof of their incorrigibleness), and thus draw down the final judgment upon all former crimes of bloodshed (vers. 34–36); Jerusalem especially would not receive the grace, which sought in vain to *allure* them, even to the last, and this grace now withdraws itself from them, *until* there shall be a penitent return of Israel to its *Messiah*, which lies in the remote future (vers. 37–39). Thus does the rejected Messiah turn away from them; thus does he declare the judgment beforehand; yet not without something conciliatory at the close, in the gracious look which he casts upon the children of these condemned parents, who shall one day be restored—every thing in one comprehensive view of this people and generation, as one whole under the leading of God.

Verses 2, 3. We are not to conceive of a *magisterial* power and dignity as belonging to the persons here rebuked; for our Lord uniformly showed an exalted humility towards all to whom he was lawfully subject, and, on special grounds did not even make use of his own royal dignity, nor even the rights of prophet to rebuke and inveigh against the holders of power. He reprimands them not in so far as they had still in any way to *judge* and *rule;* therefore it is not the "High Priests and Scribes," so that it is necessary to understand the Sanhedrim, but the "*Scribes* and Pharisees" —the words being purposely in this order. Of "an organized *political* influence," which he would prevent the people from opposing in a revolutionary way, he does not here speak; he does not in the remotest way denote the school and sect, which indeed was then the dominant one, as the holders of the "collective *theocratical* power," not even in order to acknowledge that power. For καθέδρα, ("seat") is neither a θρόνος (throne) nor a βῆμα (tribunal); but generally, the place which any one fills, and here the pulpit or lesk in school and church, as we now say. To sit in the seat of any one is to occupy his place with its rights and prerogatives (see Sir. xii. 12 in the Greek); then to become his successor in office in so far as an office is spoken of; for a transference of a transferable office is certainly pre-supposed therein. But there was at this time in Israel no *seat* of the *prophets*, no outwardly constituted right of succession; for, Samuel's schools of the prophets existed for a time only by the Spirit, and even Elisha was not called by Elijah, but by the Lord through Elijah, just as Amos the herdsman was (Amos vii. 14, 15). There was, however, a *seat of Moses*, *i. e.*, an office with the right and duty belonging to it of declaring the law to the people, of enforcing it, and applying it to particular cases: this Moses did first of all in person (Exod. xviii. 13, 20), and transferred this power (which was then also a power to judge in cases where *the law* declared punishment) not only to the rulers (ver. 21) who acted with him, but also for the future to the Priests, and Levites, and Judges (Deut. xvii. 9–12). But our Lord cannot mean here even this *priestly* or *judicial* office proceeding from Moses (Mal. ii. 7; Deut. xxxiii. 10) as such, for times and things were changed since then; after the return from the captivity, since the time of Ezra, the first scribe or סֹפֵר, another seat had been set up for declaring and interpreting the law (Neh. viii. 4–9), namely, the pulpit in the synagogues, and the right of the learned in general to teach the people. *This* Christ calls quite properly the present seat of Moses, which the *school*, as we now say, had occupied; more particularly, however, the specific *sect* of the Pharisees, which had obtained the upper hand in the school, so that no Sadducæan *Scribes* were acknowledged, although Sadducees also sat in the high council. It matters nothing to the point, whether the Rabbis and teachers in the temple and synagogues sate or stood (Luke iv. 20); the ἐκάθισαν, "sit," denotes the occupying of this place in general. As Christ at the beginning acknowledged the masters in Israel (Luke ii. 46; John iii. 10), so now, at the close, he lets their authority pass undisputed for the little while it has yet to last (till the judgment, ver. 12); he will not himself thrust them down before the time, but let them sit as now they *sit*. Whether, moreover, the form ἐκάθισαν is intended to denote "that they were *self-elected* to their office"—that they have assumpted the seat, and sit as a matter of fact—is still a question; there is certainly something of this in the background, as afterwards ver. 12 comes into prominence. But at first our Lord seems to speak only in the way of *acknowledgment*, just as at chap. xxi. he acknowledged the keepers of the vineyard in order to rebuke them. For the order of the development from Moses down to the present time, notwithstanding all offence in the individuals, was yet, on the whole, true and legitimate: if there was a seat of Moses in Israel at all, who sate in it but the Pharisees? Although they may have arrogantly seated themselves and now sit (for example, they called the ignorant rabble, John vii. 49, as עַם־הָאָרֶץ, or *people of the earth*, their "footstool"), yet they were the real, and fundamentally, still orthodox representatives of legal Judaism; hence Paul afterwards connecting himself with them could appeal to

their influence. Inasmuch, therefore, as our Lord leaving out of view the Sadducees and Essenes, speaks thus here of the Pharisees, he *honors* them (as in all his former controversy with them) at the same time that he rebukes them. "Notwithstanding his decided renunciation of what was dead and ungodly in Pharisaism, he yet had grafted his teaching only on their and on no other Jewish sect."

From this will be rightly understood the following confirmation by Christ of what these Pharisees *say* for the people, which from a want of clearness has been much misunderstood. That in the πάντα ὅσα ἄν, "all whatsoever," their false human statutes, which make void the commandment of God, are by no means to be included, is evident enough afterwards from vers. 16–22; and no one should so understand it after statements such as chap. xv. 3–20. What, in that case, would be meant by the προσέχετε, "beware," addressed to the people as well as to the disciples? "Christ commended the sheep because they listened not to the murderers and hirelings"—and can it be that he should now unconditionally direct them to these shepherds? Certainly, our Lord had, since the Sermon on the Mount, "placed the mass of the people above their representatives," and this is no "incongruous and revolutionary perversion of relations." It was the true reformatory relation, which Christ will assuredly never suffer to be abolished among the people of God, so as, after the genuine Romish fashion, to surrender the ignorant multitude blindly to human authorities. We cannot understand, again, how Olshausen, with the contents of this and the 15th chap. before him, can yet say here: "Their statutes contained in themselves nothing sinful; they were only very burdensome, but whoever entered into them faithfully and earnestly could receive no harm from them!" There lies, therefore, in the important οὖν, "therefore," between vers. 2 and 3 the already self-evident limitation, viz.: All that they say to you as in Moses' name from this seat, *conformably to this seat*, as true readers and interpreters of the law*—"lest the people might think that the Pharisaic traditions were of equal validity with the precepts of Moses." Luther's marginal gloss runs: "If any one teaches otherwise and more than Moses, he sits not in Moses' seat; therefore Christ rejects afterwards *their* works and doctrine of men." This discriminating recognition furnished the true complement to all his controversy with them hitherto; and our Lord therefore now expresses it to prevent all misunderstanding of his words (as in Matt. xv. 17). The people needed, and need at all times, in so far as the legal economy of God extends into the New Testament, such readers and interpreters of the word that has been given by God. Our Lord, therefore, at the same time, confirms by anticipation the similar office in Christendom; and declares it as his will that, in all times, the occupiers of any seat of Moses (not certainly a seat of Christ, who knows no representatives) should be honored on account of the office, notwithstanding all personal unworthiness, just as parents and magistrates are to be honored. Even although something human, unprophetical, pertaining to the letter in human fashion, should cleave to it (as Moses himself, at the same time, in the prophetic spirit bore the office of the letter), yet so long as it does not go directly *against* the word and commandment of God, it is to be tolerated—but not further. What they tell you to *keep*, already with the gentle irony rightly expressed by Luther, "that *ye* should keep"—as preparing the way for ver. 4. Yea, that observe and do *ye*, faithfully on your part, in order that it may not remain undone (see the like expressions, Exod. xviii. 20; Deut. xvii. 10, 11), although they do it not themselves; but ye must not do according to *their* works! Here the τηρεῖν, "observe," passes significantly to the inward disposition, which is different from the outward ποιεῖν, "do," and first of all required—also testified to by them against their knowledge and will in the word of the law, for it corresponds to the Heb. שָׁמַר, *to keep*.

Verses 3, 4. They themselves continually *say* what the law says, but they *do it not*: this is the first all-embracing designation of their hypocrisy, a hypocrisy which is developed and intensified, according to a psychological law, precisely by this saying and not doing. With this ver. 4 is immediately connected epexegetically; though by an almost universal mistake and in opposition to the plain word, these imposed burdens have been understood of their human statutes. It is only a figurative carrying out of ver. 3, according to the usage of the term (see on chap. xi. 29), and means nothing else than the saying and not doing spoken of immediately before: They proudly and with pleasure give forth the law in all its strictness, they delight to thunder it out severely, as from Sinai—Thou shalt! thou shalt not! without ever thinking of their own obedience (Rom. ii. 21–23). Just so the moral Pharisees of the present day preach endlessly of duties and evermore of duties! They lay upon the shoulders of the poor people burdens which they themselves will not *touch* with *one* finger (Luke xi. 46), or move from the spot; not to speak of taking them in their hand and laying them on their own shoulders in order

* This alone is what we find in it; namely, the acknowledgment of the office, and of all the teaching which was actually in accordance therewith. Roos, as if he had in his mind the pastors of his time, yet hardly according to historical truth, would understand a great deal too much. "From the *desk* these people say nothing wrong. Their human statutes, perverted interpretations, bad counsels, they spread abroad only in their decisions and conversations or they bring them before their students in a learned shape. In the desk (in the pulpit) *all is as yet well enough*. There they are afraid. There God still keeps his hand over them!" We doubt very much whether it was so.

to carry them.* Does this, then, correspond to their *statutes*, which even Bengel would understand as meant here? No, in *their* self-chosen works, ver. 5 (now first comes the transition to these), they indeed go zealously before the people. We should in that case have to understand Christ as going on to say in ver. 5: "I have said to you that they *do not;* verily, they do indeed outwardly, on account of the people, but that is not the right doing." But this sense, however true as respects the divine law, yet has respect to this law only as requiring a spiritual obedience; and not to those statutes which actually require only an outward observance, and for the overscrupulous doing of which, not proceeding from the heart, ver 4 would be a very unsuitable expression. The true explanation of the whole is found afterwards in ver. 23, where the real *βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου*, "weightier matters of *the law*," certainly correspond to the *φορτία βαρέα*, "heavy burdens," here; in like manner, Rom. ii. 21, 23, rightly understood, Thou stealest, committest adultery, and robbest God in heart, although not in act before the people. In their own hearts the commandment of God is to them an intolerable yoke; not merely in the deep sense of the truth which an honestly striving Paul finds (Acts xv. 10), but with a contemptuous putting aside of the commandment, so that they do not even lay a finger upon it in order to the true keeping of it before God: still they find their pleasure in the *δεσμεύειν*, *binding*, and *ἐπιτιθέναι*, *imposing*, on account of the office. Of an actual *adding* of their own commandments Christ does not yet speak *here;* else he would certainly have expressed himself more distinctly upon this important point, so as to distinguish between vers. 3 and 4. This, however, is already at all events implied in the idea; viz., that the Pharisees, with self-seeking pleasure, make the commandment of Moses a matter of conscience as *their* commandment; that in *their* binding and imposing, they already *make something else out of it;* instead of being a call to repentance in order to the knowledge of sin, they rather make it a laying on of all sorts of burdens. In *this* way they indeed *falsify* the law; and they bind its commandments thickly together without *mercy*, ver. 23, so as to be an intolerable burden as coming from their hands (chap. xii. 7). Here the Jurist Grotius is for once a better interpreter than most theologians; he refers to the *benignior interpretatio*, every where conceded by Moses, but neglected by his interpreters.† who on the contrary only "omnem operam impendebant ritibus *urgendis* et *ampliandis*." Now, in so far as this *ampliare* had more or less a real foundation, at least in the Mosaic *letter*, Jesus will not all at once do away with it before the time, God having permitted the letter to become thus sharp and unbending in the hand of his stewards. With an admirably wise moderation, he *finds fault* with the rigor of the interpreters, yet he stirs up no one of the people to offer resistance to the received interpretation. According to Luke xi. 45, 46, Christ said the same thing expressly to the *νομικοῖς*, or lawyers, who, as a distinct class (it is there expressly attested), applied themselves to the written law in preference to tradition (compare, finally, Jer. viii. 8, in the original text, in order to understand the entire relation of the סוֹפְרִים to the תּוֹרַת יְהוָה, as our Lord here views it).

Verses 5—7. Of the inward *doing* before God, such as the law requires even as declared by them, they will know nothing at all; but what they do as *their* works, *i. e.*, *now* reaching further, what they do according to God's command *and* their own invention, they do only for display before the people. We have here a direct resumption of the Sermon on the Mount, chap. vi. 1 (*πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι, to be seen*, literally as there); and it is to us a confirmation of the reading *δικαιοσύνη*, "righteousness," in that place. *Look at them*, and you will at once see this; for they make it grossly palpable to all! Most appropriately and with no slight scorn, resting upon pure truth, Christ mentions first of all the most outward and trifling observances, because it was precisely these that they made a display of; only read and observe the description and delineation of Pharisaism as a whole in its pomp and parade, to be found in Buxtorf, Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Lundius. Mark and Luke mention only the *περιπατεῖν ἐν στολαῖς*, "going in long clothing," which is wanting here, and is to be understood chiefly of the wide טַלִּית, or *mantle*, reaching even to the soles of the feet. The *φυλακτήρια*, or תְּפִלִּין, "phylacteries," still in use, were bits of parchment upon which passages from Moses were written, Deut. vi. 4–9 (and therefore that spiritual fundamental commandment held before them by Christ), xi. 13–21, Exod. xiii. 2–10, 11–16, not however to remind them of these, but for mere outward show. They were enclosed in two cases, bound round the forehead and the arm; and originated in a literal interpretation of Exod. xiii. 9.* They are called in Greek *φυλακτήρια not* because they were preservatives or amulets, as, according to ordinary Greek usage, it might be taken (Justin, for example, so misunderstanding it, found fault with these phylacteries on this

* "In what an entirely different light does the Saviour appear, who himself sought to bear the heaviest burdens, and by his love to make every thing easy for his people" (Stein *on Luke*).

† For example, in regard to the tithes, it was not agreeable to the intention of the law to extend them to the smallest herb; because these would hardly yield an emolument to the Levites, while they entailed the most grievous vexation on the tithe-payers.

* The Jews give it a more sacred observance than it receives on the plate worn by the high priest on his forehead; for, the name יְהוָה is there only once, but here it stands 23 times!

ground, and indeed such a superstition may at that time have connected itself with them); but, originally, they were only means of *remembrance* or memorandum-papers. Schöttgen, therefore, is more correct than Wahl, for the former explains: quia observatoria quædam erant et hodieque esse debent, ut legis divinæ memores sint. The κράσπεδα, "borders," are the צִיצִית or *tassels*, which were spoken of before in chap. xxii. 40. There could be no more striking example, and at the same time symbol, of the triflingly *outward* manner in which they handled the divine commandment than the fancied fulfillment of the earnest admonition of Moses, by the wearing of memorandum-papers and all such frippery. That they make these *broad* and *large* is also symbolical of all their life and action: in the one (which was actually literally enjoined), at least broader and larger than Moses meant, only for show before others, instead of reminding themselves; the other, moreover, was only an exaggerated interpretation of the proverbial saying, Exod. xiii. 9; Deut. vi. 8, 9, comp. Prov. iii. 3; vi. 21; vii. 3.* The two together delineate completely their relation to the *Torah* or law. See the capouches, tonsures, cowls, rosaries, crucifixes in monkery, with all that is similar to these in heathen Bonzes and Brahmins; ever the same folly of the human heart, betraying itself in these things, such as Christ must needs ridicule and rebuke in these Pharisees in Israel! Decorating the body with all sorts of ornamental appendages is the symbolically significant expression of the Pharisaism of the human heart in its lowest stage, often practiced childishly by the heathen; and thus now do even the priests and masters in Israel act in their own fashion! In like manner there is every where the same petty desire of honor and place, to which the chief *seats*, with *names* and *titles*, are all-important. It was necessary even to rebuke the *immoderate* ambition which led them to seek and hold fast the chief seat in the synagogue, although that was assigned according to office and right; but the same ambition betrayed itself doubly in this, that they transferred the place in the synagogue also to common life, and even at entertainments contended with each other for the uppermost seats, as in Luke xiv. 7. And now comes the pitiful desire for those titles which have existed from the earliest times, and exist to this day, in the world and the worldly church, with their "Excellencies" and "Eminences," but which the servants of God and interpreters of his word should leave to the world; or, if such titles must exist, should at least not *love them*, but should know better what a mere *being called of men* signifies! Our Lord only begins here to delineate this with the first and most general title *Rabbi* (the repetition of which was especially formal, as is to be seen from Mark xiv. 45), in order to carry it out further in the prohibitory warning addressed to his disciples

Verses 8—10 That our Lord does not forbid the outward use of the words and names, but only the disposition expressed in the φιλεῖν τοὺς ἀσπασμοὺς τούτους, "*loving* these salutations," and all that is further connected therewith, is so evident that only a Quakerism, which is itself Pharisaic, could misunderstand it. Will Christ, then, forbid children to call their fathers by the name of Father, as would be the case were we to understand the words literally? Even the spiritual children he will not forbid to call their spiritual fathers by the name which properly expresses this relationship (see 1 Cor. iv. 15). He must, in that case, have forbidden many more names such as Lord and King, and whatever, "*upon earth*" among men, is merely a reflection of divine honor and dignity. The words are spoken in the first place of the office of teacher; and as surely as Christ afterwards appointed manifold offices in his Church, must these offices also bear their corresponding names (Acts xiii. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11). This, therefore, he does not forbid, but he says: Ye are *not even* to let yourselves be named Rabbi in *such* a manner, with such *fondness for* and *pretension* to personal authority, as the Pharisees.* Between the twice-occurring μὴ κληθῆτε, "be ye not called," he puts the equally valid μὴ καλέσητε, "ye shall not be called;" therefore that they are not to acknowledge and yield to the like assumption in others.† The three titles are a graduated exemplification of what was then in use: *Father* (a natural expression of reverence for superiors occurring from the earliest times, both among Jews and Gentiles) was then in particular a higher title given to the heads of sects; and καθηγητής denotes (although, perhaps, the then existing practice did not exactly correspond to it) a *leader*, to whom others are to be unconditionally subject in matters of knowledge and religion (see Rom. ii. 19, ὁδηγὸς τυφλῶν, "a guide of the blind"). There lies, however, in the threefold title, and what is connected with it, something more for the disciples of Christ: in the first clause, διδάσκαλος, *teacher* ("master" as the invariable rendering of Rabbi) is certainly the true reading, and ὁ Χριστός, "even Christ," to be cancelled, for Christ cannot have needlessly repeated himself. One is your *Teacher*, because ye shall all be inwardly taught of God (John vi. 45, xiv. 26); that is therefore the *Holy Ghost* in the heart (comp. Jer. xxxi. 33, 34, with Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27).

* Hence the טוֹטָפוֹת in the Sept. are not yet called φυλακτήρια; but in the *Targum* on Deut. are already called תְּפִלִּין.

* "Only this is his righteous will, that we desire not the higher place on its own account, and the names Teacher and Father merely on account of these names" (Rud. Matthäi).

† Lange finds in this change of the expression actually the fore-knowledge, on the part of Christ, that not many would *claim* the name "Father," but that many might wish in a wrong way to ascribe it to others.

Therefore there follows then the *Father* in heaven, and *Christ*, the one Leader or Forerunner; hence, as Richter perfectly well observes, "a hint at the threefold *I* in God, before which every proud *I* must disappear."* It is, however, not enough that only One, as the Triune, is to us the true Teacher, Father, and Leader; Christ adds directly, as the inference from this and as the test of it, But ye are all *brethren!* The great and little, the high and low in place, the masters and beginners are, with respect to their call and immediate relation to God, placed upon a level; therefore, "teachers and learners have the same holy inward Teacher,"† all being as yet only learners, children of the one Father, followers of the one Leader. The spirit of this commandment of Christ for his people is not merely that it does away with all those barriers that fence round schools and learned castes in his Church—which stands not in such things, whose servants and members are to derive their authority and dignity which the gift of God alone imparts, as little from any faculty whatsoever, as at that time from the Synagogue—but, moreover, all *respect for men* which, with assumed authority, would force itself between God and us, is done away with. And this is in reality the main thing: Whoever *assumes* this to himself sins, and even so whoever concedes it to others. "No one is at liberty to take the place of Christ in the Church, and to let himself be called so and so in this sense. The Spirit himself whom he hath given to the Church must take it of his own, and show it to us. We know of no teacher in the Church besides and beyond him, and no philosopher in the school to whom we could entrust ourselves."‡ Observe now again how our Lord, abolishing all Old Testament tutelage, brings in a new state of things in the true liberty and equality which is founded on humility before God, now fully revealed and accessible to all; and how he himself thus exaltedly makes himself equal with the Father in heaven. What becomes, then, of the primacy of Peter, what of the most Holy Father in Rome, what of the father confessors and generals of the orders, who give themselves out for guides of souls with the demand for unconditional obedience? Every dominion in one's own name falls before Christ; every misuse of the name of God and Christ in order to one's own dominion cometh of evil, proceeds from the same evil heart as all Pharisaism did once, even though it should again creep in as plausibly as, for example, Zinzendorf's title "Papa" in the Moravian fraternity. Christ will have in the New Testament§ a directly free and near relation of all to himself, without human interposition and tutorship. "All, even the weakest, are to be directed to this one true Master, who casts out no one. The point of view from which the teacher is to be regarded must ever be that according to which his hearers shall learn to say, with the inhabitants of Sychar: "We believe now, not on account of thy saying; we have ourselves heard and known that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world."*

Verses 11, 12. This one Master, however, has often and long since told you what alone avails in his kingdom, and says it to you once more as the true Forerunner (see chap. xx. 26–28, xviii. 4; Luke xiv. 11, xviii. 14). This is not accomplished by the *title* "servus servorum;" rather is this holy fundamental commandment of Christ thereby quite as shamefully and foolishly perverted as at that time the *Hear O Israel* was by the phylacteries. No saying stands in these and other words so often in the Old and New Testament as that concerning humbling and exalting; in this place the first clause has a special significance for those who were arrogantly sitting in Moses' seat, and predicts for them the being cast down, and the coming of others into their place, just as Ezek. xxi. 26, 27 already testified. Christ goes before as Leader in humbling himself so as to be exalted—*Satan* was the first who exalted himself so as to be humbled.

Verses 13, 14. They come not into the kingdom of heaven, or rather of their own will *do not enter into it:* this stands before, and is itself the first *Woe* (as antithetical to the first *Blessed*, chapter v. 3); the immediately following fulfillment of what had just been said, viz., that whosoever will not humble himself in spiritual poverty can also not be exalted. But, in the case of these occupiers of Moses' seat, it is immediately added to this, that they prevent others from entering; nay, the aggravated hypocrisy, consisting in the false pretence of promising help to the people into a kingdom of heaven, in order to plunder them of their earthly goods, brings with it forthwith a περισσότερον κρίμα, "greater condemnation," as a second Woe. Observe here, again, the true order of these two verses; as well as the proof that the Οὐαί or "Woes" are not phrases and interjections of passion, but the deliberate announcement of the condemnation (ver. 33) upon those who will not go into the kingdom of heaven How they shut the kingdom of heaven against men had already been remotely indicated in chap. v. 19; then, in chap. xi. 12, the further development of the enmity against Jesus. In Luke xi. 52, Christ had thus expressed it: Ye have arrogantly appropriated to yourselves the key of knowledge, and taken it away from others (ἤρατε); *i. e.*, not a special key in order to γνῶσις or knowledge but rather the key of the *kingdom of*

* When Lange (iii. 210) refers the title "Father" to the *administration*, that of "Leader" to the *Reformation* of the Church, he certainly puts his own idea into the words!

† Olshausen, *Christus der einzige Meister* (Konigsberg, 1826, p. 14.)

‡ Gaaber, in the *Sermon before the Rhine Provincial Synod* (1838).

§ As already in the Old Testament God the Lord promises to his Israel that he alone should be their Father, and not even Father Abraham or Israel was to be accounted of before him (Isa. lxiii. 16).

* Olshausen, at the place cited above, p. 10.

heaven, as the following words show. The *knowledge* is precisely this key; and while the Scribes had usurped to themselves a monopoly of knowledge they misused it for shutting instead of for opening. In general, the true interpretation and application of the law, that is, consequently, the knowledge of the true way of salvation by repentance and faith (Luke i. 77), is the open door into the kingdom of heaven; and they had stolen and falsified both of these before Christ came. With obstinate consistency they completed this robbery in the days of John and of the Son of Man; snatched away from the poor people by their authority the acknowledgment of the Messiah; and said to those who wished to believe on him, and who rarely defended themselves with such bold independence as that blind man, *We know* that this man is a sinner, that must be enough for thee! (John ix. 24). They shut the door ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, "*against* men" (lit. in their face); they do not let in the already quite near εἰσερχομένους (Present: who are actually on the point of willingly entering)—as they afterwards continued even till the judgment to hinder the preaching of the Gospel for the salvation of the heathen (I Thess. ii. 16). That they should *say*, We have the key of the kingdom of heaven! and yet prevent others from entering, inasmuch as and because they *will* not enter in themselves—such conduct, on the part of the false teachers and guides, deserves the Woe, deserves the true *title* of *hypocrites*, *blind guides*, *fools*, and *blind*, which now come instead of those before mentioned. And withal they are the holy ones with their many and *long* prayers; which cost them so much time that it is but reasonable to give them entertainments and gifts in return, all the more because they, as "devout intercessors," wish to let others have the benefit of their sanctity! We must thus understand something of intercession in these prayers, in order that the ἐν προφάσει, or εἰς πρόφασιν, *in* or *for a pretence*, may correspond to what goes before. Christ has in his mind perhaps such prophetic rebukes as Hosea iv. 8; Ezek. xxii. 25; more particularly Isa. x. 1, 2; Micah ii. 9. They hypocritically cozen poor credulous women so as to get their property and goods (somewhat in the same way as, Luke viii. 3, love to the Lord Jesus led the woman to do; or even worse): the wide maw of their avarice swallows whole *houses*, *i. e.*, all the property and possessions of the widows thus defrauded, whom they ought to have protected! Is it not as if Christ had intended to prophesy, at the same time, of the gifts to the clergy in the middle ages, of the profitable traffic in masses for souls (also for the dead husbands of widows) even at this day? But those who thus gather treasures have thereby heaped up for themselves another treasure, the condemnation meted out to them all, the more fully because of the shameful *pretence!*

Verse 15. As if these persons who are thus accumulating judgment were themselves altogether perfect patterns of holiness; nay more, as if they who thus robbed the people instead of leading them into the kingdom of heaven had already fulfilled their pastoral office in Israel, and had nothing more to do at home, they compass land and sea (a proverbial expression) to make proselytes; again an *opus supererogationis* proceeding from bare hypocrisy, as if an ardent zeal impelled them thus to draw people into the kingdom of heaven. "The Jews, before Christ, were not permitted to act as missionaries; their desire to make proselytes was contrary to the will of God; even Jonah durst not preach Mosaism, the Jewish religion of shadows, to the Ninevites, but only the wrath of God, in order to repentance" (Richter). The σεβόμενοι or φοβούμενοι τὸν θεον, יִרְאֵי יְהוָה, those who feared God, who, actuated by an inward impulse of truth joined themselves to the Jews, and who, in the New Testament and in other history, are represented as a most praiseworthy class of men, through whom the transition of the Gospel to the heathen was instrumentally effected, but who were hardly acknowledged by the Pharisees, regarded by them only with envy and contempt—these were not the complete "proselytes of righteousness *made* by the Pharisees whom Christ here means.. These latter were rare because a heathen would hardly be induced to take upon him the entire yoke of the Jewish law. Therefore: "If ye have made one such proselyte, ye think ye have made a conquest of which ye may ever after be proud; therefore all your concern has been just to effect this, ye give yourselves no further trouble. And when (as in a rare case) ye have succeeded in your object, when one has entirely surrendered himself to you as his patterns, what do ye *make* further of this proselyte whom you have gained? Twofold more a son of hell, *i. e.*, one deserving of, and doomed to condemnation than ye yourselves are!" A sharp word, but, startling as it may sound, nothing but the truth, as confirmed again by history in all times. Let it not be objected that surely the seduced were less guilty than the seducers that it is at least enough if both fall together into the same pit; what Christ here means reaches farther, and justly so. He who could yield himself up from heathenism, to such Pharisees, must have done so from the first with an evil conscience; and if he remained in this school, what must become of him! The Pharisees for their own knowledge and conscience had the true word of God still near to them; but the Judaism planted by them *at second hand* had of course no longer any thing of the true kernel, but, on the contrary, only the assumed mask, so that the poor heathen was better before as a simple heathen. They taught him systematically to act the hypocrite; therefore was he, "by being indoctrinated into hypocrisy," twofold a child of hell. Here also our Lord condemns, by anticipation, all that false proselyte-making of the pseudo-church which strives only after the outward increase of its body; all appliance of power

without persuasion (instead of the apostolic *πείθειν*, 2 Cor. v. 11); and all perplexing of the conscience, so as to catch people without being able or willing to convert them.* For, every change of religion, without a felt necessity and conviction of the heart, is only a hurt and a loss; as may be seen not alone in the Christians made by the missions of the Jesuits, or even in renegades. Thus do moral corruption, false doctrine, and corrupt practice, become worse and worse when delivered from hand to hand, and every where we find the disciples and adherents worse than their masters!

Verses 16—22. Now comes, in the true order, the *false doctrine*, which these blind guides implant in the people at home and in the proselytes over land and sea; so that they come not into the kingdom of heaven but into hell. If, on the one hand, the Pharisees are severe in binding and imposing the law, they know, on the other hand, when to loose and to *dispense* with it; this, however, results in a still worse caprice. Christ, as we know, prefers to speak, not in abstract generalities, but in concrete examples; therefore he gives here, first of all, two designative examples with their refutation (vers. 16, 17, and 18, 19), then a further refuting counter-affirmation with reference to the same two examples (vers. 20, 21)—wherewith, finally, in connection with the last instance of their *outward* manner of dealing with the law, viz., "Whoso sweareth by *heaven*," he points to him with whom alone we have to do in everything, the living *God*, to whom the Pharisees do not give what is due (vers. 21, 22). The Lord purposely selects examples such as those of which he had already spoken in the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. v. 34, and again afterward, chap. xv. 5; for he will here, chiefly pointing backwards, draw the final inference and pronounce the decisive sentence. He selects them, also, as affording a striking specimen of the way in which the holy name of God is hid beneath formulas and webs of lies, and as a most suitable preparation for the conclusion of the entire discourse. These guides in Israel are, alas! *mere* servants of the *temple* and *altar*, not of *God*, whom they forget in their regard for these; therefore that which alone they wanted to have is at last after much long-suffering *left* to them, viz., the temple—but as *their* house, without the indwelling of God, consequently desolate! (ver. 38). And what now is this their house? Nothing else than what they have made of it, an abode of murderers, which must fall to pieces upon their blood-guilty heads! *Ye blind guides!* This, too, had already been said before, chap. xv. 14, and Luke vi. 39; here it is further intensified into *fools* and blind, *i. e.*, wilfully not seeing. Every where do Pharisaism and Jesuitism express themselves especially in the wresting and misconstruing of the oath; and even now it is difficult to obtain from the Jews a binding oath; they have always in store many an *οὐδέν ἐστιν*, "it is nothing."* The gold of the temple is not the gold which adorned its walls, but the rich temple-treasure, which yet, according to their principle, must "ever be accounted poor," so that never enough could be made over to it—the Corban set apart for sacred uses; for, from motives of self-interest, these knaves gave the preference to the gold and the altar-gifts even in oaths. And how perverse! Is it not through the temple that the gold becomes the gold of *the temple*; is it not through the altar that the gift becomes an *offering*? The altar is most holy, Exod. xxix. 37.† Whosoever, therefore, swears by the *altar*, includes, of course, all that belongs to the destination of the altar, all that is upon it or that belongs to it; the altar is the *greater* in which the less is comprehended. And now ver. 21 is not merely parallel with the preceding, in which case Christ would have said "by the temple and—the gold that is in it and on it"—but he here advances further, and suddenly rises higher, disclosing the ground of the whole in the words, "And by *him that dwelleth therein*." This leads further still: the temple, which is itself sacred only through *God's* presence in it, is the dwelling place of this God only as a figure of heaven (1 Kings viii. 27, 30). Therefore here also, as in the Sermon on the Mount, oaths by heaven are the same as by *the throne of God*. Finally, for these fools and blind it must even yet be added, "And by him who sitteth on the throne;" so that they, as in Moses' seat they forget Moses himself, in the end would forget in the seat of God the living God himself, and make empty oaths by the mere "*seat* of God." He who sits there will certainly one day thrust down those who sit on *their* seat; and he who sits above at his right hand will one day make his enemies his footstool. By this simple word, *He that sitteth thereon*, every thing has been said to them. For the rest, we already know that Christ does not approve of oaths by the altar, temple, or heaven; he only brings them forward because they are in use, and, tracing them back, shows that they are all in reality oaths by God. Whoso *swears* by the temple means the temple as rendered sacred by God; swears, therefore, as by the temple, so in that very oath by him who dwells therein. So also by the *heaven*—for all oaths by created things are otherwise contradiction and unreason—he can mean only the heaven where God is; therefore, in reality, only the living God who hears his vain oath. What patience on the part of Christ, thus again in *this* discourse, to enter so fully into the refutation of their folly! He thus condescends in order to say and show before all the people,

* Comp. Nitzsch, *Prakt. Theologie*, i. 288.

* As at that time even in Rome the Jewish casuistry was well-known and notorious; *hence*, in Martial (xi. 94): Ecce negas, jurasque mihi *per templa* Tonantis; non credo: jura, verpe, per Anchialum.

† Yet we are not *there* to understand with many against the Sept.: *All* that touches the altar is thereby *sanctified*. This would correspond here indeed to the discourse of Christ, but compare Lev. ii. 3.

by the one differently applied example: *This* and *such like* are your ordinances, which cannot bear the test of reason, and which have already been sufficiently refuted by me! How great and how bad must have been the wilful neglect of what is of main importance in those miserably trifling pickings and choosings; the forgetting of God in the temple and the heaven; consequently, the transgressing of his commandment which requires the heart, in people who believe such doctrine!*

Verses 23, 24. The first four woes are past; the three others follow in rapid succession, ever heavier on the head, ever deeper into the heart. Now comes first, properly speaking, the *personal* conduct of these blind guides, *their own* inward character and true state before God, when the bottom of their heart is disclosed to them. It was (Lev. xxvii. 30) doubtful as to the interpretation, and as to practice disputable, whether tithe was to be paid of all garden-herbs, even the least. The Pharisees, in such things, did rather too much than too little; but the *weightier* part of the law—more difficult, indeed, even to touch than all outward obligation was to bear—they had consciously long since entirely given up or left behind! Thus the βαρύτερα does not certainly all at once mean only "what is more important, the main thing," but refers back to ver. 4; still, the expression of course passes over to this signification, for what is weighty and difficult is certainly what is important, and essential above other things. The form ἀφήκατε, "Ye have omitted," contrasts quite correctly with ἀποδεκατοῦτε, "ye pay tithe;" the one ye do ever diligently, the other ye have already let slip, put aside; as in many things ye have put aside the commandment of God, for the sake of your statutes (chapter xv.), so in those others, in which ye appear before the people as the scrupulous fulfillers of the Mosaic commandments, ye have neglected the inward, the *essential* part of the law properly so called. Whosoever has put this away from him, actually retains only time and inclination for zeal in tithes of cummin. The καί, *and*, that follows, *explains* their wonderfully faithful conscientiousness, and discloses the evil ground of it. Again, with unconscious irony, speaking to them as it were in their own language, Christ sets in opposition to the threefold tithes *three* things to be given to God; as, but for this antithesis, he would, according to chap. xxii. 40, have specified only the love of God and our neighbor. In Luke, chap. xi. 40, the saying *followed* that about cleansing the outside of the vessels which it here precedes; the connection, however, is in both places the same, for our Lord mentions here that to which these Pharisees attached greater importance than to inward cleansing before God. There *two* kinds of herbs were specially named (and then in addition πᾶν λάχανον); therefore also, in opposition to these, only a twofold inward character (and conduct proceeding from such character): judgment and the love of God; *i. e.*, in addition to the *righteousness* that judges true judgment (which always remains the first and foremost thing in the *law*), the love that *proceeds from God and is well-pleasing to God*, exactly in the sense of Matt. ix. 13, xii. 7. Here, connecting still more closely with that word, the idea in its trichotomy takes a different turn. It is *not*, however, judgment upon yourselves, mercy towards others, faith in God; for in this sense πίστις or *faith*, is no βαρύτερον τοῦ νόμου, "weightier matter *of the law*;" if this third is understood of the disposition of mind from which both proceed, then is the order of the antithesis broken. We apprehend the meaning of the words rather as follows. *First of all*, the κρίσις or "judgment" as that which at all events goes before, עֲשׂוֹת מִשְׁפָּט וּצְדָקָה, "doing judgment and righteousness" (since Gen. xviii. 19, occurring so often in the law and prophets), viz., the *righteousness* that discharges all the debt of the law; but in so far as it rests on a true judgment which is just, and that again upon a thorough self-judgment applied first of all within, Luke xii. 57.* *Then*, further, the mercy or love which God teaches, requires, and gives as the spirit of the law rather than strict justice. Finally, with these there is joined a third and perfect thing, the πίστις as אֱמוּנָה, "faith;" the reality and perfection of justice as of love, the *sincerity and truth* which stand opposed to the seeming faithfulness in trifling observance (Bengel. sinceritas, quae opponitur hypocrisi, nam qui, c. xxiv. 51, dicuntur hypocritae, Luke xii. 46, dicuntur ἄπιστοι—we compare in addition to this, πιστός, Mat. xxiv. 45). Thus the whole becomes parallel at the same time with that prophetical word, Micah vi. 8—the third not excepted with respect to its inner sense; for he who walks humbly before God is sincere and entire. The same contrast of outward trifles with what is truly essential, is again presented by Christ in connection with another of the minutiæ to which the Pharisees attached so much importance. It was the custom to strain wine, vinegar, and all sorts of drink, carefully through linen cloth; so that not the smallest unclean animalcule, not even a יְבַחוּשׁ (which, in the writings of the Rabbins, is the special name for a sort of insect in wine) might be drunk with it, and thus Lev. xi. 20, 23, 41, 42, be transgressed; as the Buddhists in Ceylon and Hindostan do with drinking water at this day. Now Christ himself for once makes a proverb out of this: "Who strain out the gnats, even the smallest single gnat, and yet, without seeing it,

* Zeller (*Beugg. Monatsbl.* 1843, 5) finds in the hypocritical casuistry of these lax directors of conscience a *fourfold hypocrisy*; approving of unspiritual abuses—releasing from obligations—inverting religious ideas and divine ordinances—making self-interest a rule of conduct.

* He who judges himself in his own conscience, and he alone, exercises justice and righteousness towards others (Von Meyer, *Blätter für höhere Wahrh.* vi. 145).

drink down, swallow *the camel!*" He puts in opposition another *unclean* animal, and that an enormous one (chap. xix. 24); so as, at the same time, to denote the monstrousness of their hypocrisy which tolerated this, as before their greedy avarice was denoted by the devouring of houses. The sense of the passage in itself, after the foregoing verse, needs no explanation; but that there might be no misunderstanding, as if he meant to say that faithfulness in *little things* is not necessary, our Lord put between these sayings the words, *These ought ye to have done and not to leave the other undone* (ἀφιέναι as ἀφῆκατε). Justice, love, and faithfulness—these are the principal things *done;* while the outward trifling observances are just on account of the *faithfulness* which certainly imparts value to them, the things *not to be omitted.** When the philologist begins with trifling minutiæ, and does not go beyond these, the reason certainly is that he has no sense for the spirit and meaning of the writer; this latter, however, being pre-supposed, he should then not neglect even a single iota. Thus Christ here means that the tithe of mint, anise, and cummin is also to be paid, *if* the conscience finds these in the letter and sense of the law: I am in that case not even to swallow the *gnats*, and think the trifle may thus be disposed of. But he will have conscientiousness in what is least, only to proceed from inward faithfulness upon the whole.

Verses 25—28 The Pharisees had already heard of the washing of vessels (Mark vii. 4); here it forms the transition from such things as still rest on the Mosaic commandments when pressed in the letter, to such as were self-chosen. Speaking generally, the advance which our Lord here makes from what goes before, is manifold: while, by a slight connection, he passes from the strained drink to the drinking and eating vessels, he now makes use of this figure only more exactly to denote what is *outward*, and what *inward* (according to Mark vii. 15, 18–23); he then proceeds to apply the figure of the vessels to represent the men themselves, points them to their *own consciousness* of inward uncleanness in their hypocrisy. "Ye knaves know well what is in your so cleanly-washed cups and platters, how you have gotten it; and how used it; for both these, the sinful *getting* and sinful *enjoyment*,† are plainly meant by the ἁρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας, "extortion and *excess*" (*this* and not ἀδικίας, "injustice," is the true reading).‡ If now, first of all, the *inside* of the cups and platters is to be cleansed (and that not hastily by giving a few alms therefrom, as is said mockingly, Luke xi. 41; but as it follows there in ver. 42), it thus appears that the inner side and contents of the vessel also belong to the outside, as regards the man himself and his heart; therefore quite naturally the vessel becomes a figure of the Pharisee, as was plainly said in Luke xi. 39 by τὸ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν, "your inward part," and is indicated here also on ver. 26. In every sense—even in the outward vessel, how much more in the doing and inner being of the man—it is true that he alone who has cleansed the inward part, has also made the outward truly and actually *clean;* while he who only cares for the outward, is far from having therefore done all for the inward (Luke xi. 40; Tit. i. 15). Therefore look now at *your* inward part—there is *death!* A new and profoundly terrible figure, derived from the worst form of Levitical uncleanness, now follows, viz.: whitewashed *sepulchres*—which, at the same time, already, as it were, prepares the way for what is further said, ver. 29. A human heart can be a temple of the living God, or a grave—a heaven, or a hell. The prophet, Ezek. xiii. 10, spoke of plastering the wall with slacked lime, which in Acts xxiii. 3 appears as a proverb, and Christ has here intensified the expression to the utmost degree; we know of no more horrible, and, at the same time, more appropriate figure whereby to express the lying contrast between the outside and the inside in those hypocrites; it is also the last woe, the seventh, whereby they are completely portrayed and condemned. The tombs were spread over with lime,* less for ornament (although this also comes in at ver. 29) than as a necessary mark of distinction, that *pollution* might be avoided (for the Jews extended to the sepulchre what was true only of the corpse); Christ, therefore, will here say, Whosoever rightly considers and rightly regards your whitewashed sanctity ought to beware of you, for he that touches you pollutes himself, touches death!† Your whitewash looks, indeed, quite seemly, ὡραῖοι, and gives no distinct portraiture of the dead bones within; yet the ὀστέα νεκρά, "dead men's bones," and *all the filth* of corruption are within. *Such are ye*—is again declared with abundant plainness in ver. 28: Your δίκαιοι, "righteous," is nothing else than an ἔξωθεν φαίνειν or "appearing outwardly." "Your religion is the whitewash," exclaims Wurster to the Pietists of the present day. Your morality, virtue, etc., is the whitewash—must we say to the hypocrites of all sorts.

Verses 29—33. The eighth woe plainly comprises all the seven in the κρίσις τῆς γεέννης,

* Such things must also be done on account of the commandment—says Sirach, chap xxxv. 7 (in Meyer, ver. 4, comp. the original text).

† Which twofold idea Lange even finds to be indicated in the *cups* and *platters*.

‡ Not however with Grotius πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας, which follows at the end. ver, 27.

* A practice which was even repeated yearly on the fifteenth of Adar.

† The figure in Luke xi. 44 was *otherwise* applied, although with the same fundamental idea; for the Pharisaic whitewash is indeed not seen by the people to be only the superscription, Here is a sepulchre! *Μνημεῖα ἄδηλα*—as the Talmud speaks of קֶבֶר הַנִּכְּרָא, *i. e.*, sepulchres only found out to be such afterwards (*Babyl.* "*Sanh.*" fol. 47, 2. *Hieros* "*Nedarim.*" 57, 4). A sepulchre marked out with painted bones is called קֶבֶר מְצַיֵּר as distinguished from קֶבֶר תָּהוֹם.

"damnation of hell," connecting itself with the beginning, ver. 13; and, includes the wicked seed with their wicked fathers in one collective sin, guilt and punishment. *The hypocrites* (this continues to be their title now for the seventh time) protest, indeed, against this in word and deed; but before God their protestation is held for what it is worth, and is rather turned against them as their own confession. They repaired, adorned, even built anew the sepulchres of the prophets and pious men of old; just like our own time with its rage for monuments and jubilees. When the people are so busily occupied with such work, it is an evil sign for the present. Men are fond of praising the dead witnesses for truth, whom, if alive, they would thrust from them; they are glad, so to speak, that they have only to build sepulchres and monuments for them. Thus does Christ view their conduct here, because he sees through the hypocrisy: Ye yourselves, even when ye protest against "your *fathers*," confess against your will that ye are the children of those who murdered the prophets. In Luke xi. 47, 48 the idea comes still more sharply out; not in the form of the protesting word, but of the confessing deed: Yea, the fathers were the murderers of the dead, and ye willingly come after to build the sepulchres of the dead; yet how glad ye are in your hearts that the prophets—the rejected enemies of all hypocrisy and trifling with the law, the messengers of God, witnesses for the truth and preachers of repentance—give you no more trouble! *Sit licet divus, dummodo non vivus* (let him be a god, if you please, so long as he is not alive). Their writings ye read not as they ought to be read; their example you follow not, but set up fine sepulchres for them. Those were true men of God, against whom our fathers sinned—so you say—but the present are false ones whom we now justly persecute and stone. "Ask in Moses' times, Who are the good people? they will be Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; but not Moses—he should be stoned. Ask in Samuel's times, Who are the good people? they will be Moses and Joshua; but not Samuel. Ask in the times of Christ, and they will be all the former prophets with Samuel; but not Christ and his apostles" (*Berlenb. Bibel*). Instead of the penitent confession so frequently put into the mouths of the people by the prophets, We have sinned we and our fathers! the last and worst generation now protests in vain against its fellowship with the guilt of the fathers, which it rather carries out to its worst extreme, completes, and thus *fills up the measure* (Acts vii. 52). Be it so, do *this*; *i. e.*, ye shall do it, through God's permitting long-suffering, which afterwards has an end, and is turned into wrath. Thus does Christ speak to them as to Judas (John xiii. 27). A profound significance for the unity of the entire Scripture and the recorded dealings between God and men lies in this, that Israel's end is here denoted by the same which in the beginning was said of the *Amorites*, who were driven out before them; viz., by the filling up of the measure of their sins, Gen. xv. 16. "The mills of the gods grind late, but they grind clean:" this the heathen also knew, because history teaches it; so should we also, without false refinement, recognize in God's doings both of these things, the long-suffering which waits, and the wrath which at length breaks out. The divine principle, according to which generations and nations are included in the reckoning of a collective guilt, and at length the collective punishment is made to fall upon the last, runs through all history; we shall not now deviate too far from the exposition by entering into the depths of this principle. The key lies already in the hypocritical words, ver. 30, which becomes true only when inverted, viz.: If they had been in the times of their fathers they would also have shed all that blood. "He whose inward wickedness has risen to a high pitch, is regarded as if he too had done all that others have done from like wickedness" (Roos). "A murderer comes into fellowship with all murderers, a licentious person into fellowship with all the licentious and adulterers. They all stand as branches upon one root, they all work to one end, they all approve of one another's works" (Rieger). The fellowship of sin and punishment before God's judgment actually extends thus far, even to the descending connection of growing corruption; as is seen in a people when the children, not warned by the guilt of their fathers, continue it and carry it to its consummation. Therefore, afterwards, even all the blood shed *upon the earth* (Luke, "since the foundation of the world"), from the murder of Abel downwards, is reckoned to the last evil generation of the Jews. Upon this a book might be written: we deem it sufficient now only to point out that Christ thus affirms, in all its severity, this reckoning of God's judgment; but that he yet lays the principal emphasis, in order to conviction, upon the long-suffering which waited patiently and exhausted every call of grace before the filling up of the measure of sin. What he says in ver. 33 is almost word for word the first discourse of the Baptist (chap. iii. 7); for to this it returns, because every intervening call and invitation to repentance for the kingdom of heaven had proved *in vain*. Now, indeed, the πῶς φύγητε, "how can ye escape" (as Alford has well reminded me), instead of the still warning τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν, "who hath warned you," sounds stronger and more decisive. A further confirmation of the as yet more figurative γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, "generation of vipers," which the Baptist uttered, is here added by Christ in the quite unfigurative ὄφεις, "serpents;" and the whole together means not merely *sinners born of sinners* (with reference to ver 31) but speaks plainly, in the sense of John viii. 44, of him who at Rev. xii. 9 is called ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, "that old serpent." Thus does it correspond to the γέεννα, "hell," whose κρίσις ς.: "damnation" the περισσότατον,

"greater," in addition to the περισσότερον ver. 14 expresses; and designates as at ver. 15, the ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ὄντας, "who are of their father the devil," as complete υἱοὺς γεέννας or "children of hell."

Verse 34. What is here meant by the διὰ τοῦτο, "*wherefore*"? It is only trifling with the simple word to supply as follows, "in order that if possible ye may yet flee from the damnation of hell"—for the impossibility of this has just been affirmed (in the πῶς φύγητε); the filling up of the measure of sin has just been imputed to them, has been already predicated of them as certain; and the τοῦτο can alone refer to *this* import of the two last propositions. Therefore it must mean, *in order that* ye may kill them, *in order that* thereby all blood may come upon you, *therefore* are they sent. Yet not directly thus; for the decisive ὅπως, *in order that*, ver. 35, is rather connected with *their* killing and crucifying, and not precisely with the sending on the part of Christ. The true force of the expression is, that the wisdom and long-suffering of the Lord who foresaw the judgment, *therefore* offers yet an opportunity of contracting the last guilt; in order that, on the one hand, the measure of grace may be filled up even to the last overflow, and, on the other, that, by the actually perpetrated sin, it might indisputably appear to all the world that the condemned were deserving of their punishment.* This again is a principle of his justice belonging to the unsearchable ways of God (Rom. xi. 33), that he who might already judge every one according to all that he had done or would do, yet lets the sin exhaust and complete itself, before the judgment, in actual deeds. The ἰδού, "behold!" already plainly shows, even before we read the futures which follow, that it is no longer the former prophets that are spoken of, but a new sending that is soon to begin. Observe the majestic *I* with which he who is still in humiliation, who is himself to be first crucified by them, yet looking beyond this, puts himself in the place of the God who sends the prophets! (Isa. xli. 27). Here there is seen one of the significant differences between this last discourse and the earlier one (Luke xi.), where Christ as yet veils his *I* under the "wisdom of God." Now, however, he *takes for granted* what the parable of the vineyard had said of the killing of the Son, who, although rejected, is yet exalted to be the corner-stone; what the following parable of the marriage says of the new sending of him who is yet to ascend the throne; and what finally chap. xxii. 24 says of sitting at the right hand of God—therefore is the crucifying of the Lord himself entirely passed over, and at once comprehended in the emphatic ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω, "*I* send."† The offence against those who are sent proceeds, first of all, by an anti-climax, from killing (and even crucifying), to scourging (already signified to the disciples at chap. x. 17), and thence down to persecuting; in like manner the designation of the persons sent is according to three grades, here more concretely carried out than the *prophets and apostles* in Luke. The special apostolic dignity has its significance only for the new Church; yet all who testify of Christ and preach him are his *messengers*, which could alone be meant also in Luke.* On the other hand, there is here another difference from that earlier discourse in Luke. The prophetic authority stands first in analogy with those old prophets; then follow those who are not indeed equipped in the same way, but yet are furnished with a specially convincing *wisdom* of the Spirit; finally, the true "scribes" as opposed to the false ones (chap. xiii. 52), who, condescending more than the others to the manner of men and of the Jews, show to them out of their Scripture that Jesus is the Christ. Stephen was a *wise* man, Apollos a *scribe*, the apostles *prophets;* while Paul at least was certainly all of them together. The seeming anti-climax is now, however, changed into its opposite, when we understand the matter thus: the *killing* and *crucifying of the prophets* was as it were a thing to which they were accustomed from of old, was only a continuation of their past doings; but, that *in their Synagogues* (mark this particular) they should answer the undeniably God-given wisdom also of the *wise* men with *scourging;* that they should at least persecute from city to city even the *scribes*, in order thoroughly to suppress their quiet testimony—in this the guilt of their resistance to the truth rises to a higher pitch. They leave unpersecuted not even the least one, who without preaching with prophetical urgency merely dares, by way of testimony, to interpret the Scripture against them.

Verses 35, 36. Upon *you:* this comprehends, first of all, the wicked guides and heads of the people—who also in the foregoing verse appeared as the originators of all persecution—with *this* entire *generation*, and that for the past and the future; for it is now said, Zacharias whom *ye slew!* (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 15). The expression αἷμα δίκαιον or ἀθῷον, *righteous* or *innocent blood* (chap. xxii. 4), is one of very frequent occurrence in the Old Testament, which comes out with increasing strength, especially before the Babylonian captivity, in reference to the guilt which drew down that judgment; see 2 Kings xxi. 16, xxiv. 4; Jer. xxvi. 15. The principal passage, however,

---

* Roos: "It depended upon a test. Christ had also prophets and wise men and scribes to send out. Now just as they did to these, so also would they have done to all the prophets."

† For "that the Saviour here includes himself in the number of those sent by God" is impossible. nor does he send himself; we shall soon understand more particularly why he throws a veil over *his* blood. The fact that messengers of Jesus were *crucified* also before the destruction of Jerusalem, we learn here, as history does not record every thing.

* Quite the same general usage, as we find also in John xiii. 16.

which Christ has probably in mind, and which the Spirit caused to be written in connection with that first judgment as a typical prophecy of the second, is to be found in Lam. iv. 12, 13. *Three times* in one verse does the Lord mention *blood;* and now, from that point of view in which God regards the whole human race, lays to the account of this Jerusalem and Israel all the righteous blood *shed upon the earth*, just as his Spirit again does to the future Babylon, Rev. xviii. 24. The first righteous person* upon earth murdered through hatred of God and fraternal hatred was *Abel;* of his murder also is Israel guilty, for they have done worse to Christ than Cain did to his brother. *Zacharias*, however, is *certainly not* that righteous *Zacharias*, the son of Baruch, of whose murder in the temple shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem Josephus gives an account, *Antiq.* iv. 19—as for example, Hug formerly maintained, while even Richter still admits "a concealed prophecy" pointing to him—but probably that Zacharias of whom we read in 2 Chron. xxiv. 20-22. The distinct expression ἐφονεύσατε, "ye *slew*," cannot be an anticipating prophecy; for, Christ now uses, in opposition to the expressly marked *future* in ver. 34, quite as expressly the *past* in ver. 35, in order then at ver. 36 to comprise both in the ταῦτα πάντα, *all these things*. A prophecy pointing to an individual by name (not to say that Baruch is not Barachias) seems forced, and highly unsuitable to Christ's present frame of mind; one can see no satisfactory ground for it at all. True, indeed, it cannot be objected to that opinion, that the Zacharias mentioned by Josephus was no messenger of Christ, for only *righteous* persons are spoken of by Matthew; —still, in Luke, it is certainly the blood of all the prophets. Finally, it is quite decisive to observe that Christ here, according to the *Scripture* (to which he makes such manifold allusions throughout the discourse), intended to bring together the *first* and *last* example which the Scripture records. It is useless to ask whether the Jews did not shed righteous blood, or the blood of prophets, afterwards; the circle of canonical history comprehends typically all that was done in Israel and upon the earth. It is worthy of remark that the designation *between the temple and the altar of burnt-offering* (not without reference to vers. 17–19 before†) agrees with the express words of 2 Chron. xxiv. 21; and it is further significant that precisely this Zacharias said when dying, The Lord will see it and *seek* it! (comp. in Luke, ἵνα ἐκζητηθῇ). There is even a Jewish legend which says that his blood bubbled up and flowed, and would not be stayed for 252 years, even till the burning of the temple in the city of the murder, until Nebuzaradan had slaughtered there 940,000 priests, prophets, and chiefs of the people with their children: from which we may infer that this deed of murder in the holy city was regarded by the Jews themselves from ancient times as a proverbially fearful example. Such connection of a name well-known to the Pharisees and Scribes with the universally known name of Abel, is certainly much more natural than any special prophecy.* So much remains certain, that our Lord will here say what he at last seals with Amen: The great collective guilt of all the blood shed on the earth, as it is represented and shadowed forth in the history of the Holy Scripture from Abel to Zacharias, will break forth in vengeance *upon this generation* in a collective punishment, as well typical as real—this evil and adulterous generation which speaks as in ver. 30, and acts as in ver. 34! which thus fills to overflowing the measure of sin against the long-suffering of God! That is, indeed, first of all the *last generation* of this people, the wicked and adulterous generation possessed by the return of seven worse devils along with the first, which, in its sins, repeats and sums up all that went before; yet, in so far as the fathers are represented as only meeting their full punishment in their children, the γενεὰν ταύτην, *this generation*, here includes at the same time the entire people, of whom it is said (ver. 35): *Ye* have slain. It is a groundless assertion that γενεά, in the New Testament, can never signify "people;" see in chap. xii. 45 the same connection of this generation with their fathers, and then afterwards the remarkable passage (chap. xxiv. 34), according to our interpretation.

It may be asked, finally, Does not the *blood* also of the crucified Son of God in, and with, all the others, come upon this generation? If this question means, Wherefore does Christ not expressly or chiefly *specify* this here? the first answer is easy; for, even as regards outward propriety, it would be highly unsuitable openly to say such a thing at this farewell. For, this would be more than the word of Zacharias, The Lord will see and seek it! But the reason lies still deeper: partly, in the Saviour's feeling of love and compassion, which makes it impossible for him to express this threatening of vengeance; partly, in the truth corresponding to this feeling, that in fact the blood of *Christ*, although his crucifiers call it down upon their heads, yet even to the last

* See the interpretation of Heb. xii. 24 in my *Brief an die Hebräer.*

† In the most holy place of the fore-court, which also Josephus denotes: μέχρι τοῦ βωμοῦ καὶ τοῦ νεῶ.

* With regard, finally, to the entirely subordinate point respecting the name Barachias instead of Jehoiada (for the apocryphal Gospel of the Nazarenes with its Jehoiada is of as little value here as the apocryphal fable concerning the father of the Baptist)—it is said that both names have the same meaning, as names are frequently thus varied; or it is found to be a later corruption of the evangelical text (only not on account of Josephus, for then it would be Baruch); or even an original error of memory, confounding this person with Zech. i. 1. To us the word of Christ is too solemn to admit of such disputes. For the rest, Theile's treatise in Winer's *Journal*, vol. ii., speaks very fully of the whole matter.

judgment of the world continues to speak better things than the blood of Abel, viz., grace and not vengeance. So that, in the restored Israel at last, this blood-guiltiness is yet cleansed away (Joel iii. 26); and the vengeance on account of the rejected blood of *reconciliation* extends to quite another sphere, belongs to quite another judgment, than that which is first of all historically represented in Israel.

Verse 37. Did Christ himself say, Behold here a greater than Jonas—then may also his interpreter say to the generation of this time, Behold here is something incomparably greater than, and different from aught that has ever been uttered in accents breaking from the heart, and penetrating to the heart, in all human poems and histories. *Jerusalem! Jerusalem!* Thus cries the Messiah, the God and Lord, and Saviour of Israel in the flesh, who sent all the prophets, who is himself come, and will again send apostles, who will soon, by the hands of his enemies, hang upon the cross, by his own and the Father's divine power will rise from the opened grave, and sit upon the throne of heaven—thus cries Jesus over the sinners who will not have him and his grace, but cleave to their sin and their judgment. What a *tone* and *sound* for the hearers must this word have had when it came from the mouth of Christ: the measure already filled up of all divine grace and Saviour-love, in opposition to the measure of sin, now soon to be filled up by the children who, centuries long, had been nourished and brought up in vain—that first call of the Creator, "Adam, where art thou, whither wilt thou?" breaking forth inconceivably intensified from the heart of the Son of Man moved with human emotion—the most perfect unity of alluring love and judging wrath in this double lament, *Jerusalem! Jerusalem!* Hear, ye heavens, and give ear, O earth! for—*the Lord speaketh!* And are we to take away these words from *this* place, in his farewell, which alone is their proper place; are we to believe that the Evangelist has presumed to elaborate and improve the divine drama? Rather would we believe that Christ had already uttered three times—ten times before (which would not be so wrong) this word which he now utters for the last time with most striking emphasis.*

The whole word is a prolepsis, of the decisive judgment, stretching beyond the preaching of the apostles, the rejection of which Christ already knew beforehand: the Jerusalem which he means is the entire people, including past times, viewed in its centre. Vers. 34 and 35 are now connected in one, as also already ver. 36; therefore the ἀπεσταλμένοι, or persons *sent* as opposed to the former prophets, are the new messengers who should yet invite the guests to the marriage in vain, and the first of whom was at once *stoned* (Acts vii.) as Moses commanded that the *false* prophets should be stoned.* Between prophets and apostles then comes the exalted *I* of the incarnate Lord, who is, at the same time *above* prophets and apostles; for, this Lord it is who has always sent, and now sends, and who himself also came and called in all his messengers. The *I* of Christ embraces at the same time all the past, even as ver. 34 the future. "He never forgets his part"—to speak foolishly for the sake of the fools; he can never, at any time, deny who he is, and even when he appears most human, the consciousness of his eternal divine dignity shines through with all the more immediate reality. *Thy children*—that is, at the same time, all the people of this sacrod metropolis scattered in the country or over the earth. It would be a very false narrowing of the discourse as a whole, to explain the words *How often!* of Christ's frequent visits to the metropolis at the festival; it speaks in a higher and more comprehensive style. *How often!* includes at the same time all the calls of the former prophets, with all the invitations of those afterwards sent, and known beforehand to be in vain; although it places the calls and invitations of Christ himself in the centre. Our Lord would ever from time to time have *gathered* them all as his people into his kingdom, to his heart. But not by force; in this way no one is drawn into God's kingdom, to God's heart; even Isreal's Messiah is only a Saviour who at last passively offers himself, who must leave it to the will of men to come or not, and must go away when they will not and do not come. As an *eagle* stirreth up her nest,† fluttereth over her young, and then beareth them herself on her wings—so did Jehovah at first, Deut. xxxii. 11, and afterwards ever more kindly and lovingly offer his sheltering wing to his people, in the word of the prophets (Psa. xvii. 8, xxxvi. 8, lvii. 2, lxi. 5; Isa. xxxi. 5, 6; Mal. iv. 2)—until, with most familiar tenderness, Jesus, here speaking in the person of Jehovah (which is to be observed, see especially Isa. xxxi. 5), would spread his wings over them as a *hen* over her chickens, ere the birds of prey, as other eagles of judgment, come.‡ The wings are still spread even for the murderers of the prophets, while Christ now speaks; even for those that stoned Stephen, as

* Dorner says, moreover, correctly: Haec verba a Christo dicta esse non eo loco, quo Lucas vult, sed quo Matthæus, verba ipsa indicant; tunc enim dicta sunt, cum ultima voce Christus discederet e templo numquam eo rediturus.

* In the construction πρὸς αὐτήν, "unto *her*," which is also according to grammatical usage, there is expressed here, at the same time, a bitterly complaining, unconscious *turning away* of the countenance from the murderess of the prophets; after which it turns to her again.

† קַנּוֹ, νοσσιὰν αὐτοῦ, comp. Luke xiii. 34, as also both together, τὰ νοσσία and ἡ νοσσιά, Psa. lxxxiv. 4.

‡ Lange expresses the sense of my remark when he calls it the antithesis of *actively training* and *passively saving* love; only he does not definitely enough bring out the thought that the eagle also *bears* its young and *keeps* them from falling. It is rather a climax than an antithesis.

was shown in the case of Paul, he will still spread them out. But what he himself has experienced will be the result, upon the whole; that, namely, which he expresses in the words, *Ye would not!* (Isa. xxviii. 12, xxx. 15, and many places in the prophets). The grace that still remains will indeed gather others in their place who *will;* but they who *would not* what Christ would, fall into the condemnation. "The power of the Almighty appears as impotence before the obstinacy of the creature; and has only tears (Luke xix. 41) wherewith to overcome them." Whose *heart* dares here to answer with the dogmatics of the *head:* "Thy willing and drawing was not in earnest; thy lamentation but a mockery and a sport: for thine irresistible grace was not there to give them the power to will?"

Verses 38, 39. The second *Behold!* in addition to the first, ver. 34—the text of the prophecy that soon follows for the disciples (chap. xxiv.). The *house* is, in the first place, the temple (Luke xi. 51, *οἶκον*); but, together with it, the entire holy city as *one* habitation, the whole country of which this is the metropolis; people and state, with all their possession and property, in the same wide sense as Acts i. 20; for, it is through the temple that all subsist. Now it is no longer the temple, no longer *God's* house; but, *your* house left to *you*, as ye would have it. As yet in Matt. xxi. 13 it is *my* house—now, however, it is no longer so. *Ἔρημος*, "desolate," often elsewhere, and first of all, signifies *empty*, deprived of its proper contents (which then stand beside it in the Gen.); here, therefore, in the first place, *templum sine numine* (a temple without a divinity). From this follows, indeed, the *desolation* and dispersion; because, when God departs, only the punishment of sin remains—as was already said to Solomon, 1 Kings ix. 7–9; see further Jer. xxii. 5, and especially Jer. vii. 6, 11, 13, 14, which prophecy now for the first time finds its second and complete fulfillment. Of course, the *seat* of Moses is thus thrown down; and the Rabbins of Babylon or Jerusalem are acknowledged no longer. *Ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται*, "Behold *is left*"—that begins at this moment: for, *I*, the Lord of the temple, now go out and away from you! (chap. xxiv. 1). Although they saw Christ afterwards until his crucifixion, it was no longer in the temple, but merely as a suffering sacrifice. They will be compelled to *see* and to acknowledge him in his judging power (chap. xxvi. 64); but otherwise no longer, the risen Saviour did not show himself to all the people. *Ye:* that is, again, the entire generation of those who obstinately reject him, including also their posterity, as ver. 35 their forefathers; but not including all who do not persist in this rejection. Finally, however, there is here also a comforting "*until*" annexed to the long judgment upon the children and the children's children; as, in chap. xxii. 44, there was a threatening *until*, in connection with the priestly sitting of the King. That he will forsake them, is therefore *not* the *last* word of Christ in this farewell! To understand what he says only of a compelled acknowledgment of the coming Judge is rendered impossible by the *εὐλογημένος*, "*blessed*," and the entire 118th Psalm; it can only mean—Until ye (the late posterity of this generation) one day acknowledge him who is now rejected, joyfully welcome him as Messiah, and cry Hosannah in truth, not like the empty Hosannah a day or two before. Because it was empty and vain, Christ cannot express himself thus, Until ye *again* say. He takes leave of them not merely "with the feeling that he can return to the temple only as Messiah or never" (according to Hase); but with the clear-discerning prophecy that, one day, the people of God will honor him. The still future restoration of Israel according to the flesh is announced throughout all the Old Testament, from Deut. iv. 30 on to Zechariah (for Malachi points back to the punishment upon the sinful people); he who has not read this is not yet able rightly to read the prophets (2 Chron. xv. 3, 4; Hos. iii. 4, 5; Zech. xii. 10, xiv. 8–11). But of a "*final* victory of the Saviour over *all* his adversaries, whom he so punishes as to *gain them to himself*"—of this we find nothing in the whole Scripture, neither in Psa. cx., nor in the final close of Christ's discourse (Matt. xxv.), nor at the end of the Scriptures, Rev. xxii. 15, 19, 21 (not *μετὰ πάντων*, "with *all*," but *πάντων τῶν ἁγίων*, "all the saints"). Nor is the restoration of Israel by any means a typical pledge of this; as if there may not remain for many only the sentence, Ye would not!—all the less, since Scripture announces that restoration as contemporaneous with the judgment upon Gentile Christendom.

CHRIST'S PROPHECY OF HIS COMING.

(MATT. XXIV. AND XXV.)

This prophecy appears here, indeed, as an *answer* to a question of the disciples; but this question was itself called forth by the declaration of Christ—that of this beautiful and solid edifice not one stone should remain upon another. True it is, again, that the disciples drew from Christ this emphatic confirmation of what was said in chap. xxiii. 38, by a question addressed to him (see especially Mark xiii 1); yet all the Lord's words were no other than a natural continuation of the preceding sayings, which denounced judgment upon Israel, Jerusalem, the temple; nay, it was certainly provided for beforehand, that Christ should leave for *his disciples*, *i. e.*, his Church in all future time, a complete prophecy of the *end*. As John was directed to record, in harmony with his esoteric design, the last gracious promises of his *coming again to comfort* in the resurrection and by the Holy Spirit; so, on the other hand, the three other Evangelists must needs preserve the prophecy of Christ concerning his *coming again to judge*. And this has been done most fully by the apostle Matthew, who alone, in chap. xxv., carries it to the last end.

He alone also also gives us at once. in chap. xxiv. 3, the question of the disciples in its most exact form; thus enabling us to understand in its continuous unity the entire answer of Christ, as it runs on through two chapters. What in Mark xiii. 4, and Luke xxi. 7, is mixed indistinguishably in a general *ταῦτα*, "these things," and *πάντα ταῦτα*, "all these things," is in Matthew's account separated into *three parts*. The disciples ask: When shall this happen, that is, first of all, the *destruction of the temple* with that judgment upon Israel, of which thou hast assured us? Further: What shall be the sign of *thy coming*? And finally, What the sign of the *end of the world*? We must transpose ourselves into their ideas and conceptions, in order to see how much they did or did not understand of this their own question. They knew, in the first place, with a certain measure of distinctness (although not clearly and surely), that the present lowly estate of him who was come, who had so often spoken of his impending sufferings and death, was afterwards to be followed by another *coming of the Son of Man*, a manifestation and revelation in the *coming in of the kingdom*, the then alone completed *παρουσία τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, "coming of Christ;" of this he had spoken more than once, and very expressly in Matt. xvi. 28.* They knew, further, from what they had just heard (for they would scarcely of themselves have thought of Dan. ix. 26, 27, and therefore Christ afterwards reminds them of it), that an affliction and destruction, a *judgment upon Jerusalem* and Israel, was to break forth as the most immediate consequence of the rejection of Christ. When, accordingly, they put these two things together, it would remain uncertain to them how they stood related to each other; whether the destruction of Jerusalem would at the same time introduce the entire revelation and establishment of the kingdom—or (which was more in accordance with their Jewish conceptions), whether the *judgment upon the whole world*, with which they were familiar, from the Old Testament, and which was in like manner announced by Jesus, would be coincident with that catastrophe. For this was the third thing which they knew of as future, as *to be*, to be *accomplished*. Christ indeed had, on one occasion, Matt. xvi. 27, 28, almost connected the general judgment with the coming of the kingdom; then again, at chap. xix. 28, he had spoken of a *παλιγγενεσία*, "regeneration," in which there would still be an Israel over which to rule in glory; in like manner, again, chap. x. 15, xi. 22, xii. 36, 41, 42, he referred to a "day of judgment," in such a manner that the judgment of the present Israel and of the whole world seemed to run into each other; finally, he had spoken, John v. 29, vi. 39, of the last general judgment as on a *last* day, with a general resurrection of the dead, and consequently as at the *end of the world* properly speaking, or of the present state of things, according to his own words, Matt. xiii. 39, 49. In vain would they endeavor to arrange all these old and new representations upon any definite theory of the *When* and *How*. As the Jewish people, in the time of Christ, knew or understood nothing of a twofold coming of the Messiah in lowliness and in glory, so the disclosures made by Jesus respecting his sufferings, and respecting the destruction of Jerusalem, had completely shattered their whole theory concerning the coming of the Messiah, and the end of the world.* Chiefly was "Jesus' announcement of sufferings an element, which threw into confusion all their eschatological conceptions, and, as it were, deranged

* True, there are those who will not admit this; with them, however, our believing interpretation, which interprets the *Scripture* from its own resources, has nothing further to do. Thus we find it taken for granted, strangely enough, that the disciples, as Jews, could think only of the destruction of Jerusalem; that the compiler (the so-called Matthew), afterwards interpolated the question concerning the *παρουσία*, etc. See a (successful!) prize essay by a young beginner of this class (candidate), Rud. Hofmann. *Die Wiederkunft Christi und das Zeichen des Menschensohnes am Himmel.*

* As Lange (iii. 215) aptly says.

the plan which they had sketched out."* Now, moreover, came the announcement of the judgment soon to fall upon Jerusalem, in addition to, and between these. How does *this* stand related to the looked-for advent of Christ, or the *manifestation of his kingdom;* and further, in what relation do these two stand to the *end of the world*? If at first they had thought thus: When Jerusalem falls, then will Christ come to build his kingdom, and to manifest himself in his power—they would yet further be doubtful whether the end of the world would coincide with *this* advent; whether, in general, only one, or two, or three different catastrophes lay in the future? This is the sense of the question, only thus to be understood, which must have been preparing itself in the minds of the disciples for a considerable time before, and which now, when a fit occasion called it into utterance, found this natural expression. We have but little to say as to the ideas which the disciples entertained respecting the connection and course of the threefold coming about which they seem to ask; suffice it that they could have no definite ideas at all respecting the course of the three events which they therefore blend into one question. They perceive that this is their last time and opportunity for putting the question, which had long been pressing upon them: Help us out of our difficulty by a decisive declaration respecting the *when* of all these things that are to come to pass.

How now does Christ answer? Because in reality the judgment upon Jerusalem and the last coming of Christ are "events that correspond to each other, of which the last is typified in the first" (as even Neander admits), Christ, therefore, separates what will be separated in the fulfillment, but at the same time, as *prophesying*, he views them together, just as the former prophets viewed even the first and second coming of Christ so together, that only in the light of the fulfillment can they be distinctly separated in the interpretation. For he who here speaks is himself the last prophet, and therefore continues the style of the prophetical words, and within the prophetical conditions of vision. It is only a misunderstanding, when many (as recently Dorner, Lange, and others) very strongly protest against all obscure mixture of future things in the prophesying of *Christ*, because he, standing high above the prophets, spoke with a clear and calm view of the events, and of the manner in which they should take place. Now, we do not hold that there is any obscurity in this prophecy of Christ; any more than there was in the old prophetical word, which was likewise perfect in its kind, according to the meaning of the *Holy Spirit*. But with all this, we do not see why Christ, notwithstanding the undisputed higher position that belonged to him, should yet as *man* have *prophesied* essentially otherwise than by a contracting perspective view, such as is essential to *every* prophecy—which does not as yet present history in detail. If any one will call this (with Wilh. Hofmann, *Missionsfragen*, 1, p. 40, comp. p. 104, 105) the "lower intuition which belonged to him in his state of human abasement," we have nothing to say against it; but we cannot go so far (with the same writer) as to maintain that Christ throughout views the destruction of Jerusalem and his own coming as not at all separate; for he knows and declares the distinction between them. Moreover, we decidedly deny, that he in any way conceived of all this as about to happen within the time of the generation then living. But we are almost anticipating, when all that we would say here is only by way of introduction.

So much is in our view certain, namely, that Christ in this discourse *typically connects* events together (as is mentioned also by Hofmann in his *Weissagung und Erfullung* and by Delitzsch, who in other respects differs from him); yet he himself teaches us to see this. He lays it down that the destruction of Jerusalem is already *a* coming of Christ to judgment and setting up of his kingdom, but he immediately shows *behind this* yet *another* coming, nay, last of all with striking *distinction*, a final coming at the end of the world properly speaking. These *three* things, all which were rightly specified in the questions, he, in the corresponding answer, not less *perspectively* joins together (according to the manner of all prophecy hitherto) than distinguishes from each other, and shows them in the order of their succession. Only Matthew has been guided by the Spirit to understand and communicate the entire answer, carried out to its conclusion, while Mark and Luke break off at an earlier point.* Chaps. xxiv. and xxv. at all events remain one whole, although Christ (probably) may not have spoken all in connection, as it is here written, without pauses here and there. We give, on a first survey, our view and arrangement founded upon what has been hitherto said, which we will afterwards explain and confirm in detail.

Let it be observed, however, beforehand, that by this threefold division we do not intend a strictly defining and adjusting chronology of the future (as Lange, iii. 2, 1291, has misunderstood us); but only a progression in the stages here placed in juxtaposition, in which at the same time, the whole is always reflected in each. It is certainly *una res* of which Christ speaks—this is our answer at present to the beginning of Dorner's treatise (*Deorat. Chr. eschatol.*); yet it is twofold, inasmuch as Christ combines in one glance *two* separate future fulfillments. Thus in part was this prophecy read even by the Fathers; thus has it always been

* As Ebrard, in like manner, can say of the *question;* although afterwards he knows not how to arrange the *answer*.

* It is not to be supposed here that (as Neander thinks) the "erroneous mixture"—which does not at all exist—as being unworthy of Christ, is owing to the false understanding and reporting of the hearers.

understood by the more deep-searching commentators, by all who have been profoundly versed in Scripture. The first principle of all prophetical interpretation, from 2 Sam. vii. downwards, requires it. That Christ did not speak here "promiscuously, now of Jerusalem and the destinies of the Jewish people, and now of the end of the world," but of both these in and with each other, first the one, then the other coming more into prominence—*this* is not a mere "opinion of some," but the true *consensus* of all living tradition in the Church of the faithful, which it were very salutary for the doctors of the theological school, to know and consider. By this, too, no "error opticus" is maintained, for it is in accordance with the nature of all prophecy, which can only *indicate* more or less clearly the distinction of times, the difference between type and antitype, and which in general always comprises in one view what is manifold. With all this, it is true that the *intervalla seu incisurae* come more strongly into prominence in *Christ's* prophecy than in any other; but not as definitive epochs, for he, too, does not foretell events historically, and gives no "decursum Christianæ religionis historicum." We wish in accordance with this to be rightly *understood*.

In the first place Christ speaks of the *destruction of Jerusalem; i. e.*, of course in order to denote the *when*, and first of all, of the intermediate period which precedes and prepares for it, chap. xxiv. 1–28. *This* must be the first thing, and is so in reality; every interpretation which overlooks it must fail in arriving at a clear view of the whole. *In the second place* Christ speaks of his other and proper coming in the *manifestation of his kingdom*, chap. xxiv, 29–44. Our interpretation will show that, notwithstanding the εὐθέως, *immediately*, ver. 29, there is *here* an important point of separation, for which compare meanwhile Luke xxi. 24. The confusion which characterizes the usual interpretation has arisen from overlooking the prophetic manner of viewing the future, *i. e.*, the *perspective* and *typical* relation of great catastrophes *corresponding to each other*. For, the judgment upon Jerusalem is itself a first coming of the Son of Man; *only as such* has it its prophetical significance, *only in this light*, therefore, does Christ prophesy of it. Then was there a typical *judgment of the world*, then appeared typically the kingdom of Christ established among the nations, in opposition to the rejected people; *i. e.*, the *two* following catastrophes, the more remote as well as the nearer, are to be seen preliminarily in the first, as we have already said on Matthew xvi. 28. Thus does our Lord regard it, and this is the reason why in chap. xxiv. 4–14, and then again vers. 23–28, the expressions selected are so strong as in the fullest sense to apply only to the later coming, although between these, in verses 15–25, he speaks quite plainly of Jerusalem.*

Whilst, then, at ver. 29, the typical first coming *passes* quite out of view, and a *second coming of the Son of Man*, the gathering together of his elect into a finally established manifested *kingdom*, comes into the foreground (Luke xx. 31), it is to be observed beforehand, with a view to the interpretation, that this also is not the last coming, at the end of the world, but an *intermediate* coming of Christ, the acknowledgment of which alone opens up to us the entire prophetical system in this prophecy.* Here there is as yet nothing said of eternal punishment; but only of being left, of being shut out, or left without. The middle part of Christ's answer, which embraces this intermediate coming, extends onward to chap. xxv. 30; for here at first he gives the *prophecy itself* (already running out into a sort of parable) as yet in direct continuation of what goes before, chap. xxiv. 29–44. Then, however, he follows this out by *three parables* which contain warnings to watchfulness and readiness, addressed to his disciples in particular, who wait for the coming *kingdom* (which is to be delayed much longer than they thought). He first represents in general, in the singular, the *faithful* and *wise* servant, in contrast with a bad servant (chap. xxiv. 45–51); the two parables that follow speak separately of the *wisdom* and *faithfulness*, and at the same time widen the view, so as to show the manifold variety of those who shall one day stand before him as their Lord, to enter in with him or not; then in chap. xxv. 1–13, the *wise* virgins; finally, ver. 14, the *faithful* servants, who, however, are now (more definitely than at chap. xxiv. 45) the *stewards* of the goods and gifts of their Lord.

From this intermediate coming of the Son of Man which is meant in all the parables belonging to chap. xxiv. 39, there is now plainly *distinguished* (and this ought never to have been mistaken) the great *judgment-day* of the King, in full power and glory, for all nations, at the *end of the world* properly speaking—the last coming of Christ on the last day, when an eternal separation shall be made between misery and blessedness. chap. xxv. 31–46. Only now is the answer complete; and the end of all prophecy is reached in a concluding word of our Lord, beyond which nothing more can or is to take place.†

* Here are formed almost of themselves, for every unbiassed and attentive reader, precisely the *three* cycles which afterwards Lange (iii. 215), agreeing with me, is obliged to admit. Petersen also arrives at the same conclusion (*Lehre von der Kirche*, iii. 685).

* Yet this *intermediate* advent is a secret which is only now opening itself up to some, for the Church is slow to learn the word of prophecy. Certain things are disclosed only when the time comes for them, and it ought then to be the least of all objected to these things that they were unknown to the doctrine of the Church hitherto, nay, that the latter has condemned (without distinguishing and inquiring aright) what, at an earlier period, pointed at these things. Zeller speaks very clearly and truly concerning these three comings of Christ, which perspectively cover each other, of which, according to him, the first was his coming into the world (in the *Beugg. Monatsbl.* 1847, No. 10).

† We may here name, as agreeing with us, and

THE FIRST COMING; DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM; DISPERSION OF ISRAEL.

(Matt. xxiv. 2, 4–28; Mark xiii. 2, 5–23; Luke xxi. 6, 8–24.)

The disciples, terrified by the word of Christ, chap. xxiii. 38, show to him on leaving the temple in the evening, after a day full of conflict and fatigue, the *building materials* of the temple, which was still in course of construction (and was finished only a short time before its destruction). Looking up at the spectacle they exclaim in their simplicity: *See*, what stones and what buildings! There were foundation stones forty yards broad, and forty-five yards in length, of the whitest marble; not merely with λίθοις καλοῖς, *goodly stones*, was Jehovah's sanctuary adorned, but also with ἀναθήμασι, *consecrated gifts* of piety and reverence, or even of acknowledgment by kings!* Is all this really to be left desolate? Is nothing to be spared? But the Lord sternly answers as he had already spoken, Luke xix. 44; he charges them only again to *look at it aright*, as a glory that is doomed to the most complete destruction. † The imaginary difficulty of Matthew's οὐ βλέπετε, "*See ye not*," it has been sought to remove by all sorts of different constructions; but it is simply the same *question* which Mark also has: Ye *see* all this, as ye think? It implies: But ye see it not yet aright, with your ποταποί and ποταπαί, just as if the destruction of such great *buildings* were scarcely conceivable: I say unto you with my Amen, which nothing can resist, that the days shall come when, of all these which ye now behold (Luke), *not one stone shall be left upon another*, as it had been laid in the building according to Hag. ii. 15. Compare also, for the proverb, 2 Sam. xvii. 13. After the Jews were conquered, Titus commanded the soldiers to dig up the foundations of the whole city round about, as well as those of the temple; although before this he would willingly have spared the latter, and repeatedly offered to do so.‡ Afterwards Turnus or Terentius Rufus tore up the foundation of the city with ploughshares, whereby certainly Micah iii. 12 was literally fulfilled. Let us, when we look upon the grandeur and decoration of our ecclesiastical and civil edifices, remember this fulfilled word of Jesus; and it will be a preservative against all false admiration of their earthly glory, against all undue æsthetic dependence upon it, and against the Romish tendencies to which it may minister. Let us view the entire edifice of the world in the light of this which has been said of it beforehand: *Not one stone upon another!* (2 Pet. iii. 10, 11).

A while after this first and unconditionally decisive word, which gave the disciples enough to occupy their thoughts, Christ sat upon the *Mount of Olives*, from which the principal view of the temple was to be had, even to its interior—on the same Mount of Olives from which the destroying host afterwards poured in upon the devoted city (comp. Zech. xiv. 4, 5, of the more remote future). There the disciples, no longer contradicting the *fact*, now bring forward their question formerly raised respecting the *When* of the great catastrophe, in connection with the coming again of Christ (Matt. xxiii. 39), and the end of the world. The three Evangelists do not indeed agree literally in the answer; our Lord's words were copious and free, so that each one might preserve and bring forward something different from the others. Yet the agreement so predominates, that we are warranted in arranging what is given by the others according to the plan of Matthew, and certainly must not entertain the idea of two different discourses.* Christ, we may be sure did not—contrary to the whole nature of the prophetic vision, which advances from the near to the remote—leap backwards and forwards from one thing to another, and speak *first* of the last end, then of Jerusalem, then again of the last end; but if Matt. vers. 15–22 (parallel with Luke vers. 20–24) refers to the judgment of Jerusalem, then vers. 4–14 and 23–38 in like manner refer, at all events *in the first place*, to the same event. The disciples summing up all in their indefinite question desired a σημεῖον, *one sign*. He gives them, at first, various preparatory signs, which will occur similarly, as presages of the first and second coming; until, at ver 30, there appears the one last *sign* for the visible coming of the Son of Man (analogous with ver. 15, for the

that certainly from independent illumination, the beloved father Zeller, a man whose truly prophetic gift ought to be respected by his believing contemporaries. He divides just as we do: (1) the coming of the Lord to judge Judaism; (2) to judge degenerate anti-Christian Christendom; (3) to judge all heathen nations, the final judgment of the world. All these together are the coming again of Christ; and with respect to their similarity and diversity they are most exactly recorded from the lips of our Lord by *Matthew:* (a) chap. xxiv. 1–28; (b) chap. xxiv. 29, on to xxv. 30, (c) chap. xxv. 31–46.

* They are mentioned before by Luke in contrast with the widow's mite; Josephus gives a glittering catalogue of them. Even Cæsar Augustus had presented precious vessels as a gift of honor; Tacitus speaks of *immensæ opulentiæ templum.*

† Lange's interpretation of this question: "Do ye actually see all these things? To me they already appear as a vanishing vision!" savors too much of our modern sentimentality.

‡ Κελεύει καταδκάπτειν . . οὕτως ἐξωμάλισαν οἱ καταδκάπτοντες, ὡς μηδὲ πῶποτ' οἰκισθῆναι πίστιν ἂν ἔτι παραδχεῖν τοῖς προσελθοῦσιν (Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vii 1, 1).

* We do not with Richter attach any value to the assertion in Brandt's *Schullehrerbibel* (where there are so many arbitrary assertions), viz.: "In Luke Christ speaks *at an earlier period* and of Jerusalem; afterwards again similarly, but no longer of Jerusalem." We notice this as a caution against such exegetical caprice, adopted solely to avoid the typical double sense. Although Luther had recourse to a similar expedient, viz.: Matthew and Mark throw together what Luke alone clearly separates in the true order.

preliminary, not yet personal, coming to judgment). Therefore in Matt. vers. 4–15 are given the signs of the destruction of Jerusalem drawing near; but these are portrayed in colors so strong, that this first period must be seen to be only the *type* of the latter. If, at chap. x. we found in a similar gradation of perspective vision, that all that was spoken literally of that first sending out applies spiritually to the more remote future, so here, this entire portion of the discourse, chap. xxiv. 4–28, has certainly already a real *double sense*. It is no result of chance (to speak foolishly), that every thing which is here mentioned was somehow actually fulfilled already at that time; but still less is it to be denied, that the fulfillment which entirely corresponds to it lies as yet in the future. *Hence*, ver. 6, τὸ τέλος, "the end," is parallel with the σύντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, "end of the world," of the question—but at ver. 8, the "sorrows" are again parallel with the great "affliction," ver. 21, and in the οὖν, *therefore*, ver. 15, there is an undeniably direct connection with the τὸ τέλος, or end, at ver. 14, and again, at ver. 23 a simply continuative τότε, "then." He who will break this continuous connection, must have recourse to artificial interpretation in one place or another; the only true key to the understanding of the whole lies in perceiving, that our Lord speaks prophetically *of the earlier as a type of the later*. Advancing from the most general to the most concrete, he mentions, vers. 4–15, those signs which, as they must and shall precede the end of the world, shall also precede precisely on that account also the end of the Jewish nation, and in these he comes ever nearer to the event: first in the fallen, desolate, disordered Israel (which even now has become a nation *without*), there will be false Christs or Saviours—then in the same, and in the Gentile world, ever increasing calamities of wars, with accompanying throes of nature—then, even in the *Church* of God properly so called, which exists as the kernel to be saved, offence because of persecution, and falling away, likewise false prophets —*yet* with all this, the continued preaching of the Gospel in all the world! Hereupon Christ specifies the most immediate, *nearest* sign of the coming end, according to Daniel (ver. 15). The *judgment of the destruction itself* is, from ver. 16 onwards, so represented that the disciples of Christ are directed to *flee* (vers. 16–20); then they are *again warned* against falling away in the great tribulation (vers. 21–26); finally, the sudden unmistakable *coming of the Son of Man* for the salvation of his people, and judgment on the outcasts, is indicated (vers. 27, 28). The direction to flee runs thus: Flee in haste, without turning back, or looking back, yet not without foresight and prayer! The warning against falling away is repeated, because it is now certainly meant *at the same time* to apply to the *interval* from the judgment of Jerusalem on to the second, more proper, coming of the Son of Man; yet the double τότε, *then*, vers. 21 and 23, evidently connects, in the first place, again with vers. 19 and 16, and can only be separated therefrom by departing from the natural interpretation.* The great tribulation will threaten danger also to you *elect*—*therefore* beware, ye *elect*, of the false Christs, and false prophets (vers. 5 and 11 being now joined together), as on account of the danger that threatens you (vers. 23, 24), so on account of the warning against this which ye have received from me, vers. 25, 26.

Verses 4, 5. Beware! Take heed! Watch over yourselves, that ye may be delivered, may be saved, when I really come. This remains, generally speaking, the ground tone of the whole answer, with which it begins here and closes at vers. 42, 44—to resume and prosecute it then in parables. (Mark, ver. 9, βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτούς, as 2 John, ver. 8.) The disciples inquired respecting the πότε, the *when*; Christ, however, gives no proper answer to this throughout the entire discourse (in spite of the oft-recurring τότε): see rather vers. 36, 42, 25, 13, and mark the last ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ, "*when* the Son of Man shall come," ch. xxv. 31. He only gives *signs* for the different analogous periods, which manifoldly fulfill themselves; in order that his people, expecting him in each of these periods, may be on their guard. (This is what Mark means by the ἤρξατο ver. 5, viz.: he began at first with something quite different from the desired answer.) The impulse to our inquiry concerning Christ's second coming should not be curiosity about the time, but the desire to be found to have persevered in fidelity before him. But as, on the one hand, the near expectation of the *true* coming One is helpful to this, so, on the other, the warning against the *false Christs* is yet indispensable; hence the assurance which, while it pacifies, urges to still persevering faithfulness, viz.: *I come not so very soon!*—it will yet be a while ere this, and there lies in the interval much deceiving confusion of falsehood, and violent breaking out of sin, as a necessarily preparatory development (2 Thess. ii). *This*, therefore is the first fundamental idea of the answer. Many shall come, not merely ἐν, but ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, personally assuming my name to themselves. The natural, most immediate, punishment of Israel for the rejection of the true Christ, was the being given up to lying saviours and deliverers, as was already foretold, John v. 43. In every period of corruption, and of calamity as its consequence, this symptom of lying consolations and promises repeats itself; hence, at the period of the captivity, false prophets had abounded, Jer. xxix. 8, 9, xiv. 13; Ezek. xiii. As the preliminary and most immediate fulfillment, we are not so much to understand *goetæ*, such as Simon Magus, and deceitful wonder-workers in general (of whom Josephus is full), as rather those who promised

* For so must we call it when Ebrard (*Kritik. d. ev. Gesch.* p. 617) makes the τότε (which is yet, since ver. 16, only one and the same) to denote the time *after* the shortening of the tribulation, and declares this to be the only true sense.

redemption to the people Israel (Luke xxiv. 21), *i. e.*, would become their Messiahs, saviours, and liberators. This is what Christ means, and it matters nothing although no one may have directly said: *I am the Christ.* Josephus also relates enough about saviours of this class.* But while our Lord so decidedly warns against them, he lays it down (which is not to be overlooked) as a main point, that *his* true coming will bring no outward salvation even to this Israel; that the judgment over it remains inevitable; and that for his disciples, as he afterwards says, only *to flee* is appointed. He *therewith* points at the same time beyond, to a later coming, when the fulfillment, found before only in part and preliminarily, recurs in a fuller and more proper form. Already does the expression *and the time draweth near*, which Luke adds, point beyond to this farther sense.

Verses 6—8. We have here the general signs of the preparation of all great catastrophes; as surely to be found then on the more limited scale, in so far as the Jewish horizon represented the sphere of the world, as afterwards on a greater scale, according to the import of the expressions which typically point to the *end* properly speaking. War in the immediate neighborhood, ever-growing alarms in the distance, terrifying rumors of war, commotions and tumults of the people against each other—all this is in reality, *on the small scale*, the picture of the time as described by Josephus, which, with every year, became more exactly applicable. The *wars* were certainly, at that time, more of the nature of insurrections, tumults here and there (Luke, ἀναταστάσιαι), manifold commotions and massacres, for example between the Syrian and Jewish inhabitants in the cities (ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος), such as are to be read of in Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17, 10. 18, 1–8, where it is said "every city was divided into two opposing hosts." Besides, in Italy also, Otho and Vitellius strove for the kingdom—βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν, if we would interpret quite exactly; the entire discourse, however, rather (as Isa. xix. 2) denotes by expressions which typically point further, the general commotion and convulsion, also the internal distraction of the Jewish people raging among themselves. (For the rest, what Bengel finely observes is pre-supposed: Christiani magis *audiunt* bella quam gerunt.) *Famines and pestilences* may be regarded as an expression proverbial† of such times (2 Chron. xx. 9; Jer. xiv. 12, xxi. 7, θάνατος and λιμός together; also as a proverb: μετὰ λιμὸν λοιμός). But there are not wanting historical notices of famines and pestilences in that time. Under Claudius alone there were four several famines in Palestine, Greece, and Rome (*in divers places*); compare also Acts xi. 18. Tacitus (*Annal.* xvi. 13) mentions a plague (A. D. 66) in which during a single autumn in Rome 30,000 men were swept off. There were earthquakes, A. D. 60, in Asia Minor, according to Phlegon; A. D. 63, in Campania; under Claudius in Crete according to Philostratus; at Rome, A. D. 51; in Phrygia at Apamea and Laodicea; again in Campania, according to Tacitus and Suetonius; as also in Judea, according to Josephus, iv. 4, 5. All this we merely mention, in opposition to those commentators who would entirely sever the prophecy of Christ from its nearest fulfillment, in which is the pledge of a further fulfillment. Luke (who, ver. 10, indicates by "then said he unto them" a short pause in the discourse calling attention anew) adds *fearful sights* and *great signs from heaven;* but while this points indeed to the more completely corresponding future (Luke xxi. 25), such signs were not wanting even before the destruction of Jerusalem. The accounts which Josephus gives of these* obtain from Christ's word a credibility not to be slighted; as further (we hesitate not to say it), from the analogy of the typically corresponding times, a remarkable light falls back from this passage upon those histories in the second book of Maccabees (see chap. ii. 22, iii. 24, v. 2, x. 29, xi. 8; there promising victory, here threatening destruction). Yet all these are only *preliminary signs*, says Christ, all this is not yet τὸ τέλος, the last and proper end; because the end of Jerusalem is only a sign of the συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, all this will *again* occur quite differently in the last time. Compare Dan. xi. 27, 35 for this special expression; as also Jer. li. 45, 46, for the entire prophetical description; especially, however, the remarkably corresponding prophecy of Azariah the son of Oded to king Asa, 2 Chron. xv. 5–7, which evidently extends to the distant future.) With profound significance does our Lord

* Of Thendas, *Antiq.* xx. 5, 1 (remarkable on account of Acts v. 36, 37), who would lead his followers through the Jordan; of another, xx. 8, 10; of those who falsely prophesied of divine help even to the last moment, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5, 1. All these appeared, at least before the Gentiles, in *Christ's* name: Judaei *impulsore Chresto* assidue tumultuantes.

† Niger, who was murdered by the Zelots, uttered this curse upon the people at his death: λιμόν τε καὶ λοιμόν (Josephus, *B. J.* iv. 6, 1).

* He does not leave unnoticed the σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα which happened before the destruction of the city: A comet which hung over it during a whole year; a light in the night around the altar and temple, a sacrificial cow which dropt a lamb in the temple, both at the Passover season; the opening of a door in the temple of itself; chariots and besieging hosts in the clouds; the mighty voice in the temple as of a great multitude: Let us go hence! at the time of the Pentecost; finally, τὸ δὲ τούτων φοβερώτερον, that a certain man from the country, named *Jesus*, began four years before the breaking out of the war, in the midst of peace and plenty, to cry out, *Woe to Jerusalem!* and, notwithstanding his being chastised and scourged as a "madman," continued this for seven years and five months—till the end of the siege, when with a last *Woe also to me!* a stone that was thrown killed him (*Bell. Jud.* vi. 5, 3). Even Tacitus, *Hist.* v. mentions similar circumstances.

finally denote all this by the expression ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων, "beginning *of pangs*," in conformity with the Jewish doctrine concerning the חֲבָלֵי מָשִׁיחַ or throes of the Messiah; for there must be a *regeneration* before the *end* can come, and the growing outbreaks of sin are viewed as a necessary development, in order to the ripening of men and nations for judgment and redemption. A death struggle already typically goes before, as the birth pang of the *new* Jerusalem; just as at last heaven and earth are destroyed ere the new world is born.

Verses 9—13. As Christ, at chap. x., had previously given similar directions to the apostles, to be observed by them until the Son of Man should *come;* so the manifest repetition of them here is proof that he speaks, at all events in the first place, of the foretokens of this nearer coming. The direct address to the disciples, in the constant *ye* and *you*, is unnatural on the supposition of a prophecy at once passing to the remote future; but, on the other hand, it is most appropriate if we suppose that he reminds them of what had been said to them before, and the fulfillment of which is now nearer at hand. As in the sayings of John xv. 26 to xvi. 4 the apostles are first of all meant, so here also, where Mark and Luke repeat in a still more detailed form what was said on the occasion of their first mission—and in particular the direction to rely on the promised Spirit when called to defend themselves, and the citation from Micah. The particulars have already been considered at chap. x. It is evidently indicated by the "*before all these*" of Luke ver. 12, that this persecuting and hating of the witnesses and confessors of Christ, even to the death, was to begin very soon—before the other greater commotions and terrors should come—as the first principal sign of the course of the kingdom henceforward, through long afflictions, to a late completion of victory. As a testimony unto *them* to whom ye preach: so also Mark, as in Matthew chap. x. and again xxiv. 14. But Luke gives the other side, viz.: it shall turn for a testimony to *you;* compare the similar expression, Phil. i. 19. The disciples should know in all their persecution that their Lord was truly with them, giving them mouth and wisdom, so that kings and princes must in their consciences bow before their testimony to the truth, even as Pilate before Christ. So Paul in bonds makes Felix tremble! The θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν, "*some of you* shall they cause to be put to death," of Luke is the more definite interpretation of the ἀποκτενοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, "they shall kill *you*," in Matthew; for this limitation was certainly promised also at Matt. xvi. 28. We have only to consider the growing general hatred towards the Christians; and the persecution of Nero, in which, to speak with Tertullian, it had already become a *nominis* prælium, a war against a *name:* Matt. *of all nations* (chap. x. 22, only πάντων) is, exactly as at ver. 14, a strong expression for the first fulfillment, as typical of the future fulfillment. As regards Luke ver. 18, see already on Matthew x. 30: it is meant to be said here, as there, first of all: Nothing shall be done without the will of *God;* therefore, also, nothing that shall issue in your destruction; all things shall tend to your salvation (Phil. i. 19-21), even *although* ye should be killed!* And then the word, as it respects those who should remain, passes over to ver. 19; and it was specially fulfilled when, in the destruction of Jerusalem, no Christian, so far as we know, perished.

For the rest, as appears in Matthew (who, instead of more detailed repetitions, preserves what is properly new in the present discourse), the persecution of the name of Christ is here only a basis for the transition to an announcement of that *falling away* in the Church which should be the result of that persecution. As surely as the words of vers. 10–12 reach further beyond, so surely were they already at that time preliminarily fulfilled; we have only to think of the Demases in the early Church, the strong words in 2 Tim. iv. 10, the entire Epistle to the Hebrews, with its much-needed warning against falling away. Because ver. 10 speaks of the Christians, we must of course look for the *false prophets* (ver. 11) also in Christendom; ver. 12 adds forthwith the effects of the false *doctrine* in the bad *life*. (They are the ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, analogous to the old ψευδοπροφῆται, 2 Pet. ii. 1; 1 John iv. 1, and the ψευδαπόστολοι, 2 Cor. xi. 13.) In those who are led away the ἀνομία, the *iniquity*, then increases—that is, in the present fulfillment, the last open outbreak and manifestation of ripened sin and selfishness, the *antinomianism*, by many at this day (for example Göschel) exposed with all severity in its true light (comp. 2 Tim. iii. 1 fol). The transgressors prevail (Dan. viii. 23); therefore also love in the loving, in whom it ought still to burn ardently, *grows cold;* the corrupting mass infects also the little band (which is here remarkably denoted by τῶν πολλῶν); brotherly distrust and anxious self-concern predominate; nay at last *all* the virgins become more or less drowsy and slumbrous. But the Judge and Saviour deals not so sharply with the weak: although a certain waxing cold of the first love is predicated of *the many*, *i. e.*, actually of all—he shall and will yet find such as endure even to the end. Compare again chap. x. 22, 23; and note that only *the end* can in the first instance be intended as there: it is the antithesis of the *beginning*, ver. 8; and as such glances already to the last end, which at ver. 14 is still more definitely viewed, while it means at first the end of the great tribulation of Jerusalem, vers. 21, 22, for those who are preserved till then. For those who are killed or who die earlier, it is certainly death (Rev. ii. 10), according as the end of the as-

*"Whatever may outwardly befall you, even death itself, will as little affect your real eternal welfare, as if not even a hair of your head perished" (Von Gerlach).

sault is appointed to each. Our Lord in Luke xxii. 28, 29, typically acknowledged his disciples' *having continued steadfast*, so as to receive the appointment to the kingdom; and the same ever goes on in all *temptations*, which have always again a nearer *end*. The most distinct explanation stands at Luke ver. 19, where the possessing and preserving of their *souls* includes the spiritual and bodily *salvation* in one* (Matt. ver. 22). The end is *patience*, the armor of the saints (Rev. xiii. 10, xiv. 12), as the beginning is *caution*, ver. 4.

Verse 14. In spite, however, of all persecution, nay of all offence and growing cold in the Church of Christ itself, the preaching of the Gospel to the world yet goes on unhindered; and this is a wonderfully fulfilled sign and testimony of the grace of the Lord in his kingdom. Here the great similarity of the earlier period with its antitype at the last time was strongest, and therefore the prophesying word almost entirely anticipates; this we by no means deny. Vers. 4–14 is correctly viewed by Dorner as a sort of general exordium (Lange: "A representation of the entire course of the world, even to the *end*, in its general character"). It is quite true, that here we have only *admonitions*, without any reference to chronology. But Dorner misapprehends the typical double sense as if τὸ τέλος, "the end," could *only* be the same with the συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, "the end of the world." For whilst, in the glance at the last end, this τότε ἥξει τὸ τέλος, "*then* shall the end come," has almost literally extended thus far, immediately upon this the return is made by the οὖν, "therefore," ver. 15, again to the *typical* end (Ezek. vii. 2, 3, 6, בָּא הַקֵּץ); and we must even in the former case not overlook the first fulfillment. Matt. xxvi. 13, and xxviii. 19 reach indeed further; yet, *in a certain measure*, already in the apostolic period, even before the end came upon Jerusalem, all the Gentiles in the then *orbis terrarum* had heard the testimony of the Gospel. Mark, ver. 10, puts this word (εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, as it were "into all nations") in strict proximity with the preaching of the apostles, and thereby points us again back to Matt. x. 18. Thus did the apostles themselves regard it, so that by the preaching of the Gospel before Cæsar *all the Gentiles* heard it (2 Tim. iv. 17); and the Gospel had come unto all the world, to every creature under heaven, (Col. i. 6, 23).† One has only to learn from the history of the Church and of missions the wide spread of the Gospel after a very few years, in order to understand the *typical* truth of this particular‡ It was indeed only a typical truth; Acts viii. 4 was ever more strongly repeated,* and will be repeated even to the last end. Still, the type shows us, on the limited scale, that we are not to expect, even at the last future, the general conversion of all nations; but only an analogous *preaching* for a *testimony*, yet so that every where the message will be heard. Nay, this expression is used in other places generally where the testimony is *not* received. When the two connected signs in their strangely contradictory coincidence reach their fullest manifestation—viz., the apostacy of Christendom and the spread of missions—then cometh the end. Then will another abomination of desolation in the holy place be seen, of which that at Jerusalem was only the remote type.

Verse 15. From this verse onward to ver 28 Christ certainly speaks chiefly of the signs of the approaching destruction of Jerusalem; he portrays this however "*only as* the sign and beginning of the judgment of the world." In this we quite agree with Lange; we find in it, however, over and above, a special *typical* significance, pointing to the *last* days of the second fulfillment. That our Lord by no means sums up, in the οὖν, *therefore*, the entire distraction and desolation of Israel (and the Christian Church?) hitherto described—but must mean something singular, special, something that was strikingly perceptible—is clear first of all from the ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε, *when ye see*. He appeals thereby to a peculiarly remarkable coincidence of what happened, with a long existing, although little understood *prophecy;* for he will teach us here that, as his own forewarning word (ver. 25), so also the Old Testament prophecy, and in general all that has been given by God to his people, is to be a light and consolation to us in the evil time. He names Daniel the *prophet*, perhaps not without reference to the place that was assigned to him among the כְּתוּבִים or *Hagiographi;* he confirms so clearly and earnestly the authenticity of the book existing in the canon under the name of this man, that every other result of a learned criticism is refuted by anticipation; he adds even an emphatic challenge attentively to read and *rightly to understand* the prophetic word, in order to see that its fulfillment has not been omitted. For, that the parenthetical remark has been inserted by *two* Evangelists, as an addition of their own, remains so inexplicable and unexampled, that we,

* Not merely according to Thiess: "Wait patiently, it will not cost you your life."

† But not Rom. x. 18, where, according to the sense of the Psalm, the revelation of nature is to be understood in opposition to ver. 19; see my *Andeutungen für glaüb. Schriftverst.* p. 345.

‡ Where, however, we must not (as Roos, *Die Lehre J. Christi*, p. 423) press the letter, as if actually at that time, perhaps in the last year before the end of Jerusalem, "the whole of the then known world" had heard the Gospel: all that can be said is that we have no information of such having been the case. This is quite as wrong as on the other hand to reduce the expression "all nations" to a too narrow sense, as for example in a recent essay (*Das prophetische Wort, etc*, p. 31, 37).

* Again, after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the triumph of Vespasian, the Gospel first broke out with increased force. Rutilius: Atque utinam nunquam Judæa subacta fuisset, Pompeii bellis imperioque Titi! Latius excitæ pestis contagia serpunt, Victoresque suos natio victa premit.

agreeing with Hengstenberg, cannot enough wonder how Bengel could have entertained such a supposition.* The challenge comes from the mouth of Christ, and calls to the right understanding of the dark word (just as in 2 Tim. ii. 6); it refers also very evidently to the passages in Daniel himself (Dan. xii. 4, 10), which speak of the right understanding of his prophecies, only at a later period fully disclosed (as in chap. ix. 23, 25 Daniel himself was summoned to consider and understand).

It is not necessary that we should enter at large upon the exegesis of Daniel as a whole; it would lead us too far to do any thing more than merely state our confirmed opinion. As Daniel in various senses prophesies of Antiochus Epiphanes as the type of Antichrist, so Christ here inserts and demonstrates the intermediate fulfillment when Jerusalem was destroyed; and by way of exact confirmation connects this with the discourse of Daniel in chap. ix. which treats of that event. The prophet had, in chap. viii. 1–9, announced almost historically the nearest fulfillment at that time in its entire development; then however in vers. 10, 11, 17, 19, he received definite hints to the effect that this vision extends, in like manner, to a later time of the end. In chap. ix. he receives, immediately upon his prayer, the very remarkble determination of time which finds its limit in the days of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem; *to this*, therefore, first of all Christ here points in the *βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως*, "abomination of desolation" (Sept. ix. 27, *τῶν ἐρημώσεων*, comp, however, literally 1 Macc. i. 54). Now, it is true that this rendering and construction is against the original text, in which כְּנַף, *wing* ("overspreading"), belongs certainly as the *stat. constr.* to שִׁקּוּצִים, *abominations;* but in the further extending view of the whole, it retains its truth, as we shall soon see. We are quite agreed with the more recent commentators that the passage in Daniel is to be read "Upon the pinnacle the abomination:" that is, Even unto or upon the *temple* with its pinnacle (which at the same time may mean the pinnacle of Jerusalem), desecrated by abomination, the *desolator* comes. Therefore, only an abomination already being fulfilled, affecting the sanctuary, and bringing desolation as its punishment, can here be meant by Christ—quite in analogy with the idea which at ver. 28 is otherwise expressed: When the corruption and the abomination is consummated, even in the innermost sanctuary, then must the dispersion come! The *ὅταν ἴδητε*, "when ye shall see," of Matthew and Mark, therefore, is really not one and the same with the *ὅταν ἴδητε* of Luke; and the neglect of this has confused many commentators.* Luke preserves a word of Christ which was certainly *also* spoken, and which specifies the *outward* sign of the encompassing besieging army (Luke xix. 43); while Matthew and Mark give another word respecting the *inner sign*, which already stands *in the holy place*. This can only mean the *temple*, even in the circumlocution of Mark: *ὅπου οὐ δεῖ*, where truly something else than *abomination* ought to be! It is wrong therefore to seek this abomination in the Roman military badges, eagles, and imperial figures on their standards; and to explain the *τόπος ἅγιος* "or holy place," of all the country round about Jerusalem (Psa. lxxix. 3; 1 Macc. x. 31), chiefly the Mount of Olives; or even (comp. Psa. lxxiv. 4) to mention the setting up of the imperial statue in the temple, which was only attempted a considerable time before. For, the abomination is, according to Daniel, set up by Israel itself; this alone corresponds as, on the one hand, to the earlier analogy before the captivity (2 Kings xxi. 2–7; Ezek. v. 11, vii, 8, 9, viii. 6–16), so, on the other hand, to the later fulfillment in the antitype, in which *both coincide*, in which the Antichrist itself proceeds from the midst of Christendom, and sets itself with its idolatry in the temple of God (2 Thess. ii. 4). What, in the faintly preliminary fulfillment of this sense, the abomination in the temple at that time, properly speaking, was, we can no longer know; it must, however, have been an aggravation and consummation of unholy character and conduct in the sanctuary, in the highest degree manifest to the Christians, which they could not but *see*. The first fulfillment of this particular is concealed by history in order to the second. Von Gerlach, agreeing with us, understands, "Such an abomination as must necessarily draw desolation after it;" but he is wrong when he affirms that this is therefore nothing definite, and only expresses the culminating point of corruption. So little is a striking special fulfillment here, as often times, excluded by the general sense, which is also true, that the latter must rather, according

* Lange unfortunately still sees in this merely "a later note;" his opinion is at last (iii. 217) thus expressed, "The Evangelist remarks this by way of interpolation," without noticing the fact that *two* Evangelists must have inserted the same remark. In like manner Alford speaks of an "ecclesiastical note," which has come into the text in the same way as the Doxology in the Lord's Prayer. We see no ground for such a supposition, no reason at all against its being taken simply as the word of Christ himself. We think it quite *natural*, with Braune, that as elsewhere when he wished to awaken and fix attention he said, "Who hath ears to hear, let him hear!" so here also he should say, "Whoso readeth, let him give heed!" Nay, we say further with Braune, "This direction is still always the best introduction to the prophetical word"—namely, as an admonition carefully to *read*, with *attentive observation* of the corresponding signs of history.

* Lange also has not yet rid himself of this. Even Delitzch, with Hofmann, sees in Luke xxi. 20 the "authentic *interpretation* of the words of Christ;" but understands only the idolatrous signs of the heathen army which the Romans brought into the temple (*Luther. Zeitschr.* 1850, 3, p. 487).

to prophetico-historical law, culminate and become *visible* in a last detail.

Further, it is not to be overlooked that our Lord does not literally render that passage, Dan. xi. 27; but he retains the *βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως, abomination of desolation*, so as at the same time (which Hengstenberg and Hävernick overlook or deny) to connect with it one or two later passages where this expression actually occurs. Daniel, chap x.–xii., carries out the prophecy more particularly. After chap. x., which prepares the way for what follows, we find in chap. xi. Antiochus Epiphanes standing evidently as the type of a future destroyer (the Antichrist); and in such a manner that, according to the manner of prophetical discourse, in vers. 31–35 the reference to the first predominates, while in vers. 36–45, where the view extends further to the "other time," the reference to the last predominates. Finally, in chap. xii., the whole closes with the view reaching furthest of all to the final decision and redemption. Here now, in chap. xi. 31, it is said that the arms of the enemy shall pollute the holy place, shall set up (properly *give, i. e.*, render by way of recompense) the *desolating abomination;* and in chap. xii. 11 there is again the retrospect to this *βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως*. Only the last passage entirely corresponds to the citation of Christ; and its sense is, that abomination, the *desecration* of the holy place by Israel necessarily completes itself in vengeance, and represents itself in the *desolation* of the same by the enemy. Was not this also the innermost sense of the *ἀφίεται ἔρημος*, "is left desolate," chap. xxiii. 38—is not this alone what fully corresponds to the case? Heathenish violation of the temple is already present, and heathenish violation yet comes; for, vengeance is to manifest the guilt, and only by recompense to complete it. Thus also we fully understand how the two signs, which meet together in Matthew and Luke, belong to each other as one *ὅταν ἴδητε;* and *βδέλ. ἐρημ.* is the abomination which brings with it the desolation, because it is already so itself.

Verses 16–18. If what is said here is to receive in the second fulfillment (as may certainly be possible enough) a significance literally coresponding beyond expectation, we must seek it in the circumstances of a Church of Christians assembled again at the *last* time in *Judea;* for there the second catastrophe is to concentrate itself. With this agrees that ancient tradition (mentioned by Dorner, p. 7), that the Antichrist shall set up the abomination in the restored temple. Who knows whether this be only a *dream* of the fancy! It reaches, however, into the uncertainties of prophetic vision, with which we shall not, as many do, too confidently meddle; so much only is certain, that Christ now speaks quite *plainly* of the *first* fulfillment.* As already in chap. x. 23 flight was recommended to the apostles, as afterwards in Luke xvii. 31, similar expressions were used in reference to the "coming of the Son of Man," there indefinitely spoken of, so now the faithful are enjoined to flee out of Jerusalem and Judea, in evident *antithesis* to the subsequent *gathering together* of the elect, ver. 31. Consequently, *this* catastrophe is not yet the last gathering and redemption—this is precisely what these words would intimate. The obdurate Jews hoped even to the last for succor and help; the Christians warned beforehand by their Lord, were to flee—not, however, until the end actually comes; previous to this they were to endure in patience. In Luke, ver. 21, the expressions are somewhat differently applied, with the same sense, Delay no longer! The *mountains* are the neighboring mountainous country from ancient times proverbial as a place of refuge; although Christ prepared for his gathered ones another Zoar in Pella.* So suddenly will the destruction come at last (ver. 27), that he who happens then to be on the flat roof must not descend by the inner staircase to the house, nay, scarcely by the outer stair to the street, but, where possible, at once hasten over the roofs, and so to the city wall; he who has laid aside his garment in order to labor in the fields must not turn again for it in order to take it with him. It matters nothing now whether or not thou hast thy garments, if only thou escapest thyself, and bearest thy life for a prey! (Jer. xlv. 5). This, of course, at the same time typically denotes that earnestness which turns not to look at or seize any thing, but is intent only on saving the soul from the judgment (Luke xvii. 32).†

Verses 19, 20. This haste which leaves all behind, *in the last moment of decision* when all that remains is *flight*, does not however exclude a preceding supplication for mitigation of the evil—which was to be expected, indeed, long before it happened—does not exclude a taking heed to and attentively considering the circumstances, with an appeal to God in prayer. As on a later occasion (Luke xxiii. 29) Christ said, with pathetic tenderness, when speaking of the tribulation upon Jerusalem: *Blessed* then are they who have no children born, no sucklings to save, or, because that will be impossible, to lament—so he says the same here from the other side with a severe *Woe.* It is

* Proceeding from this hint of ours, Steinmeyer (in the *Vortrag vor der Berliner Conferenz*, in the *Ev. K Z.* 1849, No. 70) seeks to open up more exactly the reference of the type to the after-time; yet we think that his prophetical hermeneutics, always fundamentally true, lean too much to idealistic generality. I find in the back ground rather a strictly *historical* parallel.

* *Τὰ ὄρη* in all the three Evangelists, so that Steinmeyer only by play of fancy can find here *the mountain* of solitary prayer.

† Steinmeyer's admonitions to obey Christ, when he enjoins flight, *i. e.*, an entirely inward *retirement* and *withdrawal* from outward exertions, which can no longer avail, retain their spiritual truth for the entire period of the approaching end, although they do not exhaust the most special sense of the word.

like all that goes before, spoken partly in the way of proverbial example, partly also literally, of the distress which the faithful share in common with the judged, while they flee from it--pregnant persons and nurses will be much encumbered in their flight! Then he adds another word, which refers to the precautionary prayer against an *unseasonable time*. This general idea receives a twofold expression, namely, *bad weather* (χειμῶν as chap. xvi. 3) and the *Sabbath;* for, the one is an example of the hindrances of nature, the other of hindrance from the environment of human ordinances and customs. It has been quite needlessly asked whether our Lord, contrary to what he elsewhere declares regarding exceptions arising from necessity, here means that flight on the Sabbath day was a thing *not permitted* even to his people; he has *nothing of this* in his thoughts. He may perhaps in the slightest degree have referred to the foreseen legal scruples which would cling to the minds of the Jewish Christians: not, however, that he would confirm *these;* at the utmost it is indicated that he pre-supposes even to the last an abiding friendly relation between his Church and the Jewish ordinance.* All this, however, is not the principal idea, which is meant only to designate various possible forms of hindrances to flight; as the unseasonable weather, so also the time of the Sabbath, in as much as journeying and fleeing would then be rendered difficult, at all events from without by others. He speaks assuredly, not without design, even to this last moment in a thoroughly *Israelitish* manner; but he means much more by these concrete descriptions, as before in vers. 17, 18, according to the spiritual import of the figurative discourse. So that it would not be against his meaning, but rather entirely corresponding to the strong *Woe*, were we to understand his words thus: Woe to such as are pregnant with plans and undertakings, when the time shall make it necessary, stript and empty of every thing, to seek only preservation from imminent judgment!†

Verses 21, 22. Christ has further Daniel's prophecy in his thoughts; what was there (chap. xii. 1) evidently said of the great tribulation which is now as yet future, he here applies, with *typical* truth, already to the tribulation of Jerusalem at its destruction. (Mark, ver. 19, intensifies the expression, so that we may perceive besides that it is not yet to be taken literally in the first fulfillment.) Josephus, indeed, as an eye-witness, expresses himself almost in the same words when he describes the greatness of that calamity; yet that other coming will alone give to these words their entire meaning. Luke, vers. 22, 23, has instead of this, These are the ἡμέραι ἐκδικήσεως (2 Macc. vi. 15); days in which is to be fulfilled *all* that is written—not merely in Daniel, but in all prophecy—of judgment and anger upon this people, from the curses of Moses onwards to the חֵרֶם with which Malachi ends: therefore the great affliction upon this *land*, and the (great, complete) *wrath* upon this *people!* (1 Macc. i. 64; 1 Thess. ii. 16). So Titus is represented to have said that God was so angry with this people, that he also was afraid of his anger if he should show any mercy to them; and after the calamitous siege he refused to take the honor of it, saying that he had only lent the hands for this to the God who would show his anger against the Jews! Had not a limit been fixed by grace in the midst of wrath to the fearful calamity, no man would have escaped alive from it (for that is what is meant first of all by the words, *no flesh should be saved*—comp. Jer. xii. 12, the expression אֵין שָׁלוֹם לְכָל-בָּשָׂר); the elect also, *i. e.*, here chiefly those who were the believing ἐκλογή out of Israel, without being able to hold out and then to flee, would perish. But for the sake of those elect, whose gathering together and redemption remain the final aim of all judgments (a glance forward to ver. 31), who were also now to be saved in type, these days of terror shall be *shortened;* or, as Mark has it, The Lord *has already shortened them*, in his eternal wise decree, beyond which nothing can happen either great or small (comp. Gen. xix. 22). This κολοβοῦσθαι or "shortening" is again taken from Daniel, who, in chap. ix. 25, 27, uses חרץ (comp. Job xiv. 5; Isa. x. 23), and at ver. 24, חתך in the same sense: the destruction is fixedly determined, exactly measured out, and *cut off*, so that it cannot last a shorter or a *longer* time. Many explain this of the sudden interruption of the siege by Cestius Gallus, so that many might flee; although this *interruption* does not quite correspond to the shortening here meant. In the future fulfillment, however, the gracious cutting short of the time of tribulation, the hastening on of the end brought about by God's hand and decree, on behalf of the elect who are to be saved, will probably be much more strikingly manifest.*

Verses 23—26. In this τότε, *then*, Dorner (although not precisely as Ebrard understands it) finds a certain *transition* from the type to the second fulfillment, as if it meant "then also, *afterwards*." Here then is what, at a

* Thus it is not at all necessary to suppose, with the above-named Rud. Hofmann, that "μηδὲ σαββάτῳ is again added by Matthew *de sua mente*, perhaps *ex eventu*, but in contradiction to the spiritual and liberal view of the Sabbath elsewhere expressed by Christ!"

† With Steinmeyer less exactly: "Woe to the life that is in process of formation, to the life that is yet weak." For the Woe applies not to embryos and sucklings. Otherwise his interpretation of the *garments* as vessels, outward forms, for which one is now no longer to care, as if the garments made the people, is deserving of consideration at least.

* Zeller speaks profoundly (*Beugg. Blatt.* 1837, No. 6) upon the means of this hastening prepared in the entire development of history, according to which the carcass must ever more rapidly grow putrid for the eagles.

later place, he so strongly contends against, a sort of prophetically shortening *εὐθέως, immediately* (comp. p. 21). He views the whole of vers. 23–28 only as *appendicem admonitionis loco positam*, so that ver. 29 is connected with ver. 22. *But* by this is overlooked the entire close connection of this *continuous* discourse, as already indicated above, which does not now speak at once of another *τότε*, but of the same danger for the elect of being involved in the common ruin. In the previous verses, however, prominence is given to the *distress;* while now it is to the danger of being *seduced* by false offers of help out of that distress. *Both* are meant, as well in the first as in the second fulfillment; except that Christ again, as at the beginning, turns the view more strongly from the type to the antitype. Therefore his warning with the utmost propriety applies to us, in reference to powerful errors that are impending. The fundamental idea is: Beware of trusting to the pseudo-Christs or pseudo-prophets when they would entice you away from *waiting* patiently for the true Christ and his real coming, when they tell you to wait *here or there;* for it is not in such a manner that your Lord will reveal himself. What Jewish fanatics and Christian seducers did in this way, at that time, with their promised but hardly accomplished signs and wonders, was indeed a faint type of those things of which 2 Thess. ii. 9–12 prophesies, and which Christ with his strong words has here chiefly in mind. At the same time, however, we are not to suppose that only the last days are suddenly to bring such things, hitherto unheard of; for they go on in a gradually progressive development, and the warning of Christ has even now its most serious truth. The signs and wonders (respecting which we learn here, as Israel did already in Deut. xiii. 1–3, that in themselves they do not prove the truth) will appear at last in the most literal reality, but rather in their spiritual form; although accounts of deceiving, tempting wonder-workings in external nature are also not altogether wanting. The intervening *εἰ δυνατόν, if possible*, teaches us, indeed, that the elect who are foreseen by God *cannot* be led away. This impossibility, however, lies not in themselves, so as that they might falsely boast of this, before it is revealed whether or not they are of the number of the elect (see 2 Pet. i. 10, iii. 17)—but only in the gracious decree of God who keeps those who are faithful to him.

Oh that we took faithful heed to all that the Lord has so faithfully *said to us beforehand!* "It would have been better that, in the times of peace, ye had let yourselves be instructed as Christians respecting the end of the world, than in the times of trouble to be *terrified* thereby like the world;"* or—we add—to let yourselves be deceived by false, fanatical *consolations;* for Christ means rather a being seduced into false tranquility, than a being terrified. His warning prediction embraces the entire period of waiting for the appearing and setting up of his kingdom; and is, in the general sense, to be understood in the light of the earlier discourse, Luke xvii. 20–23. *Behold here or there*—this can never be said of the kingdom of Christ, which (rightly understood) actually remains an "invisible Church" until one day the manifestation and revelation of what is now concealed shall appear undeniably to all. The expressions "in the *desert* or in the *chambers*"—are intended to specify the *here or there* under two aspects. They are selected with reference, in part, to the circumstances of the judgment upon Jerusalem; when *ψευδόχριστοι* or *false Christs* raised tumults and led out their followers openly into the desert, as Acts xxi. 38, and many instances in Josephus, while the *ψευδοπροφῆται* or *false prophets* called to secret consultation or waiting in their chambers. Then, however, they form in general a variously significant antithesis of possible seduction. The one points us *widely* to the great desolate Church, the other *narrowly* to manifold sects and schisms; hence the latter, as opposed to the former, stands in the plural.* The invisible presence of Christ is indeed here as well as there; yet not exclusively here or there, so that those who wait for him should confine themselves to any particular place. The deceiving voices would "limit Christianity to this and that system and practice"—"would allure now to strictness, again to laxity, now to separation, again to union"—offer at one time open power and authority, and, at another, secret, false spirituality—and in whatever other ways it might be interpreted. Always there are two main by-paths, in the perplexed times of the Church waiting for its Lord, which in reality correspond to Sadduceeism and Pharisaism. The *frivolous* seeking of Christ there in the desert, seems good and wide-hearted; but there is in it the leaven of unbelief in the spiritual inner reality of his kingdom. The *fanatical* seeking of Christ here in the chambers, seems earnest and zealous; but there is in it the leaven of hypocrisy, of impure separatism arising from individual caprice. In truth Christ *is* already in every place where souls, in full humility, and patience of faith in *his* words alone, wait for his

* Nitzsch, *Wittenberger Predigten von* 1819, p. 46.

* We do not retract this, in spite of Lange's opposition (ii. 3, p. 1271); and still think that the antithesis of public and private, general and particular, is far more definitely indicated here than the strangely inverting interpretation, according to which the desert would signify the renunciation of the world, the store-room of the enjoyment of earthly goods. Those who find a reference in *ἔρημος* to the "Eremites" forget that in *biblical* usage *ἔρημος* and מִדְבָּר mean only the uncultivated expanse; and so *ταμεῖον*, with the idea of privacy (Matt. vi. 6; Luke xii. 3), points back only to the Heb. חֶדֶר, which frequently occurs in this sense. The latter point, at the same time, applies by way of refutation to the fault found by Sepp with the Lutheran translation.

appearing; but this *visible manifestation* of his kingdom will not come so long as any one can doubt or deny, so long as a dispute can arise between a here *or* there.

Verses 27, 28. Does not our Lord *now* at last speak of his yet future advent? it might be asked, seeing that the preceding word, with its deep significance, already extends to the later time. To this we answer that he certainly speaks of this; as in the entire prophecy every thing points to the end, and therein alone finds its last truth. But, as surely as the expressions of ver. 26 were not yet completely loosed from the type, so surely does he speak here also *in the first place* still of the *coming of the Son of Man* denoted in chaps. x. 23, xvi. 28, for the first preliminary manifestation of his kingdom, the salvation of his people, the punishment of his enemies; as demonstrated when all the Jewish and Gentile world saw his hand and power, and the certain truth of his word, in the judgment upon Jerusalem. *Like the lightning*, which shoots under the whole heavens (Job xxxvii. 3)—this means, first of all only in contrast with what goes before, So suddenly, so *manifestly* and *indubitably*, that no saying and crying Here or There is any longer necessary.* If at that time the whole world did *not* see or recognize *Christ* in this gleaming lightning-flash of wrath upon Israel, and the gracious light upon his Church, we mark in that the imperfection of the type; for the rest, however, it is clear that not till ver. 30 is the visible *coming* of the Son of Man spoken of with yet more definite expressions. Therefore the *παρουσία* which shows itself *only* in the manner of lightning is still distinguished from the *personal* coming. But here we must be on our guard against all ingeniously idealistic generalizing of the idea; as, for example, Lange (after having called [*Leben Jesu*, i. 38] even the first appearing of the Lord, "a great lightning-flash upon the world") speaks of "the illuminating lightning, the world-purifying storm of the *spirit of John*, in its power of light and fire" (p. 267)—and the like. Such notions only lead away from the proper interpretation of the text, which here plainly means a convincing, undeniable, *suddenly* appearing *fact*. And one, indeed, in which (as must ever be repeated) there is a twofold correspondence between the first and the second fulfillment. Dorner's view, that ver. 27 can *only* denote the *παρουσία κατ' ἐξοχήν*, the *extremum judicium* (pp. 17–27), is without foundation; our Lord, in other places, spoke of the destruction of Jerusalem under the name of his coming, Matt. xvi. 28, x. 23. In the earlier preparatory discourse, Luke xvii., in which naturally the two events are as yet interwoven with each other throughout, the disciples (because he has repelled the Pharisees with their *when*) inquired at least concerning the *where;* and Christ gave them for answer the same saying with which he now in Matthew, closes the prophecy respecting Jerusalem in particular. Yet Dorner, with perfect justice, says that the meaning here is, *non in civitate et urbe hac vel illa* (*e. g.* Hierosolymis, Pepuzæ) *apparebo, sed quousque extensa est mundi generis humani putredo*—yet this by no means excludes the fact that the idea *takes its start* from *Israel*.

There can, in general, be no doubt* that what is here spoken of under the figure of the eagles gathered around the carcass, is the *judicial punishment* which connects itself with the advent of Christ (and which, even in the first coming, is what chiefly makes it visible). For our Lord uses this particular figure not as a proverb in general, but as a biblical and still more as a prophetical proverb; and he therefore gives thereby again a *sign* arising from the coincidence with earlier prophecies. The נֶשֶׁר or "eagle" the Bible as also the Greek ἀετός, includes also the *vulture*, to which we do not now give the name of *eagle*, but which as is well known, even Pliny classes with eagles; hence first of all in Job the original proverb, As an eagle flies to the prey (chap ix. 26), *where a carcass is, there is he*, by a wondrous instinct he can scent and descry it from afar (chap. xxxix. 30). When Moses (Deut. xxviii.), with remote indefiniteness, portrays the variously fulfilled future punitive judgment upon Israel, and speaks of the *nation* which the Lord will send upon them from afar (first of all the Medes and Chaldeans, comp. ver. 48 with Jer. xxviii. 13; ver. 50 with Lam. v. 12; Isa. xlvii. 6, xxxiii. 19; but afterwards, also the Romans, comp. ver. 52 with Luke xix. 43), he first makes use of the figure of the eagle hasting to his prey (ver. 49). Then Hosea, ch. viii. 1, alludes to the same figure; and afterwards Habakkuk thus designates chiefly the Chaldeans (chap. i. 8). It follows therefore that Christ now points back to that first judgment upon Jerusalem; because all these form one connected series of types which reflect each other, the earlier of which always at the same time prophesies of the later, even to the last. He will thereby say that *God's fundamental principle in all judgments* remains the same, in so far as a corruption that has grown to maturity draws down punishment, not merely by the rules of perfect justice, but also by a necessity inherent in itself; quite *naturally*,

* Here the exegesis of the Irvingites says truly: "The lightning comes out of the dark cloud, and before it goes the storm, not the morning twilight."

* Nevertheless, many well-meaning commentators (following the ancients, Theophylact, Euthymius) even to this day hold fast what continued for an unaccountably long period to be the orthodox interpretation, and which even Luther thus expresses: "*As the saying runs*, Where a carcass is, etc., as the eagles gather together wherever the carcass is—so shall my people gather themselves to me! Where I am there shall my elect also be!" The Irvingite tract already mentioned, *Das prophetische Wort*, lays emphasis on this, that eagles consumed only animals *newly* dead, therefore the carcass here signifies the Saviour who died for us, yet saw no corruption; and this passage denotes "the withdrawal of the Church to Christ."

so to speak, just as the eagles are made for and find out the carcass.* That which is dead grows putrid; and what is putrid is consumed and cleared away to make pure air, by those agents which are made and appointed to that end by God. The "putrid carcass of the state" and the dead, corrupting national condition of Israel, was, at that time, the carcass around which the eagles could not but be gathered; even so will it be one day with Christendom, when Christ comes the second time. The putrefaction and corruption of the dead forms a fearfully appropriate figure (chap. xxiii. 27) for all self-dissolution on the part of sinful nations and multitudes of people prepared for the judgment. Still we must not explain this first of all of the Roman *eagles;* this was only added as one of those providential ironies of so-called chance, such as are often presented in the history of the world when viewed in the light of the prophetic word. The angels of judgment (ver. 31, chap. xiii. 41) will one day completely execute the consuming, desolating Woe upon the great πτῶμα or *carcass;* and there may be a hint of this when, in Rev. viii. 13. the angel who denounces the Woe is also called a flying eagle. In this respect, as Hofmann† perceives, it is not at all so much amiss (as regards the final sense) to explain the ἀετοί of angels.

If, after all that has been said, we do not yet understand what an advance over a wide intervening space is indicated by the *prophetic* εὐθέως, *immediately*, that follows in Matt. ver. 29, *Luke*, ver. 24, comes to our aid, with a clearly decisive word evidently belonging to *this place*. The *wrath upon this people* will not entirely consume and exterminate them from the earth (Deut. vi. 15, ix. 25; Amos ix. 8, 9); but they shall partly fall by the sharpness (or devouring mouth) of the sword, partly be led captive *among all nations*, according to the prophecy which has been in course of accomplishment since Deut. xxviii. 64, which was by no means fulfilled in the first exile, but is manifestly so now even to this day. Their *captivity* by the hand and counsel of God mocks all attempts at emancipation, just as the continued existence of the oppressed and homeless people among the nations defied all the cunning and power of Egypt to effect their extinction. And *Jerusalem?* Destroyed and laid waste, indeed, as it never was before, there will not remain a Jerusalem, but—a sanctuary *trodden under foot*, a (former and future) city of God given over to the Gentiles. (Ἔσται πατουμένη expresses more than πατηθήσεται.) It is again a prophetic word; for, in this prophecy of Christ all former threads run together, to show us the foreknown unity of the prophesying Spirit. *Being trodden down* indicates in general a being oppressed, ignominiously treated, brought under subjection by the power of the enemy (for example, Jud. x. 8, at the beginning of the judicial punishment upon Israel); and Daniel afterwards prophesies of the sanctuary being trodden under foot, chap. viii. 10, 13, (of which in 1 Macc. iii. 45, 51, iv. 60, the first fulfillment follows), as Isa. lxiii. 18, lxiv. 10. 11, had already spoken of it (not without *recompensing* reference to chap. i. 12). Comp. still Rev. xi. 2.* The hand of the Lord rests wonderfully upon this city, and its entire typical history: the Zion and Jerusalem of God, because its inhabitants have become Amorites in the complete measure of sin, because they themselves have polluted and trodden down the sanctuary, must, through the abiding abomination of desolation, itself become a *Jebus* (יְבוּס, trampled place), ere the original *Salem* of Melchisedec returns. For the state of being trodden down lasts a long time, but not always. Julian, indeed, will in vain attempt to build, and the Crusades will in vain again sanctify it; but the Lord has appointed the end, "*Until* the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled." Luther understood this to mean: "Until the Gentiles are converted to the faith, that is, until the end of the world"—but we now understand the prophetical theology better. The *times* of the Gentiles can only be the *times of calling*† appointed, for them as for Israel, by the grace and long-suffering of God; and they are fulfilled or expire—*i. e.* (in the correlate expression which belongs thereto), the *time* of the *end*, the day of judgment is come—when the Gentiles also are ripe for a like *judgment* to that of Israel. This however is meant every where by the prophetical expressions; see Isa. xiii. 22; Jer. xxvii. 7; Ezek. xxi. 25, xxii. 3, and in particular Ezek. xxx. 3, an allusion to which passage our Lord has doubtless here in his mind. The *Gentiles*, however, are not merely "the Romans, on whom the Germans fulfilled the judicial punishment" (Braune), but all non-theocratical nations through the whole course of history, chiefly the Christendom proceeding from them. In this entire, long period is accomplished the gathering together of the faithful out of all nations, the coming in of the πλήρωμα or *fulness*—but then the treading down of Jerusalem ceases, and it is built again; then will Israel be restored out of all nations, all as the prophets have prophesied, and Christ here points to this in the ἄχρι, *until*, which confirms all. Compare, finally, the very strikingly harmo-

* What Von Gerlach remarks is very striking, that, to a certain extent, every thing in this prophecy arranges itself around ver. 28 as a main and fundamental proposition—judgment upon what is ripe for judgment; therefore the destruction also of the *outward* false kingdom of God is in the course of nature the necessary end.

† *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, ii. 278.

* All these passages abundantly refute that trivial rendering by Bolten, "Jerusalem will be *inhabited* by the Gentiles;" that is, will be trodden, for which signification of πατεῖν Wahl's *Clavis*, which interprets it in the same way, adduces other passages of the Sept. and Greek writers.

† Therefore, something else than (according to Lange) the time when they shall exist as *political powers* and rule over Jerusalem.

nious passage of the apocryphal book Tobit, where at chap. xiv. 4, 5, it was already said, according to genuinely prophetical intuition: "Jerusalem shall be desolate, and the house of God in it shall be burned, and shall be desolate *for a time;* and again God will have mercy on them, and bring them again into the land, where they shall build a temple, but not like the first, *until the time of that age be fulfilled*" (*Ἱεροσόλυμα ἔσται ἔρημος, καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ κατακαήσεται καὶ ἔρημος ἔσται μέχρι χρόνου. Καὶ πάλιν ἐλεήσει αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεός, καὶ ἐπιστρέψει αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ οἰκοδομήσουσι τὸν οἶκον, οὐχ οἷος ὁ πρότερος, ἕως πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος*)—this latter here in quite another sense.

THE MIDDLE ADVENT: APPEARING OF THE KINGDOM: GATHERING TOGETHER OF THE ELECT.

(Matt. xxiv. 29–44; Mark xiii. 24–33; Luke xxi. 25–36.)

We have, in our interpretation hitherto, studied as much as possible to abide by the literal and clear sense, applied to the nearest fulfillment, that which already lies historically before us. We could not and would not deny, that all that has been said by our Lord at the same time reaches much farther; but, in order not to offend the majority of our readers, who could hardly tolerate such things, we refrained from disclosing the typical reflections lying behind the prophetical word, and from bringing into notice those hints, whether in great things or in small, which are interspersed here and there for the searching eye (as for example, that the lightning of the advent of the Son of Man shines *from east* to west and *vice versa*). Now, however, when Christ begins to prophesy exclusively and properly of the future, which is as yet concealed from us, *interpretation*, in the strict sense of the word, ceases. He who has forgotten and lost sight of the fact (as, alas! many critics at the present day), that, according to the clear declarations of Christ elsewhere, the catastrophe of Jerusalem and Israel was itself a coming of the Son of Man, could of course not agree with what has been said hitherto from this point of view; he who forgets, further, that all prophecy, according to its nature, must, with all clearness on the whole, retain, before its fulfillment, a certain measure of obscurity in the particulars—he who will handle a prophetical text just as he would other historical and didactic texts, will from this point onwards be still less able to reconcile himself to the word of Christ, and our attempts to interpret it. It is impossible, however, for us to pay continued attention to such folly, because that would every where prevent us from saying any thing to those who do understand.

An old and, in this form at least, obsolete exegesis (such as is represented, for example, by the English Newton, in his otherwise valuable work upon the prophecies), understood Matt. xxiv. 29–44, solely of the destruction of Jerusalem; but such an interpretation could be based only on a lamentable torturing of the words, the possibility of which indeed lies in this, that this second section of the discourse contains typical *glances backwards* to that first, just as the former was spoken in purely typical *prospective views*. But that with ver. 29 a *section* actually begins, in which the word quite plainly brings to view *another* coming of the Son of Man, ought to be an unconditionally settled point with every commentator who reverently takes the three Evangelists together; and it is determined already by the *καιροὶ ἐθνῶν*, "times of the Gentiles," in Luke, here put between with a far-reaching *ἄχρι*, "until." *Consequently* the *εὐθέως*, "*immediately*," in Matt., on which the critics still always stumble, ought not to lead us astray, but must be understood in accordance with the prophetical manner of viewing events together. Every other letter of the passage points clearly enough to the true sense of the Spirit in this one little word. *Those days:* these are the same of which vers. 19 and 22 spoke; therefore also the expression "*after* the tribulation of those days," is here an evident assurance, that what is *now* to happen will follow after the *shortening* of this tribulation; *i. e.*, further, as after the *τότε*, "then," ver. 23, so after the "coming of the Son of Man" which is meant at vers. 27, 28, namely, when this prepares the way for itself *the second time* by similar terrors, and then displays itself indubitably now for the first time properly in a visible form. One has only to read Mark, ver. 24, as Bengel rightly, without the comma after *ἡμέραις*, "days," in order to find every thing in perfect harmony ("*Post* tribulationem *illam* erunt *dies illi*, ergo alio spectat *illam*, alio *illis*. *Illam* respicit totum sermonem præcedentem, sed *illis* ad novissima prospicit, uti ver. 32"). When our Lord, in the certainly remarkable *εὐθέως*, "immediately," hastens over the great *μετά*, "after," through all the *καιροὺς ἐθνῶν*, "times of the Gentiles," this is neither an ordinarily historical "immediately," as the English Bible renders it, nor a פֶּתַע (already indeed falsely thus rendered in the Greek text), nor "suddenly, unexpectedly"* (see verses 42–44), meant merely of the *final* end. What then? First of all, the key lies already in the declaration of Christ respecting his own ignorance of the time (ver. 36, Mark ver. 32), according to which he himself, seeing events in close proximity, overlooked the wide intervening space.† Then, however, according to the

* For which Lange also again decides! Comp. Dorner's Note, p. 3, which mentions by name the principal commentators of this class.

† *Not merely*, as Bengel thinks, "Of that which is to happen after that calamity of the destruction of

spirit of all prophecy, this εὐθέως is perfectly correct; it indicates that the fulfillment *hastens* to the end in a strictly defined and ceaseless development (Hab. ii. 3), and that chiefly its latter stages will transpire abruptly and suddenly. If this εὐθέως cannot be so understood (we ask in opposition to Dorner)—what, then, is meant by the apocalyptic ἐν τάχει and ταχύ, "quickly"? (Rev. i. 1, xxii. 6, 7.) We hold it undisturbed with honest Roos, who here observes: "In truth the waiting of Jesus until all his enemies become his footstool is no *tedious* waiting! His glorious coming is *to him* so near, that he represents himself as one who is *soon* to come." This is what is *true* and justifiable in the *fraus optica*, at which Dorner is so horrified, which already in the lowliness of his human vision made the long time appear shortened.*

All that Christ has further to say respecting his *middle* coming, in order to the manifest *appearing of the kingdom* for his elect then gathered together (as this was spoken of above), includes both the *prophecy itself* that speaks of it, and also the three warning parables on to chap. xxv. 30. The prophecy itself mentions first *what* will happen, and then gives a declaration respecting the *When*. Here, also, are analogous signs (as in vers. 6–8), only now presented in shorter compass, in a more condensed form (ver. 29); then *the* directly announcing sign, and the *coming* of the Son of Man himself—his coming visibly before all the tribes of the earth to *judgment*, ver. 30, as also for the *saving* gathering together of his people, ver. 31 (both corresponding to vers. 27, 28). If the first question of the disciples, *When* will this come to pass? still remained for the final answer, Christ at last replies to it here in a twofold manner; at the same time, carrying back the end to the beginning, but *no longer* speaking expressly of the destruction of Jerusalem. There is first of all a *general asseveration* that all shall certainly come to pass at its proper time: all the signs as surely as the fig-tree again puts forth shoots. Israel is indeed destroyed, but still remains spared, vers. 32–34 (for the future conversion, chap. xxiii. 39) —nay, the complete fulfillment of every word even to the last is here certified, as surely as heaven and earth pass away! ver. 35 (On the sense of these asseverations afterward more particularly.) Hereupon follows at last the definite conclusive declaration respecting the *time*, *day*, and *hour*, according to human calendar-reckoning. *No one* knows it, ver. 36—the coming of the Son of Man will at all events happen unexpectedly; as for the race of men who are to be judged, like Noah's time, vers. 37–39; so, with its separation between the judged and saved, vers. 40, 41, for *his people* also, who are therefore directed to *wait* and *watch* from one generation, to another, vers. 42–44 (watch, for ye *know* not time and hour! ver. 43. *Remember ye* what others forget! ver. 43. Thus *be ready!* ver. 44). This conclusion already in the parabolic form then leads over to the following parables.

Verse 29. The interpretation, recently brought forward by Dorner with great confidence and much acuteness, according to which vers. 29, 30 are not at all to understood of the *rebus extremis* (which, indeed, his mistaken *nexus* forbids him to say), but of the destruction and overthrow of the heathen world, gradually going on through the entire period of history—is the strangest and most forced thing in the whole of his learned monograph. "*Paganorum* imperiorum gloria splendorque interibit, orbis terrarum evadit Christianus et novum aevum incipiet." The powers of the world are no longer worshipped; Christ sitting in the heavens reveals himself to the world. "Jam adest secundum stadium (*οἱ καιροὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν*) continens *Ethnicismi occasum!*" This is without example in the whole ancient Scripture, the language of which alone Christ as Prophet in Israel, can speak; we find rather in the prophets the whole of the figures here used, always applied only to judgments as *types of the end of the world*. (The assertion directed against this, p. 54, 55, is completely erroneous.) We shall not, therefore, in this our second edition deviate from our interpretation hitherto.

The darkening of the light or the lights is, first of all, a general metaphor for the extinction of happiness, the coming in of the tribulation and anguish; so, for example, Jer. xv. 9, and, in the microcosm for the individual, the day of death, which is his last day (Eccles. xii. 2). Then, in particular, the obscuration of the lights of heaven, the sun, moon, and stars,

---

Jerusalem, the most immediate thing which it is proper for me now to announce and for you to expect is, that the sun," etc. But Christ actually *speaks* bona fide just as he himself *sees*. [We cannot accept the author's interpretation of our Saviour's language. We admit indeed, on Christ's own direct assertion, that the *time* of the end was a secret veiled even from his human consciousness, but this is a very different thing from any *misconception* of the matter on his part. The author's argument is even destructive of his own position: for how, if Jesus did not know when the final catastrophe should occur, could he with the least candor venture thus to assert its immediate connection with any preceding events.—Am. Ed.]

* It is finally not to be overlooked, that every generation is to wait for Christ; and probably for those who die in this attitude of expectation the space of time to the fulfillment is one that quickly passes over. Roos: "The apostles, also, were to represent this as something near; for the greatest part of their *waiting* was to be passed in heaven, where there is no being weary." Let the commentator, with true thoughts of death, transpose himself into that frame and that point of view which reduces to small compass the little bit of history upon earth before the last day. [The author here loses sight of the real point of difficulty. Our Saviour does not merely express *haste* or speediness, which in a highly impassioned style may be measurably extended, but a positive *consecution* of events in explicit terms. Moreover the passages from the Apocalypse are not in point, as they probably refer to more proximate events.—Am. Ed.]

is a figure variously recurring in the prophets, expressive of great *tribulations* and *judgments* upon nations and men on the earth, Isa. v. 30, xiii. 10, xxxiv. 4; Jer. iv. 28; Ezek. xxxii. 7, 8; Amos viii. 9; Mic. iii. 6. The word of Christ here certainly includes also this *figurative* sense; and teaches us to expect again, before his second coming, great θλίψεις and ἀνάγκας, *tribulations* and *distresses*. Here it is chiefly the heaven of the Church that is spoken of: the sun of revealed religion; the moon of intellectual culture and science, upon which the sun casts its rays (while in other respects sun and moon neither shine nor are darkened together); the stars of the heads of Churches and ecclesiastical teachers (see already Dan. viii. 10, 11, and then Rev. i. 20, xii. 1)—all these will be darkened in the great falling away, which takes place ever more and more at different periods.* In this sense it is not said that the stars fall *to the earth*; but (as Mark has it) only an ἐκπίπτειν, a *falling out* or extinction of these in the heavens. But the word then reaches further: although the literal fulfillment actually comes only as a corresponding testimony to the figurative fulfillment that precedes it, seeing that what is outward and material is in general what is unsubstantial in God's world, although the darkening in the heaven of humanity is the proper reality, of which that in the *physical* heaven is rather only the figure—yet for this very reason, *must* this *physical* realization of the multiplying signs (Joel iii. 4) quite as certainly follow, even to the last letter of the prediction. The shaking of the heavens with the earth (Hagg. ii. 6, 21)† fulfills itself not merely before, in great commotions of the world (there, vers. 8, 22), but *at last actually* just as it is interpreted in Heb. xii. 26, 27; see Rev. vi. 12–15 with reference to Isa. xxxiv. 4, l. 3.‡ At all events, in no sense are we to understand it of occurrences "in the heavenly regions," which remain invisible to men upon earth; but of truly visible things within the horizon of human vision. The δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν, *powers of heaven*, are also not the stars, which were already named (צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם, comp. Psa. xxxiii. 6; Isa. xxxiv. 4, Sept.); still less the angels, who are then to be "in great commotion," for they immediately follow in their own proper name;* but, as the Vulgate puts it in this instance correctly, *virtutes coelorum*, the sustaining and working powers of the heavenly edifice (with their influences upon the earth). Our Lord means to say, finally summing up, All things shall be shaken, and at last dissolved, so that not even "one stone shall remain upon another" (2 Pet. iii. 10–12). Still he now only touches preparatorily on this actual passing away of the heavens with the earth, which is reserved for the *third* coming (ver. 35); inasmuch as (not indeed without reference to Haggai) he merely signifies a forewarning σαλευθῆναι or *shaking*, and only announces this as preparing the way for the next τότε, *then*, ver. 30 (here the οὐρανός and its νεφελαί are still in existence).

See now how in harmony with this Luke, vers. 25, 26, first of all mentions similar σημεῖα or *signs* in sun, moon, and stars; then, however, he adds, what Christ certainly also said, how it will be ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, *upon the earth*: a fearing and trembling of nations on account of such signs, a fainting away of men from *fear* of an evil conscience, which by these signs speaks to them of judgment, and from expectation of the things that are to come upon the world—for they will not expect him, the coming One; therefore as a punishment the wilfully blind fear of an indefinite something, as we often already plainly see it in the unbelieving race of our own days. The raging sea and its σάλος or *waves*, are spoken of in like manner, in a twofold sense: figuratively of the disturbances of nations, as the πόλεμοι and σεισμοί, *wars* and *commotions*, Matt. vers. 6, 7 (for see Psa. xlvi. 4, lxv. 8, lxxxix. 10, 11, xciii. 3; Isa. xvii. 12, 13; Rev. xvii. 15), but also *literally* as the accompanying testimony.

Verse 30 *This* is a *different* τότε, "*then*," from all the preceding, with an open prophecy brought much nearer; an actually personal ἔρχεσθαι or *coming* of the Son of Man, still more properly visible than the lightning-like παρουσία or *presence*, ver. 27. For the whole scene gradually draws nearer and nearer to one end after the other. Here already, at the beginning of the section, is a stronger expression than at the end of the first, ὄψονται, "they shall see," and φανήσεται, "shall appear;" for, after all the signs mentioned at ver. 29, there goes immediately before the proper coming still a *sign of the Son of Man in heaven*—now mysterious in the prophecy, but quite manifest in the fulfillment—which is

* It remains a question whether the ruling powers in a *political* respect (in so far as they are connected with the outward Church in Christian and Christianly governed nations) are here also meant. Compare again an Irvingite essay by John Hooper, entitled: "*Translation or Transformation of the living saints.*"

† Where also just as here in the *prophetical* period there is a "yet a little."

‡ I shall therefore certainly not deny this real destruction of the present world, which the entire Scripture certifies, nor interpret the words of Jesus here *merely* figuratively of the preceding commotions of the world and Church. When, however, Kurtz (*Bibel u Astronomie*, p. 126) maintains against me that the application of that prophetical usage, otherwise recognized, is inadmissible here, because the same thing is said previously in dry and naked words—he greatly mistakes the prophetical manner, which often says the same thing in different sections, now figuratively and now properly. In this chapter, indeed, vers. 4–14, had partly a generally introductory, anticipative character, partly again, vers. 29, 30 speak purposely in expressions respecting the end as at last literally so coming.

* Also not the *mountains* that bear the heavens, its pillars, as Sepp has fancifully explained it.

most emphatically announced by the article. Here, therefore, is the final answer to the question, ver. 3 (*What the sign of thy coming?*). Already on account of the reference to the question of the disciples, but also according to the clear word itself, we cannot possibly understand by this sign the *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* or *Son of Man* himself, in his visible appearance;* for the seeing of him who comes is distinguished and separated from the appearing of his sign, by the lamentations that come between. Therefore it is not a special token connected with his visible appearance, to prove the identity of the glorious Lord with him who was once crucified, such as the wounds in his side (Rev. i. 7; Zech. xii. 10); but certainly some sign of his approach plainly manifesting itself to all the world, analogous to those foregoing signs in the heaven; and still at last *ἐν οὐρανῷ*, "in the heaven," of which we are warranted only in saying with Von Meyer, "It remains uncertain until the fulfillment."† The nearest analogy is certainly to the star of the magians; except that then the significance of it will be indubitably evident to all. All *φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς* or *tribes of the earth* shall beat the breast, and utter lamentations;‡ *i. e.*, not merely the tribes of the land of Judah (although Zech. xii. 10–14 has a typical connection therewith), but the *ἔθνη* and *ἄνθρωποι ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ*, or *nations* and *men on the earth*, as is plainly to be read in Luke (comp. Rev. i. 7, *πᾶς ὀφθαλμός*, and the *φυλαί* there as at Rev. v. 9, xi. 9, xiv. 6 in the sense of כָּל־מִשְׁפְּחוֹת הָאֲדָמָה, also Rev. vi. 15–17). First, there is the cry of lamentation, *He cometh!* before they *see* him. Then, however, he cometh *in the clouds of heaven;* which here, as in chap. xxvi. 64, and also in Mark, is the *intermediate* expression between *μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν*, "*with* the clouds," Rev. i. 7 (at the same time his continual coming in the cloud-veil of judgments, which already run through the whole history of the world) and *ἐν νεφέλῃ*, "*in* a cloud," in Luke, which designates still more clearly the advent-cloud (the white horse, Rev. xix. 11) as corresponding to that cloud of the ascension (Acts i. 9, 11).* Thus, in a way which we cannot now more nearly determine, will actually follow the *middle* coming of the Son of Man (of which in general Rev. xix. prophesies); although it does not yet coincide with Matt. xxv ?1 (in *his* entire and full glory), yet by a visibly personal manifestation: *μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς*, "with power and *great* glory." This *δύναμις* or *power* is again not to be understood of an accompanying host of angels or saints, but merely corresponds to the powers of heaven mentioned before; as a *δύναμις θεοῦ* or *power of God*, irresistibly manifesting itself in his coming and judging, as the *δόξα*, "glory," the brightness (כָּבוֹד) that glorifies him, now alone shines after the darkening of the heavenly bodies, as a last type of that which, in a last future, according to Isa. xxiv. 23, lx. 19, 20, shall be literally fulfilled (Rev. xxi. 23). The entire description of the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds gives finally, at the conclusion of Christ's discourses to his disciples—as afterwards, chap. xxvi. 64, to his enemies—the most solemn declaration as to the sense in which he has called himself "Son of Man," viz., according to Dan. vii. 13, 14. This prophecy of Daniel indeed strictly points to this intermediate coming for the setting up of his *kingdom;* it again connects itself with the beginning of the last prophetical writing in the Scripture, Rev. i. 7, 13.

Verse 31. All power and glory is his, all angels are *his* servants and messengers. That which later, in Heb. i. 13 14, an apostle again begins patiently to teach for believers and unbelievers in Israel, Christ himself also testified from the beginning according to the Gospel of Matthew (chaps. xi. 27, viii. 41, xxii. 43). Only the angels (who in general know many things which no man knows, as ver. 36 afterwards indicates, 2 Sam. xi v. 20) know how to separate between the good and the bad, and rightly to bring together the elect from all quarters of the earth. The *trumpet* is not merely figurative, as according to Num. x. 2 the host or congregation of Israel was thus convoked; but rather

* Storr, to whose forced exegesis one is accustomed, says, "The Son of Man himself is *this wonder!*" So unhappily Bengel also: Ipse erit signum sui—for which he compares Luke ii. 12, where, however, it is not the child that is the *σημεῖον*, but the cradle and swaddling clothes. Recently Hofmann (*Weiss. und Erfüll.* ii. 185) very decidedly: "He himself, his own self-representation"—with reference to Bengel. Similarly at least Victor Andreä (*Lebensfragen der Kirche Christi*, p. 99): "The sign of all signs, the sign of the prophet Jonas in its last potency, the splendor of the resurrection-body." But the text *distinguishes* by a second *τότε* the coming itself.

† It is interesting to notice the different opinions that have been expressed on this point from the earliest times to the present day. The ancients (from Chrysostom and Theophylact downwards, also for example Beda, Thomas Aquin.): *a cross in the heavens.* Others: *the clouds in which he comes.* Also: *a comet*, such as it appeared according to Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vii. 30. Hunnius: *the star of the magicians.* Grotius: *the spread of the Gospel* (to which Dorner inclines). Others: *the sound signal-call of a trumpet.* The Irvingites now understand it to be *the first resurrection.* Finally, Rud Hofmann: *the appearance of a Son of Man at that time in the Holy of Holies* recorded in the Hebrew text of Josephus—because the Gospel which was published after the destruction of Jerusalem has introduced this.

‡ Where the play upon the word noticed by Lange: *κοψονται, ὄψονται*, can have been only accidental.

* For that (as Stein thinks, who so diligently traces out the usage) this *singular* in Luke is merely a consistency on the part of the writer, who in his two writings has never used this word in the plural, is a jejune remark. Besides chap xii. 54, the word occurs in "both writings" only at Luke ix. 34, 35 and Acts i. 9, where the singular is quite as distinctively correct as here.

to be understood as calling to mind the law of Moses, given on that day when the Lord himself summoned his people from Sinai with *the voice of a trumpet exceeding loud* (Exod. xix. 16, 19). This is what Christ means by the σάλπιγξ φωνῆς μεγάλης; for when he comes to judgment the law again comes into force for those who are judged, while, for the redeemed who have become his people by the obedience of faith, it is, "I am the Lord thy God!" The sound of trumpets is in general associated with any special solemnity in which *the King* reveals himself and is praised (Psa. xlvii. 5). What the Spirit in the Scripture, however, further prophesies of the seven trumpets, Rev. viii. 2, and a last one of all, 1 Cor. xv. 52, belongs not to the interpretation here; it is only to be observed that in this passage Christ means already the same trumpet which Paul, 1 Thess. iv. 16 (still distinguished from the voice of the archangel), mentions with reference to the first resurrection—on the other hand, 1 Cor. xv. points still further beyond. For although we do not know more particularly of these things, yet the return of Israel evidently in the prophetical word closely connects itself with the intermediate coming of Christ for the millennial kingdom. Here our Lord as yet conceals this *mystery*, as also the resurrection; yet the elect gathered together are now (while at the first appearing of the kingdom after Jerusalem's judgment it happened as described at Matt. viii. 11, 12) *chiefly* the restored of Israel: hence the expressions employed point back to Deut. xxx. 4; Isa. xi. 11, 12, xliii. 5, 6; Zech. ii. 6-13 (xiv 4, 5). Yet are the Gentiles, as the πλήρωμα or "fulness" brought in, joined to his saints (Psa. l. 1–5); and his whole people are the διασπορά or "dispersion" now brought together in power and glory (1 Pet. i. 1; James i. 1). The ἐπισυνάγειν or "gathering together" is seen to be something quite different from the fleeing out of Judea before! The elect tribe, as the people of *heaven* in opposition to the φυλαῖς τῆς γῆς or "tribes of the earth"—therefore also are they gathered from the ends of the heavens (in which again there is a hint as yet veiled of the resurrection). The somewhat different expression in Mark, "from the end of the earth to the end of the heavens"—means not merely what is directly equivalent to "from one end of the earth to the other" (Matt. ver. 27; Deut. iv. 32, xiii. 7, xxviii. 64), but, together with this, indicates that then, in general, heaven and earth shall wondrously come together.

Verses 32, 33. All this however takes place not at a period arbitrarily fixed by an interfering power, but according to a regular law of development and preparation: as the eagles of judgment do not come until the carcass grows putrid, so the elect are gathered into the heavenly garner when their *ripeness* is attained. In the fig-tree learn *the* parable—namely, of these things; so it runs quite exactly in Matthew. This, however, is the general sense of *the parable*, which we are to learn from the *fig-tree* (and *all* trees, as Luke adds): when the trees put forth shoots *the summer* is nigh (Song of Sol. ii 12, 13); therefore is the gloriously bursting fruit and harvest season of the kingdom of God near before the door (as the Judge, James v. 9), when *all these things* come to pass before the eyes of believers who perceive them, *i. e.*, when all the signs above mentioned, *together with this last one*, come. For the budding of the fig-tree is the surest sign of the season of the year. If any are satisfied with this point of comparison, viz., the certainty of the signs or indications which indeed also retains its truth, let them be so;* we think ourselves warranted in asking further, what then is this *fig-tree*, so significantly marked out? Even Ebrard rightly perceives that τῆς συκῆς is intended to bring to mind that fig-tree which was cursed by Christ;† but then he certainly interprets wrongly thus: When the poisonous bitter fig-leaves sprout, when the antichristian character grows and flourishes, then is the harvest time near, when the trees which have leaves *only* and no fruit, are cursed! For Christ gives here certainly a joyful sign of *summer*, pointing to the ripeness of the elect; and says nothing of "*only* leaves," or of poisonous leaves, as is proved already by the "*all* trees," which is added in Luke. These are certainly the blessed missions for the preaching of the Gospel among all nations (see in the antitype, Rev. xxii. 2)—shall then the late fig-tree, which once *withered* under the curse, also *again* bear leaves and fruit (which in this instance go together)? Clearly enough for a simple eye does Christ show here, in this significant parable, Israel again restored to life; he points to the greater blessing that will accompany the Jewish mission as the surest sign to his people of his near approach—as will be immediately confirmed to us in the following verse.

First, however, we must insert here what is said in Luke, ver. 28; because it refers not to those joyful tokens of spring, but to terrors

* As the treatise already mentioned well expresses it: "Then even the most simple peasant does not need to ask the learned, whether the summer is near."

† On the other hand Dorner has protested against this ancient interpretation, not first to be laid to my account, with an *Ingeniousius quam verus, arbitror*. He objects that Luke records nothing of that cursing, therefore that he cannot have thus understood the parable—as if an Evangelist knows only *the* incidents which he records, and as if he must already understand every thing in Christ's discourses which he records, exactly as *we* now do! When, further, Dorner requires the express naming of the *cursed* or *withered* fig-tree, at least an αὕτη as at ver. 34 (which yet would sound very awkward), this is contrary to the nature of such prophetical hints in their background where special reference is concealed beneath a general sense first of all. Thus "*the* fig-tree" may denote here in the first place only the species in natural history; but then comes the reminding hint in addition, for those who can perceive.

and anguish, vers. 25, 26. When men on the earth tremble for fear of the judgment, then shall the children of the kingdom, although partly involved in the distress, yet lift up their heads; for to them redemption comes, to them such tribulation is only "like a stormy thaw after a long winter, which announces the nearness of spring and the time of blossom" (Schmieder). The godless ones proudly stretched their neck on high, but must now bend in fear before the Lord when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth (Isa. ii. 10-22); while they who have humbled themselves in due time now on the contrary lift up their heads. Here, again, is the echo of that old word, 2 Chron. xv. 7. The near coming of the Lord comforts the hearts of those who wait for him; for the Judge is also the Saviour, and it is right in his sight to judge the one class, and to bring rest to the other, 2 Pet. ii. 9; 2 Thess. i. 5-10.

Verse 34. We have found, hitherto, a regular progress in the discourse, ever *moving onwards* from what is typically near to what is remote and prophetically near; and now, is it to be supposed that all at once "everything moves back again to the immediate presence of the apostles?" Yet we must suppose that our Lord thus moves to and fro in his discourse, if the term γενεά here can be understood as signifying only *generation*.* All these things of which he has spoken since ver. 29 shall *come to pass* before this generation passes; *i. e.*, not merely shall be visible in their beginnings (as Ebrard says, p. 613, not to speak of the complete confusion, p. 618). Besides, only an artificial interpretation which violates the simple flow and connection of the words can understand here an antithesis of different points of time; so that, while ver. 34 again refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, ver. 36 means the latter day of judgment, with a designed distinction. Bengel's long note which, according to a preferred reading, distinguishes between ταῦτα πάντα, ver. 33; and πάντα ταῦτα, ver. 34; and interprets, "All this which has regard to Jerusalem comes to pass even in this generation; but of *that* more distant day of the second judgment knoweth no man"—is in this instance a false complication, and an unwarranted interpolation of the text. Where, then, has Christ looked back to Jerusalem since ver. 29; and what meaning would lie in the parable of the fig-tree, whose withering rather than its budding again was what came to pass in this generation? The exact understanding of this figure assists us in determining what the γενεὰ αὕτη must be for both are in fact the same. The critics hitherto with their philological strictness have regarded it as a thing established that γενεά can signify only *generation* (which Strauss boastingly maintains), but this was not even correct philology. For Dorner, after Fritzsche had led the way, has proved with the most perfect demonstration that the fact is not as those critics supposed; and we very thankfully accept this, as it was by no means our wish even from the first (in the inexact expression of the first edition) to proceed *relaxando imperio philologico, renuente philologia.** But it was overlooked, with still greater injustice, that after all even a seeming contradiction with the classical Greek usage may lose its force when an expression can be shown to bear the peculiar stamp of biblical usage, from the Old Testament downwards. *This* latter, and, properly speaking, decisive, proof, which Dorner has merely touched, I on my part give here as a necessary supplement to his demonstration and earnestly request that he will consider it

Already in the prophetical usage of דּוֹר הַזֶּה *this aetas* in the Old Testament (frequently enough, comp. also הַמִּשְׁפָּחָה הָרָעָה הַזֹּאת, Jer viii. 3, Sept. γενεὰ) do we find that connection of the fathers with the children, which afterwards recurs in the discourses of Christ, now reaching forwards, now backwards. In confirmation of this we have, immediately above in Matt. xxiii. 36, a very decisive parallel. For, as there not merely the then present, last, *generation* was meant, but, including *backwards* the entire race as one stock and lineage, the entire people who are judged in the last generation (for at ver. 35 it is said: *Ye* have killed); so the term here has the same signification pointing *forwards*. Just because the children are like the fathers, γενεά in reference to the γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν passes beyond the *species* into the idea of the γένος; and *this* (as at all events *may* grammatically lie in the γενεά, *even if* no such passages occurred besides those in the Sept.) is the proper sense of this expression, when it is used concerning *Israel*. Not merely, to speak with Dorner, "significatio gentis *acuitur* in voce γενεά, si usurpatur de gente aliqua, quae est una inter alias. Sic enim est una et singularis, ut differat ab aliis, et peculiari quadam natura insignis sit seu *indole*. Quare γενεά non solum universim denotat gentem seu genus, sed notæ specificæ et singularis genus quoddam seu gentem." Not merely so; rather is Israel as this דּוֹר, or this γενεά, always

* As Erasmus has at least in Matthew and Luke put *aetas* for the *generatio* of the Vulg., making but an ill improvement. Here Dorner happily sees the truth, and restores its due honor to an interpretation hitherto almost rejected. Upon right grounds he builds the inference: Quare omnes reor concessuros, vocem γενεά, si eam vertas *aetas*, multas easque plane insuperabiles ciere difficultates, contextum vero et orationes progressum flagitare significationem gentis, nempe Judaeorum. With especial truth and force he notices that vers. 34 and 36 would contradict each other if Christ announced every thing still for the same generation; as well as that the first Christians, nay, the apostles, would not possibly have continued to *wait for* him, when Israel was not converted and Christ did *not* come; therefore that they cannot have so understood the word.

* Recently Hebart (*Die zweite sichtbare Zukunft Christi*, Erlangen, 1850, p. 43) has likewise referred simply to Homer, in a passage overlooked by Dorner.

designated with the accessory idea of *evil*. Such is, in particular, the meaning of Luke xvii. 25 (of this evil generation, the unbelieving and perverse, Matt. xvii. 17); and with this are then connected such passages as Luke xvi. 8, where the two γενεαί or γένη are contrasted: Acts ii. 40; Phil. ii. 15, the perverse generation of unbelievers; 1 Pet. ii. 9 the elect γένος or nation. All these passages are far enough removed from the more limited idea of generation;* so as to warrant us in understanding the same thing here by ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη, "this generation," as is meant in Luke ver. 23 by ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, "this *people*"—a very evident, and almost decisive parallel. When Olshausen admits "that every thing includes at the same time its further reference to the future"—we are entitled to ask: *What* further reference then does this γενεὰ include, if not the wondrous *continuance of* Israel even to the end, for which it is spared? We cannot even say here, with many, that the expression is transferred from the type to the antitype; that Christ speaks "with intentional *ambiguity*," so that the expression might denote as well the generation of his time as the Jewish people as a whole;† that he says "in a certain double sense, This generation of the men now living shall not pass away until all has come to pass that has reference to Jerusalem; and this generation, the people of Israel, shall not pass away until every thing further has come to pass."‡ For ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη does not at all mean a generation of men in general, but what Christ has every where before designated by this, viz., *the corrupt Israel;* and πάντα ταῦτα has now nothing more to do with the destruction of Jerusalem. *This* rather is the ὀξύμωρον of the ambiguous expression: this generation will, as it were, not die; it will propagate itself in children and children's children, as a generation ever the same as the present;§ this generation which rejects me will so remain until it again cries Hosanna to me in truth! The withered figtree will stand until it again puts forth shoots! Observe here that the οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ, "shall not pass," is quite parallel with the παρελεύσεται, "shall pass away," in reference to heaven and earth. And thus we have, in the words of Christ, a most significant reference to the historical miracle of the hand of God upon Israel (according to that ancient word of Balaam, Num. xxiii. 9), whose continued separate existence, ever maintaining the same nature and character of one race even under the curse, mocks the power and cunning of all nations, and contradicts all the usual order of history. It is related that a prince once asked a preacher* to mention to him a convincing argument for the truth of the Bible in one word; and the striking answer was, "*The Jews.*"† After these explanations it will be unnecessary to refute other more singular interpretations of γενεά; such as that which understands the nation of believers, Christendom,‡ or that which has been brought forward by the Irvingites.§

Verse 35. That which at the beginning in the Sermon on the Mount, chap. v. 18, and then again at Luke xvi. 17, was said of the law; that which already in the Old Testament was testified of the *word of God* in general (Psa. cxix. 89, 96; Isa. xl. 8)—our Lord here affirms of *his* words whose prophecy will therefore also not fail of fulfillment. It will rather obtain its entire fulfillment, and the word of God be established in everlasting continuance, precisely *when* heaven and earth shall pass away, and their present form be changed into a new one. First earthquakes, figuratively and literally (vers. 6, 7); then shaking of the heavens in the same twofold sense (ver. 29), finally, in the third epoch and last coming, to which Christ here *glances forward* in the futuro,

* Also in the Sept. γενεά stands often not merely for דּוֹר (as, for example, Psa. xcv. 10), but often more generally for מוֹלֶדֶת, patria, Num. x. 30, for מִשְׁפָּחָה, Lev. xxv. 41; Jer. viii. 3; even for עַם, Lev. xx. 18.

† Tippleskirch's *Zwanzig Predigten aus Rom*, p. 13.

‡ Schmieder's *Predigten zu Rom und Pforte*, p. 108.

§ Alford has correctly expressed it in the sense given above: "Never were a nation so completely one γενεά, in all accuracy of meaning, as the Jewish people."

* According to Eyth (*Klassiker und Bibel*) it was Frederick the Great and a learned man.

† Hamann expresses it more fully: "The far greater, immovably abiding, sign and wonder of a burning, unconsumed bush, in the colonies of that *extraordinary race of men* scattered even to this day over the wide world—speaking pillars of salt for the truth and certainty of the judgments once revealed in the old valley of vision and long since fulfilled, pledge and security for the hitherto as yet concealed treasure of those promises of grace and blessings with which heaven and earth are pregnant."

‡ So Origen, Chrysostom, and others. Dr. Paulus: "This my spiritual posterity, Christendom, shall survive it." With him Lange agrees: "This race of men planted by me, viz., believers, the disciples of Jesus as an imperishable race—this new race of men, noble race of Christians, the eternal spiritual generation—there will always be a Christian people." That this is meant "decidedly appears from the connection which he shows;" but we put another connection in opposition, and think it very flat to find here the assurance "that there will always be Christians!"

§ That generation which will *then* survive the before-mentioned signs, so that all will take place within the limits of a generation (John Hooper, *The Translation*, etc., p. 15; *Das prophetische Wort*, p. 42. Compare against this Tholuck's *Litt. Anz.* 1848. p. 270). [All this special pleading on the author's part, in favor of a forced signification of γενεά or *generation*, as denoting simply the Jewish race in general, is evidently imposed by his erroneous interpretation of ver. 29 above noticed. It is sufficient to adduce in refutation our Saviour's parallel expression, chap. xvi. 28.—Am. Ed.]

that passing away of the heavens and the earth properly speaking, which is predicted in Isa. li. 6; Psa. cii. 27; 2 Pet. iii. 7, 10; Rev. xx. 11, xxi. 1. At present, indeed, the fools say: Heaven and earth shall abide for ever, there shall be no last day, Christ's words shall pass away in the course of time—but we wait for the test.

Verse 36. Our Lord, having reached this point, now in the first place again connects together the last day of his coming with that announced at ver. 30, comprising them in the one ἡμέρα ἐκείνη or יוֹם הַהוּא, "that day" (chap. vii. 22); and he assures us that his people shall indeed perceive the ἐγγὺς ἐπὶ θύραις, "near at the doors," but that the exact determination of the time (for this is what is meant by καὶ ὥρα) is and remains what the Father reserves for himself alone. Not even "the decree of the watchers" in heaven (Dan. iv. 10, 14), which has many other times and hours in its knowledge, knows *this day;* but the Father alone, in the reserved, eternal decree—what a word against all such apocalyptic curiosity as degenerates into special reckonings of time! Mark expressly says also οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, *neither the Son;* Matthew has omitted this, but not from regard to the readers of the first Gospel (who, besides, rather entertained Ebionite views of Christ); for it is included in his ὁ πατὴρ μόνος, the Father *only*, just as in chap. xx. 23 the like antithesis occurs. *The Son* also knew not—he said of so important a thing as this, I also know it not—what a rebuke to the false theology which, without understanding the complete humanity of Christ, transfers the *communicatio idiomatum* into the state of his humiliation; and which, from the earliest times, could only wrest and trifle with this word.* He does not say, "This I have not to tell *you*, I know it not *for you*"—but "*the Son* knoweth it not;" thus he speaks of himself simply as of *the Father* and *the angels*. It is wrong also to have recourse to the artificial distinction that *as man* he knew it not, although as God he knew it; for such knowing and not-knowing at the same time severs the unity of the God-human person, and is impossible in the Son of Man, who is *the Son* indeed, but emptied of his glory. It is not enough to say with Bengel, "Quia non habuit in mandatis, ut diceret diem illum;" or with Melanethon (*Epist. ad Matthes.*), "Profitetur se nescire, in quantum missus est ad ministerium evangel.i, nescit ea *nobis*"†—but for himself and his own *course of faith*, in which, as our Leader, he must be like unto us (Heb. xii. 2), he *could not*, and was *not permitted to know* many things, and chiefly this. It is also too great a refinement to which some have recourse in order yet to find something of the *communicatio idiomatum*, when (as Lange), instead of allowing to this not-knowing the force of a "positive ignorance," according to the text, they merely understand it thus far, that Christ in his sphere of vision *would not* reflect upon it, in opposition to the sinful wish to know on the part of his disciples. Compare on this the convincing refutation which Liebner has given in his *Dogmatik* (i. 1, p. 22). We will allow nothing to explain away this rebuke addressed to that false curiosity and speculation which anticipates faith, and admits of no *Nescio!* The Father knows the day—the Son knew it not then when he thus spoke—and *the Spirit?* He indeed knows all things, and searcheth also the deep things of God, 1 Cor. ii. 10. Therefore the Spirit in the Father knew, the Spirit in the Son knew not: here, however, is the limit of our understanding as regards the mystery of the incarnation. Did the risen Lord know afterwards when he spake as in Acts i. 7? The words "it is not for you" at the beginning, are in favor of an affirmative answer; while those at the end "the Father hath put it in his own power" seem to say No. Indeed, we also might say here, "We know not," if there were not other grounds for believing that he who was about to ascend into heaven then knew. But that the ascended One, who now sits at God's right hand, knows all things, is quite certain; we doubt however very much whether, in the δεῖξαι τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ, *to show unto his servants*, Rev. i. 1, the revelation of the day and the hour is also included, as at least the calculations *hitherto* seem to show; and in our simplicity we think that no believer, even to the end, has a right to know more than the Son knew in the days of his flesh.*

Verses 37—39. Already in Luke xvii. had our Lord spoken similarly, with the addition of the times of Lot; for *all* strikingly prominent judgments of God, from the beginning, form a typical perspective, each reflecting itself in the other. This Christ here teaches, at the same time confirming the historical truth of that flood which swept away *all*, and that entering into the ark; declaring them to be as historically true as one day his own παρουσία or "coming" will be. Peter adduces the same parallel against the mockers, 2 Pet. iii. 5, 6. It is significantly not the crimes and vices of which the earth was then full, that are here mentioned—"these are but details which arise on the broad ground of the earthly mind" (Braune). Christ marks and describes, as the proper character and point of comparison, merely this *earthly mind*, which despises God's word and warning. After the general propo-

* As, for example, one may read in the *Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, 1828, p. 797. Ambrose, *De Fide* v. 8, appealed to old Greek manuscripts in which these words are not found; but who ventured to add them?

† Much earlier had Augustine said: "Nescit—non ad cognoscendum, sed ad proponendum." Hilarius: "Non sibi nescivit, sed nobis.

* "If the coming of Christ will be as a thief in the night, then can neither political arithmetic nor prophetical chronologies fix the day; and, to speak humanly, he who betrays the thief, may reckon at least for such revelations upon Satan's striking in the face, and that is not any body's affair" (Hamann).

sition, ver. 37, it follows more particularly: they lived in earthly enjoyments,* plans and projects (Luke xvii. 28), carried on merchandise, planting, building, as looking forward to a secure future—and cared not, or knew not, what was hanging over them, because, although it was indeed foretold to them, yet the day and the hour had not expressly been revealed. So shall also the *παρουσία* of the Son of Man be—now with a return to the more general expression, ver. 27, although in the first place, ver. 30 is meant. For, Christ is showing the similarity of all judgments; and in Jerusalem, even to the last moment, a blind security prevailed to a fearful extent. See here, at the same time, the reason why the wisdom of God reserves the day in his own power: in order that the righteous separation may be manifest between those who despise his word, and those who do not. It is, moreover, easy to understand how this security is not inconsistent with that fear, Luke, vers. 25, 26. They say: *It is peace!* and act outwardly as if it were so; but in their hearts and consciences the pangs of travail for the judgment are preparing themselves (1 Thess. v. 3). (Surgit amari aliquid, quod in ipsis floribus angit.)

Luke, having already at an earlier place recorded these words of Christ, now gives instead of them, vers. 34–36, another conclusion of the discourse: this may perhaps be intended to express the essential import of Matt. vers. 43–51, but it may also be an actual supplement of words originally spoken by our Lord. *Κραιπάλη καὶ μέθη* is, it is true, not precisely eating and drinking *excessively*, yet it is a general expression for all that indulgence in bodily and earthly enjoyments which clogs the *heart* and stupifies the inner man. This, however, is again a further warning figure for every sort of intoxication which may be opposed to sobriety and being filled with the Spirit (Rom. xiii. 13; Eph. v. 18; 2 Thess. v. 6, 7; 1 Pet iv. 7, 8)—even were it the most refined seemingly spiritual, yet sensuous intoxication in poetry, art, or the like. The *μέριμναι βιωτικαί* or "cares of this life" are only the other side of the same earthly mind; the two are essentially one and inseparable. *Ἀφνίδιος ἐπιστῇ, come unawares*, finds its literal echo again at 1 Thess. v. 3; just as the *praying always* enjoined by Paul, ver. 17 (as in 1 Pet. iv. 8), points back to this discourse of our Lord. "As a *snare* on all them that dwell on the earth"—reminds us of Isa. xxiv. 17; and the dwelling upon the earth again indicates the earthly character and mind, as frequently in the Apocalypse. "That ye may be *accounted worthy*;" as was said at Luke xx. 35, and as the apostle again repeats at 2 Thess. i. 5. Accounted worthy *to escape*—this points back to the first fleeing from the judgment of Jerusalem (Luke ver. 21; Matt. ver. 16) in the grand and significant unity of the whole; it is likewise, however, one of the manifest distinctions between the two, and is meant to say, In that second calamity it will no longer be possible thus to escape to the mountain, to a Pella! Finally, "*to stand* before the Son of Man"—first of all, to stand as one escaped from the judgment, saved from the wrath and judgment (Rev. vi. 17; Psa. lxxvi. 7; Nah. i. 6); but, then, at the same time, as the highest and last thing of which we can be made or thought worthy, viz., as heirs of his kingdom to stand before his face (Rev. xxii. 3, 4).

Verses 40, 41. With the twice repeated declaration, So also shall the coming of the Son of Man be! and the *glance back* to its *earliest* type, Christ now makes all his disclosures (which after all reach further and contain far more than we understand) *lead back* to the general warning, *Beware!* With this he began all, and with this he will end all; the advance made, however, from the first to the second consists in this, that the first warning, viz., the end cometh *not yet so soon!* is now changed into the opposite, Christ cometh unexpectedly, *be always ready!* This seeming contrast, in which when rightly understood there is perfect harmony, and which offers much material for thought, belongs also to the wondrously profound plan of the discourse; and so in like manner the contrast, thus sublimely harmonized only in the discourses of Christ, between the abstract and the concrete in the depths of all truth—here between the authoritative announcements, grasping the future as a present reality, and the simplest most condescending tone of instruction in closely connecting parables. Only *read* and *hear* the whole again from ver. 5 onwards, in order to feel how sublime beyond comparison, with what mildness in the midst of majesty, with what a holy play of imperturbably tranquil wisdom in the midst of world-judging severity, the prophetical discourse now passes into the *parabolical*. The first *transaction* is formed by the two sentences in vers. 40, 41, which still connect themselves with the foregoing prophecy, and yet are already spoken in the admonishing form of the parable. The two in the field and two at the mill are not selected in order to indicate that common people also shall be worthy of the kingdom (as Grotius thinks), or that nothing depends on worldly rank or position (as Braune arbitrarily finds only the masters in the field, the slaves at the mill), or even (what is quite self-evident) that nothing depends on sex, man or woman; but the whole is meant first of all prophetically to say, that when the work of life is going on, ver. 38, the separating judgment will *break in*. Then this separation is portrayed as *breaking through* all human fellowship: the foolish person relied upon his outward and earthly fellowship with the wise, and thought himself as secure as his companion. (Luke xvii. 34, still more strongly the two in one bed who are the same night

* *They drank*—wine also before the flood? The parallels, Matt. ver. 49 and Luke ver. 34, leave us to suppose this. *We* at least read in Gen. ix. 20, nothing of a first introduction of the vine, this "second tree of the knowledge of good and evil"—and Matt. xxvi. 29 shows us on the new earth what was therefore also from the beginning.

separated.) It is also thereby hinted, that those who are worthy of the kingdom, with all their internal readiness in watching and praying, yet do not idly separate themselves from the business and order of life. In the *parabolical* sense, however, they are at the same time male and female laborers in the service of Christ, who do not all stand before him—as a transition to the parables of the servants (and virgins). Finally, it is not to be mistaken, that the description in its antithesis to vers. 16–18 denotes quite different relations: the "being *taken*" is more than the fleeing there; but the "being *left*" is also, on the other, hand, not yet that which, in the following chapter, the last scene before the judgment-throne of the King will announce.

Verses 42—44. There is now a return from the third person to the direct *address:* because, according to ver. 36, no one can be sure at any time whatsoever that the Lord will not come to him; because at all events every human life has its last day at death, its judgment already very closely connected with the last judgment. The not-knowing stands in each of these three verses, while in the midst (ver. 43) is the true γινώσκειν or knowing. Christ comes to his people as *their Lord*, to the unfaithful and secure as a *thief* in the night (Obad. 5; Rev. iii. 3, xvi. 15); to both as the *Son of Man*. Our Lord has already, Luke xii. 39, 40, spoken of his coming as a *thief* in the same words;* and the same figure recurs at last in the Apocalypse. So his Spirit very fully comments upon this saying by the apostle at 1 Thess. v. 1–10: comp. there ver. 7 with Matt. ver. 49.

FIRST PARABLE: THE FAITHFUL AND WISE SERVANT.

(Matt. xxiv. 45–51; Mark xiii. 34–37; [Luke xii. 42–46].)

We are now to consider the first of the three parables which follow in full, forming in Matthew the continuation of the discourse. Parables like the first and third, according to Luke, our Lord had already spoken; but, as we in simplicity believe on the authority of Matthew, he now at the end repeats them with special significance. His last discourses recorded by John *before* the esoteric words spoken to his disciples are, in a great measure, references to what he has already spoken, as if he would now graciously and emphatically say, Behold, I have told it to you, remember it! (see Luke xii., especially the connection with vers. 31-35 before).

This parable of the *faithful and wise servant* applies, as we may easily see, chiefly to the official servants of Christ in his house or his Church; yet, at the same time, it is meant (like that of the laborers in the vineyard) for all Christians in common, as afterwards at chap. xxv. 14-30 still more plainly appears. First of all are described the official commission, faithfulness, and reward of the good and true servant (vers. 45–47); in order then to place in opposition to him the bad servant, in his false wisdom, or wicked folly (ver. 48), his unfaithful conduct, ver. 49, his terrible recompense from the Lord, who comes unexpectedly upon him with the punishment, vers. 50, 51.

Verses 45—47. *Who* is this faithful and wise servant whom I will now describe! Thus does Christ ask, to awaken and admonish; so that each one may ask himself, Is it I? does this picture answer to me? At the same time the question signifies what Luther, on Luke xii., has rightly paraphrased thus: "What a great thing it is to find such a servant! Will many such be found when Christ cometh?" In Luke the office was still more especially denoted by οἰκονόμος, "steward," as also the burning lights and marriage, vers. 35, 36—already a general anticipation of the parable of the virgins, which at last appears as a separate parable. All such affinity in the manifold discourses of Christ, at different times, is far more naturally explained on the supposition that he actually thus manifoldly yet harmoniously spake, than by the now favorite supposition of a confused arrangement on the part of the Evangelists. *Faithful and wise:* the first stands before the other, because the true wisdom of the heart that looks simply to the one thing (Luke ver. 34) proceeds from faithfulness, and is one with it. Yet so far as this is still wanting in us, we may on the other hand be incited to faithfulness at least from considerations of *prudence;* this salutary *fear* Christ will warningly and condescendingly recommend to us, at all events beside the *love* which indeed alone would be the entire faithfulness. He knows well the weakness which, even to the end, needs both the alluring and threatening presentation of reward or judgment; and he requires not the proud self-deception of the *amour pur*. The meat which the steward, placed over the domestic servants, is to give out, is his word for his servants; all labor of love towards the brethren, according to the talent of grace intrusted to him, which is to be profitably employed for the good of all. The article, τὴν τροφήν, "*his* [the] meat," means here the same which, in Luke xii., is called τὸ σιτομέτριον, "their portion of meat;" and points to the ὀρθοτομεῖν, "rightly dividing," 2 Tim. ii. 15, in its full signification: To every one his due, undiminished and unadulterated, wisely and faithfully, according to need and right.* The ἐν καιρῷ, beside it, has the like twofold signification: at the just and fitting season, so that it be neither neglectfully withheld nor inconsiderately given

* Compare there ver. 33, as in the Sermon on the Mount; from which we may see what the Judge, as a thief in the night, will suddenly take away.

* Roos: He is not to shake out of his school-bag whatever may happen to be in it.

in over-abundance. Whom the Lord finds *so* doing he pronounces *blessed:* first of all, because he is already blessed in his deed (James i. 25)—then because it is a new blessedness to him so to be *found* of his Lord—finally, the Lord promises to him a high promotion from a few things to many things (chap. xxv. 21, comp. 1 Tim. iii. 13); nay, he here already says more than afterwards (here again the *difference* between the intermediate and final decision is intended to appear), inasmuch as *every* such servant is set over *all* the goods of his lord! (See the gradation of the promises, Rev. ii. 26, iii. 21, on to xxi. 7.) Here, therefore, there is a glance forward to the last, highest reward; just as in the antithesis, ver. 51, the punishment already points beyond the being merely left without, vers. 40, 41, chap. xxv. 11, 12. For, the intermediate sentence upon the servants at the appearing of the kingdom stands already in close connection with the final and eternal one.

Verses 48–51. Here we are given to understand that by all means a χρονίζειν or *delay* is to be expected, as in chap. xxv. 5; comp. Hab. ii. 3. What the preacher, Eccles. viii. 11, laments as alas! the prevalent experience; what, even in the poem of old Homer, is shadowed forth by the unexpected return of Ulysses; happens in the case of *every other* bad servant, whom Christ at once puts in opposition to the former as a well-known person—not asking now beforehand, Who is this? The examples of such are not rare. It is to be observed, moreover, that he also is a *servant*, placed in the same office, who still knows and presumes to say, *My Lord*—as he said in the good beginning of his faith and love. He also presumes not, with the mockers, altogether to deny the return of the Lord; at first he even says only *in his heart*, It will yet be a long time! If such folly, however, has once found place in the unfaithful heart, there will then soon follow the outbreak of wicked conduct; he *begins*, with an evil falling away, after the good beginning has ceased, to conduct himself ever more improperly; from the first beginnings of evil a more rapid advance is then made, because the evil element was already in these beginnings. The first and most immediate outbreak of pride and selfishness is the *beating* of the inferior servants, who yet before the Lord are his fellow-servants; *i. e.*, he plays the lord politely and mannerly at first, but soon more roughly, with quarrelsome controversy, with assumed lordship, becomes a priest and pope as much as he can, causes dissension by violence and injustice, by the unconscionable abuse of the power and calling committed to him. This leads him ever deeper into sin; until, although calling himself a servant of the Lord, and confessing his name, he yet eats and drinks with the drunken, the secure of the world (ver. 38); whether it be in grossly overt act, or, as Christ says at last, with the *hypocrites*. Woe to him when the Lord suddenly comes! His severe judgment is denoted in the words διχοτομήσει αὐτόν—an expression into which many, as Grotius,* artificially insert the milder signification: He will, at the division of his house and house-servants, in the separation between the faithful and unfaithful, *cut him off*, and separate him—to this the μέρος θήσει, *will assign him a part*, that follows, corresponds only in appearance. For, διχοτομεῖν along with the αὐτόν can only mean *to cut asunder* (as the animal to be sacrificed, Exod. xxix. 17, Sept.); therefore for men that dreadful punishment in ancient times corresponding to our "quartering," which occurs Dan. ii. 5, iii. 29, in the Chaldee, as also Susanna ver. 59 (σχίσει μέσον), and which we find frequently in Greek and Roman writers.† This, then, remains a dreadful figure; in the background already a type and beginning of that punishment which, laying open the evil intents of the heart (Heb. iv. 12), puts its victim into the everlasting contradiction of dying, and yet not dying, misery: first of all, in reference to the coming of the Lord here meant, it is a designation of the judgment which suddenly removes the unfaithful servant, casts him down from on high, and brings him thoroughly into disgrace.‡

Mark, chap. xiii. 34–37, gives a short abridgment of Matt. xxiv. 43, with the *two parables of the servants*, xxiv. 45–51, and xxv. 14; and in this instance it is plainly seen to be such a summary of the main import. (See the conclusion of Mark's Gospel, chap. xvi., which sums up in the same way. Hence he has ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος, as Matt. xxv. 14, ἄνθρωπος ἀποδημῶν, and the servants in the plural.) The rest is easily understood without special interpretation; save that the *porter* or door-keeper who is expressly named, and the four *night-watches*, are only a further filling up of the picture in this simple representation, which gives prominence only to the watching and *not sleeping* (even with a slight echo of the parable of the *virgins*). We have, therefore, in this instance hardly to interpret the *porter* separately; at all events, he ranks with the servants who are admonished to watch, and denotes at the same time the duty of every one in the place that belongs to him, also as door-keeper, to give attentive heed to the coming of the Lord, as well as to whatever else might come. Or, if "to every one his work" was alotted, might the *porter* perhaps be entrusted with that which pertained to the entering into and departing from the Church,

* Even Zeller, in the *Monatsblatt:* "There will be a judicial division and separation such as admits of no middle party!"

† In both one and the same, for example: Herodotus, of Pythius, who was cut asunder at the command of Xerxes, so that the two halves were laid on the way; Horace, *Sat.* i. 1, 100, "securi divisit medium."

‡ Only it does not mean "the *divisions* by which the ministerial office loses its authority and power, falls asunder into dead parts" (Lange). For this servant is not a collective designation of the office, but an individual of a class very common.

with the power to admit ?* Since, however, in the explanation, such an office is not distinguished from the office, properly speaking, of giving meat, we rather recognize in Mark only a variation resulting from a further extension of the picture. With such unity of the fundamental ideas, showing itself remarkably even in the strongest deviations from the literal word of Christ, we will therefore in simplicity hear *his Holy Spirit* (who actually watches for all servants, and admonishes to watch; who in John x. 3, in another reference is called the *porter*) when he utters aloud the last word: What I say unto you, I say unto all, *Watch !*

SECOND PARABLE: THE WISE VIRGINS.

(Matt. xxv. 1–13.)

The *wisdom* in the former parable connected with faithfulness is now specially represented; as, immediately after, in the following parable, the faithfulness by itself. Already, in Luke xvi. 8–12, both were connected in such a manner that Christ exhorted to faithfulness at least from considerations of wisdom or prudence; so that men should not eternally perish from want, but in the time of reckoning might know whither to go. Here, however, the wisdom of the virgins, penetrating deeper and disclosing the heart, is so viewed that all management of goods entrusted, all active performance of work committed, falls into the background, as compared with the state of the heart—the wisdom of going out to meet the Bridegroom, waiting for him, *watching* with a patient zeal, which has regard alone and entirely to his marriage. Thus does this middle parable stand significantly between the two others; and shows us the wisdom, as it not merely leads to faithfulness, but also proceeds from faithfulness, and is one with it. If ver. 13, at the conclusion (where the more extended reading also corresponds to the sense), as the link of transition to the following parable, sums up what was said in chap. xxiv. 42, 36—so in ver. 10 *αἱ ἕτοιμοι* brings into prominence the retrospect to ver. 44: the *readiness* is the watching and waiting of the heart for him, which is represented in the burning of the diligently and carefully trimmed and tended lamps; just as in the same lamp there appears again, at the same time, the *effect* of the wise faithfulness, the life and actings of faith, which are in that case certainly not wanting. Finally, however, and this is of great importance for the understanding of the parable, the *foolish* virgins receive by no means so severe a punishment as the *wicked* and *unprofitable* servant, but are merely in this instance *shut out*, as having come too late; this wisdom or folly is therefore not quite one and the same with that described at Matt. vii. 24–27, in so far as both parties in this parable are virgins. Again, the wise *virgins* are also not *commended*, as the servants were, on account of their work; the going in to the marriage says *here* enough.

Verses 1, 2. So far Olshausen has rightly seen, that these virgins denote rather the passive love to Christ, as the servants rather the active employment in his service; and that this distinction represents itself in different persons, according to the type of John and Peter, Mary and Martha. But we would lay a stronger emphasis upon what he has merely noticed as the principal sense, which only includes the former application; namely, that virgins and servants are *the same persons* viewed under different aspects. The internal aspect, that namely of the disposition of heart which lies at the foundation, remains, in all, the passive watching and waiting of the attached heart; the outer side, on the other hand, which appears in the revelation made by the separating judgment is the exercise and profitable employment by the servants of the power and gifts which they have received. The many-sidedness, resembling the play of colors in a diamond, which is specially characteristic of this last trilogy of parables—in which, at the conclusion of the discourses the parabolic wisdom of Christ finds its consummation*—is meant to say and hint much on all sides, and is far from being exhausted by a single acknowledged reference. Thus has our Lord (as C. H. Rieger rightly sees) first of all, in chap. xxiv. vers. 38, 39, announced the general security of the *great mass*, such as he will find at his coming; then in vers. 45–51 chiefly the corruption and falling away of those who are *teachers* in his Church; now, however, he predicts also the becoming remiss and remaining behind of the *noblest souls*, who have joined themselves to the bride. Yet this also is only an accompanying accessory sense; for the ten virgins comprehend the entire Church of Christ, actually entered upon its divine calling. *Then* shall *the kingdom of heaven* be like—when the Lord and Bridegroom comes; the state of this Church, which is called to him as bride, will manifest that not all who belong to it have in entire faithfulness wisely prepared themselves. Therefore more exactly: first the state of the world in general; then the state of the *outward Church* in which the evil servants create disturbance and confusion; finally, even the divided state of the inner true Church. For, the foolish virgins, who remain without, are by no means one and the same with the evil servants who are cut asunder. *The kingdom of heaven:* the collective company of those in whom it more or less subsists upon earth, who know that they are called thereto and wait for its appearing. *Ten* is in general the

---

* In which sense Braune then explains it of the preacher who baptizes and confirms, the teacher who conducts through the school

* Which only unfold their entire meaning in their *connection;* therefore, even on this account, it is certain that it is not merely the Evangelist who has thus put them together.

number denoting completeness (as also in the ten servants, Luke xix. 13); according to the Jewish ordinance ten persons formed a Passover-family; then also a Church, assembly or קָהָל; in like manner, at a marriage, at least ten bridesmaids were appointed. Therefore these ten together are the Church; their relation to the *bride* in this marriage is precisely such as was said already, at chap. xxii., of the guests. Every Church which belongs to the great Church is also, on its part, a virgin presented to Christ (2 Cor. xi. 2). Accordingly, it may be supposed that, besides the application to individual souls, which retains its truth in the first place, there are indicated in the prophetic background of the τότε ὁμοιωθήσεται, "then shall be likened" (in which may lie many things now unknown) different *churches*, whose predominant character in their relation to Christ (as in those in the Apocalypse) will at least so represent itself.* Finally, when we look back to Psa. xlv. 14, 15, understood in a different way certainly from that of the current exegesis, it may appear that the bride, in the most proper sense, is Israel at last restored; while these virgins are the nations joined to it, *i. e.*, churches out of the heathen world.

Something to this effect is probably meant by the reading (not to be despised when viewed as least as bearing witness to an earlier interpretation), which adds in ver. 1: "to meet the bridegroom *and the bride*."† In the parable this signifies, first of all, that they betook themselves to the house of the bride, there, as belonging to her, to wait until they were brought away by the bridegroom. For such was the custom which lies at the foundation of the entire parable; late in the evening, not indeed till the night, the bridegroom came with his friends (see on Matt. ix. 15) to conduct the bride with her virgins in the festal procession with torches to the nuptial supper. This, in its entire scope and aim, is what is meant already by the εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ νυμφίου, "to meet the bridegroom," that they *go out* from their houses in order to assemble around the bride; this first going out is by no means a prolepsis of the subsequent one at ver. 6, as if it where only meant here. They would go out to meet him, they made preparation for this; but they were in the house of the bride, where the ἀπάντησις ("meeting") or preparation, the waiting for the coming one, took place.* And when now he came, it was said again differently, *Go ye out* to meet him! But what is the signification of all these circumstances? The first going out is the going out from the world and from self, whereby they become virgins belonging to the bride; the second is the last joyous readiness which meets the coming of the Lord. Whether precisely that going out from Babylon required by many, in particular "out of a false Babylonish union" (as the cry is now, with which Father Zeller almost agrees)—we leave entirely aside; the text contains nothing of this, and is rather, according to chap. xxiv. 26, to be kept free from all such *outward dealing* with its profound meaning. This, however, is further to be well observed, that both parties *are* virgins before Christ, not merely before the world; there is among them no hypocrite or harlot (who would be quite out of keeping with such a company); they all go out, all go to *meet* him; and that *not* as the present time drives us all, even the strangers and harlots without, against their will towards the coming One, but with a good foundation and beginning of their own will, faith, and mind turned to the Bridegroom. Both parties expect—a better state of the world? That is not enough. They go out to meet not a pseudo-Messiah of the political kingdom of heaven, as at the present the Jews who cry for emancipation in order to unite with Christendom without Christ—not "the ideal bridegroom, who at length celebrates his nuptial festival upon earth in a purified system of doctrine, and in general virtue"—but as it simply stands in the text, *the Bridegroom*, the true and genuine Bridegroom. We cannot, therefore, in this instance agree with Von. Meyer's interpretation of the parable (*Blätter für höhere Wahrh.* vii. 247), which indeed, in the extended application, expresses much that is profound, striking, and in itself true, but which, by a false exegesis, departs from the essentially narrower fundamental sense of the whole. These Christians and Christian societies are *virgins:* in order to this it is not enough that they "do not stand in an attitude of rebellion against the one true God, which the Scripture calls adultery, and that they all outwardly maintain a virtuous walk, or even, at least, preach it"—but they are also not disloyal to Christ, the Lord and Head of his Church, the Bridegroom. For even that wicked servant, the hypocrite, said, "My Lord"—but these virgins are completely parallel with those who, afterwards at ver. 24, are called *his own servants*, each of whom actually received and took his talent of grace from the Lord, and did not throw it away, but only did not faithfully and diligently enough traffic with it. Nothing is here said of Christians or Christian Churches which are *fallen away;* these, however much or little they may still retain of his name and confession, yet, before the Lord, belong to the heathen

* Yet we are *not* to take this sense, which applies to collective bodies, congregations, churches, also peoples and nationalities, as the plain, first and direct sense; though many do so (comp. Zeller's *Monatsbl.* 1837, No. 10) on the ground that prophets and apostles (2 Cor. xi. 2) always use the word virgin only in this sense. Here in the parable of Christ, all that is said of the virgins applies undeniably *in the first place* to individual persons, and only in comparison with them to collective bodies.

† Not merely in the strongly interpolated Cod. D., but also in the Vulg. *sponso et sponsæ;* even the significant Peshito לאורח חתנא וכלתא.

* They did not, therefore, fall asleep by the way in the street.

and the children of this world. Therefore the foolish virgins are certainly not those who "demean themselves sentimentally towards him who calls himself the Bridegroom of the Church and of the soul; whose love to him and desire for union with him is likewise idolatry, Jesulatry." Not those who inwardly pay homage to "Astarte together with Baal, the moon-goddess of false philosophy, who therefore neither practically nor theoretically bear with justice the name of virgins"—these are *just on this account not* foolish virgins, for Christ *gives* the name to them not without justice. But they are those who on the whole have continued in the true doctrine; and, still more, have not merely the knowledge of Christ, but also a waiting and preparation for him in its beginning; who have also lamps burning with the oil of the Spirit, an inner life kindled from above. One may work diligently as a servant or maid in the field and at the mill, without the perverseness of the evil servant, and yet not even be a foolish *virgin:* this name always signifies much, although of course it does not apply to the foolish ones in the entire unmixed emphasis with which it is used in Rev. xiv. 4. The article (*καὶ αἱ πέντε μωραί*) now, in the first instance, brings forward these foolish ones as a warning principal figure in the parable: but it is meant thereby, at the same time to say: *Even* of the ten virgins there were only five wise, *the other five* were, also, all foolish! Whether in this equal number a precisely corresponding truth is to be sought is a question to which we venture, with Pfenninger, to answer: "One would almost think so."

Verses 3, 4. That the λαμπάδες do not signify "lamps," as we are accustomed to understand the term, but the ancient *torches*, chiefly marriage torches, which at the same time were lamps,* we indeed believe; although we do not hold it to be decided or important. At all events we admit that Winer is right in maintaining that Jahn unjustly applies to our parable the later custom of bearing wooden staves with a vessel of oil above. And what is very important, the ἀγγεῖα, "vessels," are certainly not these bowls of oil which were on the torches themselves; but (as the parallel αὐτῶν, of the vessels and lamps, and the μετά shows) a special supply by way of precaution, so as to be able to fill again: to erase this from the picture, is to take away the principal feature. The virgins have all not merely lamps, all too have oil *in their lamps*, so that these *burn* for the present. Consequently, the ancient interpretation (combated by Calvin) which finds here only the empty appearance; as well as the ordinary preaching, founded upon that interpretation, concerning dead faith, lamps without oil, or even without flame, is a perversion of this text, and passes by the warning of Christ, which reaches much deeper.* Again: foolish virgins are not hypocrites or false Christians, who have the form of godliness altogether without the substance —*not* "such as carry in their hands only the hollow, dry vessel of their selfishness." For, their lamps also burn; nay they burn long, even to the last late moment; and were therefore perhaps at first so copiously filled that, for this reason, no further stock seemed to be necessary. They thought, "It burns at first, and that clearly enough; so that it will certainly suffice." *Here* lies the critical point of difference, and no where else; Calvin hits the point when he says: "In eo vertitur summa parabolæ, quod non satis est ad officium *semel* accinctos *fuisse* et paratos, nisi ad finem usque duremus." (Compare in general Luke xiii. 24.) What are the *lamps?* The hearts that are turned towards, prepared for, awaiting the heavenly treasure, the joyful supper, the king of the feast, the Bridegroom. They burn with the flame of spiritual life, illuminated and kindled by God. *Oil* also is not altogether wanting to the foolish virgins; their lamps have rather such an abundant measure of it that they have become secure: according to the general symbology of the Scripture, this is the Holy *Spirit* who nourishes the flame of life in the heart, which without him holds merely a dry, extinguished wick in the bowl. And now, what are the special *vessels* in addition; and the *supply* of oil in them over and above what consumes itself in the lamp, from one moment to the other? We may speak of this with all kinds of words, if we only mean, understand, and hold the secret thing which it is hard to put into words. Von Meyer's note, "Understand here the right *measure* of faith, the inward anointing of the Spirit, the true wisdom" —is, we think, so far right; but not the further antithesis, "as opposed to *outward* ecclesiastical or moral character," etc. For the lamp of the foolish virgins, which burns even to the last, is more than this outward character; thus the warning would fail to hit precisely those who are warned, who joyfully say, My lamp burns indeed most brightly! If the lamp is my heart, as before said, then the vessel containing the additional supply is my whole remaining personality, body, soul, and spirit (2 Cor. iv. 7), which also must be well furnished with oil, sanctified throughout; in order that from thence a constant influx may

* So that the bowl of oil with the wick was somehow fastened to the stick above.

* As in a certain sermon, for example, it is expressed thus: "Who carry the lamp of Christianity in their hands, but the *light* is wanting!" So Lossel's *Fisher* (1845, No. 47) says *against* the text: "They have only the dry lamp!" In that case Christ would certainly not have put five against five, or ten against ten. We cannot understand how Jul. Müller (*Deutsche Zeitschr.* 1850, p. 32) can think the ancient interpretation, that the *burning* lamps without a supply of oil are the "outward profession," to be "more natural." Assuredly, the lamps are not merely "forms of faith"—these virgins of the Bridegroom are not merely "dead members of the Church, destitute of the Spirit," as even Lange enigmatically maintains.

come into the weak heart, in which the oil burns itself away by the flame. The *taking* the oil *with them* in the vessels, prudently collecting it and laying it up, corresponds in a certain measure to the faithful trading and making profit on the part of the servants afterwards, as oil and flame are what is given by the Lord; those and those only take oil with them who allow more to be given to them ever anew in addition to, and besides, that which they have; who *watch* so that their flame may not go out, so as to give diligence to make their calling and election sure (2 Pet. i. 10). Their lamp goes not out even during the night (Prov. xxxi. 18). The five wise virgins, in the simplicity which did not thus severely test their companions, have not known and admonished the foolish ones; but the coming of the Lord will discover them, and put them to shame. "We must call it *virgin folly*, folly of the children of light in their generation, when believing souls let themselves be satisfied with the first tasting of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come; when they deem it sufficient to possess within them some light, and some fire of love for to-day, but are regardless of more abundant gain, in order to the strengthening and growth of their inward man" (Feldhoff).

Verses 5–7. That the bridegroom will *delay*, and let himself be waited for longer than was at first *thought*, Christ now says openly, as in chap. xxiv. 48 he had already hinted at this; the error of the virgins now, however, was the opposite of the thoughts of that evil servant. He thought, My lord cometh not for a long time yet! But these, The bridegroom will certainly not let us wait long for him! Thus those who expected him too soon, and those who expected him too late, fall both into a nearly similar fate, when now he comes to both unexpectedly.* They were wrong in their calculation; he remained away when the lamps burned most brightly, and when every footstep was joyfully listened to: this, alas! had an ill effect upon the *entire* Church of the faithful, and yet was necessary as a trial in order to their separation. They all became drowsy, *all* even actually slept, not excepting the wise; that is indeed the true midnight, when those also who should be watching are asleep. Wesley in vain tries to escape by the false rendering: they were all "easy and quiet," the wise enjoyed a true, the foolish a false peace! True, if it were said—The one part slept through carelessness, the other through confidence in their preparation—there lies in this a truth, but yet the sleeping of the wise virgins remains a *weakness*. "This is the last trial of the virgins, in which they could not stand of themselves. Yet we see that the wise virgins are *kept* also during their slumbering, and their oil-vessels no one dare take from them; Christ watches over them with his compassion, the keeper of Israel slumbers not nor sleeps" (Von Meyer). Their weakness is not judged so as to make them ashamed; for "there certainly remains a difference between the sleep of the wise, and that of the foolish virgins"—as Lisco says, and Cant. v. 2 shadows forth. Rightly and simply the *Berlenburg Bibie* says: "They were also not without nature. But they knew that a drowsiness was in their nature, and therefore provided themselves well with oil, so that all notwithstanding would be ready; just as people are wont in the night to keep the tinder-box and every thing in readiness, whereby they may at once strike a light." They had perhaps, just before, paid attention to their lamps, and given them a copious supply of oil (which almost follows from ver. 9, where their vessels also have no more left); while the foolish, already carelessly slumbering, no longer observed the good example of the wise, so as to be reminded of their duty. Therefore the readiness of the wise virgins is reckoned to them as an entire *watching*, notwithstanding the intervening slumber; for a man watches as much as he can when he has made provision for the possibility of his sleeping.

He who comes as a thief, comes at the same time as the bridegroom; ever in the night, at an hour when one thinks not. But whence now is the *cry* of his coming (comp. in another reference, 1 Thess. iv. 16), since all are asleep? Christ here actually hints that, although the general predominating state may be called a sleeping, he will yet graciously see to there being individual *watchers* on the walls of Jerusalem (Isa. lxii. 5–7), who sleep *not*. It will not suffice to understand merely "the Holy Ghost;" because he must still have human heralds. This voice says plainly, *The Bridegroom!* and that with a *Behold!* before he actually *cometh*, ver. 10.* Upon this *awakening call* the virgins again all rise up, there is a great general commotion among all "believers;" they even *all* trim their lamps, every one as well as he can.† The foolish, therefore, begin again *to become wise;* they were never deficient in the knowledge how the Bridegroom is to be received, and the will is present with them—ah, how gladly would they be in the same case with the others! But the cleaning of the wick alone‡ will not avail, if at the decisive hour there begins to be a want of oil.

Verses 8, 9. How sad at *this* hour to hear, in common with the others, as a virgin called and come thus far to meet the Bridegroom, that now the Bridegroom comes—to arise with

* Zeller: The delay was not objective. it was no delay on the part of the Bridegroom, who wisely allows the night of judgments to come beforehand; it was only subjectively, in the opinion of the virgins, a delay. How are the pleasant and speedy expectations of marriage then deceived!

* We have already before expressed our opinion as to how far Olshausen is justified in calling to mind here the Συρφορός, Mark xiii. 34.

† The rest of the world and pseudo-Christendom sleep quietly on.

‡ Or, besides, "arranging the garlands around the lamps," as Braune ingeniously adds.

them in the first moment of joy, when every door flies open—to take the yet burning lamp in good confidence, to begin to trim it for the festal reception—and *now*, even now in the moment which is to bring the fruit and reward of all the previous waiting and preparing, suddenly to perceive with horror that the lamp *is gone out!* Yes, if the Lord would but come at once to fetch us, when our lamp is first lighted, when the first love burns most brightly and ardently! But he will delay, and then surprise us. Now, thou prayest fervently, O my soul; be not weary, so that he may find thee watching and praying! Now, the flame burns; but consider that the good oil also is thereby being consumed, and have a care for the supply, that thou mayest have when it is needed. What is necessary is not merely at the outset to love his appearing, and afterwards to be content; but wait and hasten with all earnestness to meet his coming. The decisive moment at the last (ver. 8) makes the great want manifest, the ground of which was already present in the folly from the first. Then, indeed, in the extremity, one lays hold on his next neighbor, and entreats him: Help me in with you, give me somewhat of your excellent preparation! But, *then*, no soul can communicate to another; none can have more than it needs for itself, to stand with *its entire* preparation. "There might not be enough for us and you"—or μήποτε, אוּלַי, *lest* it may not be sufficient—understand before, "We can give nothing!" The wise are at once wakened up, are again truly wise, so as, with good intention, and in true zeal, to avoid all delay.* They direct them rather to the *traders* or sellers of oil, if they may yet find time for this. Is this an idle feature in the picture, and without significance? Hardly so, and just because it comes thus strikingly into prominence. Is it a well-meant but *false* advice, which is here put by Christ into the mouth of the wise virgins?† This also contradicts our feeling—still more, however, to suppose, that it was a *mockery* of the poor foolish ones from the mouth of their modest loving associates, as even Luther says: Thus must it happen, "Justi ridebunt in interitu impiorum"—or more gently with Calvin: "Non admonitio est sed exprobratio. Fuit antehac emendi tempus, quod a vobis negligi non orpotuit." This is, indeed, alas! implied, except that those who give the counsel do not precisely thus mean it. At all events that remains true which Calvin also goes on to say: "Prostabat enim tunc oleum venale;" *i. e.*, there were and are actually *traders* from whom this oil may be had. According to Rev. iii. 18 we can buy pure gold, white raiment, eye-salve, all that we require for Christ, only from Christ himself; the sellers here must therefore indeed be his servants, whom he has appointed for this, only not exactly as Olshausen strangely enough expresses it—"the holy Scripture and its authors." We say, instead of this: Prophets and apostles, witnesses and stewards of God, in the most general sense. (Comp. Rev. xi. 4, according to Zech. iv. 11–14.) We understand our Lord as meaning, by this feature of the picture, these two things: first, for the time of preparation, to direct to the "hearing and learning and receiving, through the ordinary means and persons" (according to Zeller);* then, however, to give the warning that *at last* to take this course will be very uncertain, if not impossible. Just as before there were watchers, although all slept, so now there are sellers, although as a rule no one can any longer give to another.†

Verses 10—12. Here lie hid, in general, prophetic hints which the future alone will unseal. The time of the marriage is denoted in Rev. xix. 6–9. The foolish virgins have become wise, and actually go thence to buy; the best and only thing they can do, certainly better than with lamp extinguished to go to meet the bridegroom. But it is too late; not an hour, not a minute does the coming one now wait for those who had had time enough for preparation. So the words appear to run. If, however, we read quite exactly, it is only said, And they *that were ready* went in with him—so in like manner, only, At last came also *the other* virgins—they are not said to be five in number, nay, the rejected ones are not even *now* any longer called foolish, because they went to buy oil. There remains, therefore, a slight, very concealed, hope that one, perhaps, of the foolish virgins had recovered in time what was neglected;‡ upon this, however, no one is to rely, for the coming too late after the door has been shut is fearful enough. This sentence is expressed in words which are meant to bring to mind the Sermon on the Mount, yet it is not the same. The saying

* "Had the wise virgins watched"—says Meyer well—"they might perhaps have been able to give a supply to the others." Namely, in the time before, instead of sleeping; but then the foolish must likewise, in order to this, have been watchful and wise.

† "Why do they not cry to the Bridegroom? Why do they run to *men* for oil?" So preaches Luther on this, and compares Luke xvi. 24 the crying to Abraham, but he forgets that it is here not a folly of the foolish but a counsel of the wise.

* We are not inclined, however, to find in this feature of the parable an argument for a special, nay even a paid, office of teacher in the Church (as Alford).

† But—buy in good time for another reason. Before the coming of the Lord "the right good lamp oil becomes very rare, the illuminati have confiscated it for their phosphorus" (Stilling's *Heimweh*, iv. 438). Similarly Zeller speaks of the *gaslights* of illumination and enlightenment set up from beneath, which lead many to mistake the night for the clear day; persons *thus* misled, however, are outside of the parable.

‡ One may certainly (as Zeller) understand this form of expression only to the effect that it is meant to indicate, how it was not their *wisdom* but their *readiness* that brought them in. This, however, is not enough, because in the entire passage wise and ready are reckoned the *same*.

Lord, Lord, of the virgins it not so bad as that which we find there; for here they entreat humbly, there they adjure in an insolent question. Also the answer *I know you not!* is evidently milder than *I never knew you!* which indeed cannot be said to the virgins who at one time were ready. Therefore also they are far from receiving the curse which follows afterwards at ver. 41; not even a sentence such as the servant, ver. 30, or chap. xxiv. 51. They are left behind, and are come too late, only *for this time;* which must certainly be always a source of sorrow to *those* who already waited for the Bridegroom. When Stilling says: "I think the Bridegroom will let himself be entreated when once the sun shines over all hills"—we agree with him so far as to think that a further hope as regards the *last* end must remain for awakened and pardoned ones, who are not entirely fallen away; but protest against the error which means still more than this, and which betrays itself behind the expression, "*all* hills;" for chap. xxv. 46 is the last decision, after which no sunbeam any longer remains behind the hill. We are also at one with Feldhoff* in this, that Luke xiii. 25–28 is something *different;* when the *householder* is arisen (not as Luke xii. 36), and *the evil-doers come not into the kingdom of God.* All these discourses of Christ, sounding so much alike that they insensibly mix with each other, are yet characterized by well-weighed differences, which a true prophetic theology may forecast, and which the fulfillment will clearly demonstrate. Only we ought preliminarily to read and acknowledge so much, namely, that the coming of the Bridegroom, the Lord of the servants, is not yet the last advent of the Judge.

THIRD PARABLE: THE FAITHFUL SERVANTS.

(Matt. xxv. 14–30, [Luke xix. 12–27.])

We preachers, almost all of us, do not enough imitate in our office the highest wisdom of our Master; but are too indolent or too fastidious to learn from his Spirit the use of "coelestium similitudines ex humanis," in order to our preaching by parable to the people. Many pay their tribute, indeed, to the recorded parables of the Master, but do not themselves venture a step further on this way; many think they have nothing better to do with these parables than to distil them into a purely abstract essence, in order that they may become worthy of the pulpit. We, ought, indeed, to *interpret* them for ourselves and others, with a distinct "that is" for the principal features in them—this our Master also teaches us; but *then*, it requires the experience obtained through his Spirit to show how parable and interpretation together open up a sphere of inexhaustible meaning, of never finished application. Such is the wondrous nature of the parable concerning the kingdom of heaven, which Christ has drawn forth into light from the recesses of nature, and the secrets of human life, precisely where the common eye sees only what is vulgar and common-place.

What is more common-place than the trafficing and acquiring gain in human commerce, corresponding to the sowing and reaping in nature (see here ver. 24), the making money, which is to so many the sole impelling principle of life? Christ does not shrink from the contamination which avarice, selfishness, and sin had, even at that time, made to cleave to this; he is not thereby deterred, but rather induced, to place in opposition to this earthly prudence and faithfulness his heavenly counsel, *Γίνεσθε καλοὶ τραπεζῖται* (be ye *good* merchants). Already in Luke xix. he had spoken a similar parable; but so far are we from the opinion that Christ can have spoken this only once, either here or there, that we rather think he had already spoken before, in Luke xix. 12, 13, the saying which he here repeats shortly before his departure. As in that place the parable is strictly connected with the context, ver. 11 and ver. 28, so here it stands in the same close connection, in order to explain the prophetical *εὐθέως, immediately*, chap. xxiv. 29, by a subsequent *μετὰ χρόνον πολύν, after a long time* (ver. 19). Those features which are added in the first representation by Luke—in particular the side glance, there interwoven and here omitted, at the judgment on the citizens who would not have him to reign over them—we shall leave to our interpretation of that Evangelist. At present we only consider what, as an explanatory parallel, immediately belongs to the second representation.

Verses 14, 15. There is something wanting here to correspond to the *ὥσπερ, as;* and many, according to chap. xxiv. 37, would supply *οὕτως ἔσται ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, so shall the coming of the Son of Man be*—but this goes too far back. The English Bible more correctly puts: "*For the kingdom of heaven* is as a man," etc., for the *γάρ, for*, points first of all to ver. 1, and, by the connecting link in ver. 13, places the faithful servants immediately parallel with the wise virgins. Therefore it is to be read thus: For the kingdom of heaven is *then further*—to represent it by another figure—like unto the servants of a lord, with whom it happened thus. *These* servants are, therefore, now no longer chiefly such as are placed over churches, as in chap. xxiv. 45; but actually every individual to whom, on his part, something is entrusted and committed, out of the gift and grace of Christ. These are *his* goods, the spiritual gifts and possessions of grace purchased by him for his people, and left behind at his departure. They are *not* the earthly possessions of the householder, Luke xvi. 1, which indeed also require faithful management (and in so far are reck-

* *Evangelische Zeugnisse aus dem Wupperthale* (Barmen, 1832), in a sermon from which we have already quoted.

oned also to them as servants); nor are they *yet* the πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, "*all* his goods," already spoken of in chap. xxiv. 47. but the small first-fruits of these, as a test of faithfulness, in order to the recompense of the whole. It is *his* property, legitimately acquired and only distributed by him; and the servants, whom he calls with the evangelical calling into his kingdom and its service, are thereby already pre-supposed to be *his own* servants, *i. e.*, who have become his in faith (in contradistinction to the citizens in Luke who *would not*). The *departure* also of the Saviour, after his first manifestation, entirely corresponds to the departure of God at the beginning of the old covenant, chap. xxi. 33; for, "divine providence, after it has organized a new plan of life, lent out new capital, is always followed by an ἀποδημεῖν, or "going into a far country," in order to a trial how men will make use of it—the instructive revelation is followed by a quite as instructive silence.* This is the *delivering* of the goods of the Lord to the free disposal of his servants (although, of course, they are not entirely left to themselves); because he will one day have in his kingdom only such as are free, and have become worthy. As the servants have become his servants through grace, he has thus a further right to require faithful and active service from them; for it is only his capital that can and is to bear interest in their hands. He calls them *all* to this work: τοὺς ἰδίους δούλους, "*his* own servants," is here equivalent to the number *ten* in Luke (as in the virgins). There is no one left out who receives nothing; for in that case the right to the servants would be taken from him. When prominence is given to the *difference* in the gift by five, two, and one, this is in perfect harmony with the former equality of the ten pounds for the ten servants; they are only two sides of the same thing. In relation to, and comparison with, others, each one receives a special measure of the gift of Christ, of the calling as an office-bearer or a private member to a greater or less measure of active work for the kingdom; but every one, considered by himself, receives equally the same, just as one who has only half the strength of another bears as much, in his half-burden, as that other with his double strength and his double load. This *equal* distribution, which is removed from all caprice, and is rather righteous in the seeming difference, is evidently denoted in the clause which is added, and which points deeply into the secrets of the divine dispensation, ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν, "to each one according to his several ability;" where the ἰδίαν, *several*, by way of gracious acknowledgment, stands opposed to the foregoing ἰδίους, *own*, in order to teach that this Lord, who willingly gives to each one as much as he can receive, not merely knows his servants, but also certainly assigns to them neither too much nor too little.

Is there then a co-operating *ability* of nature in the work of grace; is not every thing only of the ability which God imparts? Thus asks anxiously the man who is zealous for the glory of divine grace;* but his mind ought to be set at rest by remembering (as Pelagius himself knew better than the Pelagians), that the natural power and capacity here pre-supposed in the servants, and brought with them to the service of their Lord, is already a first gift of grace from the Creator, and no merit. For no one has created and made himself such as he is. But that the χαρίσματα or spiritual "gifts," are, as a rule (perhaps actually in every case, even where it appears to be otherwise), exactly and justly proportioned to the natural capacity, to the individuality and character of each person; that, if not *every* gift, entirely in equal degree and without exception, yet generally the gift "is transmuted from a spiritual talent of nature into a spiritual talent of the kingdom" (according to Lange's expression)—is the great truth which our Lord here utters, not more and not less.†

Verses 16—18. But now, alas! the freedom of man, in faithfulness or unfaithfulness, brings yet another difference, which is willed neither by the Creator nor by the restoring Redeemer. *Occupy till I come!* This word, which was before distinctly expressed in Luke xix. 13, although not expressed here, was as evidently implied in the παρέδωκεν, *committed*, as, in chap. xxi. 33, it was implied in the ἐξέδοτο, *let out*, that the householder will have fruit from his vineyard. (The ἐργάζεσθαι here used signifies also in Greek, *negoatiari*, πραγματεύεσθαι; yet it is selected on purpose, as a more general expression, to indicate the activity and labor belonging thereto.) In proportion to the gift received stands also the measure of profit acquired; this is the rule and principle of judgment before the righteous Lord, beyond which he asks and expects nothing (Luke xii. 48). Therefore the parable here abides by this; while before, the different degrees of faithfulness were denoted, according to which the same pound gained in the one case ten, in the other five pounds. In this, however, was denoted not *merely* the faithfulness, but different success lying in the outward circumstances. (Ἐποίησε is equivalent to ἐκέρδησε—not merely a Latinism, pecuniam *conficere*, as Erasmus here puts it, but, in perfect conformity with the Greek language, a word taken from the analogy of fruit-bearing with every other produce.) We are of course not at liberty to pursue further into specialities the similitude of trading with,

* Beck, *Christliche Lehrwissenschaft*, i. 345.

* And, to save his theology, has recourse to an exegetical artifice, as Wesley, who refers the δύναμις (against the clause ἑκάστῳ) to the Lord: "according to *his own* mighty power."

† To infer, with Braune, that the talents are therefore not inward gifts, but "spheres of labor" of different extent, is certainly false, and can be carried out only very artificially. The sphere of labor is indeed to be considered as belonging thereto; but in itself this is no gift, no intrusted possession.

and profitably investing, a capital of money, as will appear from ver. 27. The two faithful servants are, notwithstanding their different capital and interest, equally faithful; they both *double* what they have received, which is meant to be denoted, by ὡσαύτως καί (likewise also) and καὶ αὐτός (he likewise), as emphatically as possible for him who has less so that no one may hold him in less esteem on that account. How are our hasty judgments (1 Cor. iv. 2, 5) here rebuked, when we measure the fruit without knowing how much God has sown in nature and grace! He, however, who brings no fruit at all, is certainly to be found fault with and warned. If the one talent gains only one more, the Lord will be alike satisfied with it; but he will have his own again with interest, since it was for this he gave it. All the intermediate cases in which five talents received gain only two, on the contrary, two gain five, or perhaps even one five, while five bring nothing at all—these are not in any way denied by the parable, which only selects from among them the examples most significant for the present purpose. Lord, thou hast given me *nothing at all*—this can no one say to him, who yet claims to belong to his servants. But so *little*, that it was not worth the trouble to attempt any thing with it, so that thou canst only ask back that is thine—this is, alas! that frequent excuse of indolence which is meant to be refuted by the example here selected for the purpose.

This *evil* servant is again a counterpart to that foregoing one: *there* it was positive evil-doing; *here* only an indolent not-doing, which is rather parallel to the idleness and carelessness of the virgins. Yet there is also implied in this—and it was not otherwise possible, seeing that the gift of grace was there—a positive spoiling and throwing away of that gift, by which feature the parable of the virgins is supplemented. It would be treating this servant too harshly to regard him as one who has entirely fallen away; this he is not, so long as he still possesses the talent. But it is dealing too favorably with him, and giving more credit to his own false word, ver. 25, than the Searcher of hearts who does not give credit to it (but, false as it is, applies it in a better sense), when he is described merely as a *timid character*, who had avoided entering into buisness with a view to gain, who, in false humility, had trusted himself too little. The judgment passed upon him by the Lord, ver. 26, gives him his true distinctive name which comprehends all his guilt, Thou *slothful* servant! It is, indeed, implied in this that the slothful one shuns exertion (Prov. xxii. 13, xx. 4)—but the spiritually slothful finds occasion for labor enough safely to keep, as he thinks, the talent which admonishes to activity. He imagines and persuades himself that he will at least secure it against loss and theft; but in reality he *hides* it from his own eyes, when he puts it into the earth, and thereby himself commits a theft on *his Lord's* money, the increase of which he owed as an obligation to his Master. The ἀπελθών, *departed* ("went") which stands opposed to the πορευθείς, "*went*;" and still more the *burying* of the talent, cost him as much trouble, if not more;* since there is required for this an evil, sullen labor to keep himself in idleness, in opposition to the impulse of the Spirit. The *Deutsche Theologie* calls this "hoarding up the merit of Christ"—and in those who do so the grace of God has been received in vain (1 Cor. xv. 10). The burying *in the earth*, whereby Chrysostom too fancifully understands the heart, which is earth and ashes, is first of all a proverbial expression in the parable (according to Sir. xxix. 13, xx. 30, as we also find the expression, *defosso auro incubare*); then it may also denote the sinking of the idle one into an earthly mind and course of conduct. As in Luke, the σουδάριον or "napkin" at all events might slightly indicate (what Gossner and Richter, following the *Berlenburg Bible*, remarks), that shunning the sweat of labor, he knew of no other and better use to make of his napkin.†

Verses 19—23. As surely as the prophetic glance of Christ, immediately after this parable, stretches far beyond to the last day properly speaking, ver. 31, so surely in these intervening parables, from the χρονίζειν, chap. xxiv. 48 onwards, does it extend at least to a coming which reaches far beyond the destruction of Jerusalem; and it is now no longer a "coming again at the time of the apostles" that is spoken of, although the apostles are included as the first representatives of his gifted servants. (Μετὰ χρόνον πολύν, as already said, is an evident explanation of that first prophetical εὐθέως.) The coming one remains the Lord of all *these servants*, of the unfaithful as well as the faithful; and in the case of the latter will show himself as Lord in the reckoning. What is said by the servants to the Lord, although here figuratively represented, will yet be found, when they appear and are made manifest, to correspond to the thoughts of their heart. The good servants who (as also afterwards before the King's throne) first receive their judgment and commendation, can present themselves before their Lord with a frank and joyous confidence: *See* (not merely ἴδου but ἴδε). They have in his presence a clear consciousness of the measure of what was received at first, and what was further gained, of the difference and relation between the two. I have *therewith* gained other five talents! thus does Luther render it according to the parallel in Luke, where the faithful servants humbly ascribe the gain to the gift of Christ: Thy

* Thus wrote Hamann to Lindner: "Save yourselves the trouble of digging, and the expense of a napkin—betake yourselves to the bank of exchange, where we may invest and exchange our talent."

† Although we shall not contradict any one who might think such adherence to the etymology too artificial in regard to a word that has been translated into Greek (σουδάριον, *sudarium, a sweat-cloth*, hence napkin).

pound has gained or borne ten, five pounds. (So 1 Cor. xv. 10; not I but the grace of God.) Yet ἐπ' αὐτοῖς here signifies in the first place not *per ea*, as Erasmus, but *in addition to them*, as increase and produce; Vulg. more correctly: *superlucratus sum*—comp. in Luke προσειρ. γάσατο. The same sense, however, lies indeed already in the grateful acknowledgment: Thou deliveredst unto me five, two talents, *i. e.*, this *thy capital* has thus increased in my hand and management. The faithful one now receives a gracious commendation, inasmuch as the Lord kindly reckons again to him as merit, what the servant ascribed only to the gift of his Lord: this is precisely what is just and right in the account and reckoning between God and men. With a foregoing Εὖ (Well done!) breaking forth from the heart of the satisfied, nay, delighted Lord, the servant receives the honorable name of a *good* and faithful servant; now even more fully than chap. xxiv. 45, 48.* Before this rich Lord even five talents (at that time a large sum) are held but *little*, in proportion to the yet remaining abundance of *all* his goods. (In Luke ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ; because the capital of each one was denoted as a small tithe, small indeed, yet not to be despised when with diligence it is profitably employed.) He is now set over *many things* by way of recompense: this is not quite the same with that setting over *all* his goods in which, at chap. xxiv. 47, there was already an anticipation of the last end; for the *cities* which correspond to it in Luke, are still more or less according to the gain acquired, they lie in the same country and kingdom as the αἰώνιαι σκηναί or "everlasting habitations" (Luke xvi. 9.) It is a continued and exalted activity, a dominion fraught with blessing in the millennial kingdom, that is here spoken of; but it is another kind of labor and exertion from that hitherto, namely, a *joy*. And it is the *joy of the Lord*, *i. e.*, not merely the joy "prepared, destined for thee by the Lord"—but precisely his joy, that which he first achieved for himself (Heb. xii. 2), which consists chiefly in the joy in his redeemed and faithful ones, his delight to communicate to them all that himself has, nay, at last to adjudge to *them* also all his grace which others have despised. The faithful servant enters into the fellowship of the joy of his Lord (comp. John xv. 11). This Lord has distributed the talents, not truly for the sake of the profit and gain, but to try his servants, and that he might make blessed those who are approved; just as in chap. 20 he hired the laborers in order to bestow upon them the reward of their labor. Therefore also do those who were differently endowed, having shown a like faithfulness, receive the same commendation; not, Thou hast *gained* much! but, Thou hast been *faithful* over little!* The detailed repetition of the same colloquy is meant finally to show that it will not be tedious to the Lord in his joy to express in full to each one his special commendation; and that to receive *this* from such lips will be a greater joy to every good servant than all other power and honor.

Verses 24, 25. The slothful servant *must* also at last *come forward*, but he has no joyous ἴδε, *see*, for the Lord; before venturing to speak that word in quite another sense, he prefaces it by some very ill-sounding expressions as a vain *excuse*. What thoughts of his heart now become manifest, so that he must represent himself in sad truth, although in so doing he yet means to deceive himself! They are the equally insolent and pusillanimous, the self-contradictory and judging thoughts of every natural conscience before God; for so far alas! has this servant who had once also received the gift of grace, sunk back through the non-use of that gift. Thou *art* a hard and severe master—(Luke, αὐστηρός)—this I knew!—More sharply, ἔγνων σε; thus, I *knew* thee! But why not more: I *know* it, I know thee? Because he will excuse his *former* conduct, but not because the friendly judgments which preceded had made him wiser: for he was not yet present when these were pronounced; therefore he still presumes to speak of the good Lord, contrary to the proof which had just been delivered, as of one who unjustly exacts more than can be yielded, and he expresses this in the rudest manner: Who *reaps*, *will* reap where he has not sowed, and gather where he has scattered nothing.† Thereby must the evil servant bear testimony with his own mouth to the innermost truth, and the most perfect right, according to which the Lord requires *fruit* or produce from what he sows or gives—in which idea this *last* parable of Jesus remarkably harmonizes with the first, Matt. xiii. 3–9. That God demands fruits and works—that he will reap—is the truth which remains in the speech of this evil servant; but that he makes his demand beyond the capacity of sinful man, without first imparting grace—this is the lie with which certainly the slothful man strives, but in vain, continually to deceive himself. "One cannot become so holy as God requires; it is in vain for one to attempt to satisfy his strictness"—this he has said to himself long before, until he comes into disgrace, when at last he *must* say it also before the face of the good and gracious Lord. I was *afraid*—this excuse is *half* true, since Adam (Gen. iii. 10) spoke this word for the first time before the Creator; for, the fear of

* Meyer. indeed, would construe this εὖ adverbially with the ἦς πιστός; but this sounds strange. It is certainly an interjection of the pleased and warmly commending Lord—in one little word of his mouth the highest reward! Therefore as else where εὖγε, so also μαλ' εὖ and simple εὖ thus occurs.

* "Not good and *successful* servant, but good and *faithful*," as a missionary speaker in London once expressed it.

† We do not think that διασκορπίζειν here is to *winnow*; but, comparing with Luke, take it as simply synonymous: to *scatter* seed.

the evil conscience is actually the reason of the slothfulness in what is good, just as the joyful confidence in grace is the ground of all santification. Yet this excuse is, at the same time, half false, and already a self-judgment out of his own mouth. For (as Lisco very aptly observes), the pretended *fear* and this *impudent* speech, as if the Lord were unjust, agree but ill together; a true, and thoroughly honest, fear of the strict reckoning would not have remained idle, as we shall immediately perceive. The servant must also himself at last entirely refute his own words, inasmuch as the talent which had been delivered also to him comes to light. *Lo*, there hast thou, or thou hast *that is thine!* A counterpart to the word of the householder, chap. xx. 14, which has almost no other sense than the timorously insolent, confused application: I have stolen nothing from it, only be satisfied with it—thou wouldst certainly rather not have given me it; take it now, and let me have nothing further to do with what is thine! In fact this *evil* servant has never actually appropriated to himself the gift of grace; he has, as much as in him lay, thrust it from him, through non-use; and yet he has received it, and this is the ground of his sentence. (In his case it is *εἴληφώς*, with emphasis upon the past; in that of the others it is *λαβών*, of the continued taking and keeping.)

Verses 26, 27. He has judged himself, as is said in Luke xix. Thou *evil* and *slothful* servant!* That is the true reason of thy conduct, even if with the greatest mildness I allow to be true what thou sayest and take thee at thy word—more mildly I cannot judge thee! Even the fear of my hardness should at least have had some effect, if thou hadst been thoroughly in earnest. The Lord convicts him of a complete contradiction in the speech which mixes truth with falsehood; and forcibly takes away from him the false *Ergo. Knewest* thou actually that I would reap where I have *not* sowed? Then *must* thou have made *what* I have sowed in thee at least as fruitful as possible! Have I sowed nothing in thee? Is the talent which thou thyself now producest to me nothing? (Even five talents were *little* before; but a single talent is *much* when viewed as the means of obtaining a like reward by the faithful employment of it.) Yea, thou shouldst rather in thy fear have been more zealous than the others; or—if I would exact even the smallest thing—thou shouldst at least have given what was entrusted to thee to the exchangers, if thou thyself hadst no active hand and inclination to employ it! This alone appears to us the simple sense of such a direction: thou hadst at all events open and easy *opportunity* to do *something* with it, instead of burying it. For the rest, we are not at liberty to ask *here* who are the exchangers; they belong to the metaphor of *doing business* with *money*, and Olshausen seems to us to go too far, when he speaks of "more timid natures, who are not fitted for independent labor, joining themselves to stronger persons." This servant is by no means merely a timid person; besides, to make a profitable use of grace by means of others, without one's own labor, is in itself an impossible representation. The Lord therefore cannot mean thus; for he sanctions and acknowledges the putting of the talent into the public bank (joining societies, and other acts corresponding to the figure) only when in this there has been *faithfulness and activity on one's own part. This* he will, and must, require; and it is only as a proof of this that he requires the usury, *τόκος* (what the capital has produced or borne in interest), *without* which he does not take back *his own* when offered to him. If he speaks thus to the servant who has remained idle, half in fear, half in presumption—what will he say to those whose excuse might run thus: I knew that thou art a *compassionate*, most indulgent and kind man! Fundamentally only the same thing, with a different turn: Didst thou really know this, then my great love must have awakened reciprocal love in thy heart, and therefore impelled thee to a zealous gratitude and faithfulness, nothing of which I find in thee!

Verses 28–30. Behold how the judging Lord comes as a *thief*, as a *taker away*—not merely upon those who dwell on the earth in their houses built of sand, to teach them by experience, what they would not believe, that all their possessions are empty and transient—but also upon the unfaithful ones in his kingdom; the foolish virgins, however, less than the wicked servants. From those virgins who were *left* outside the door nothing was taken; for their lamps were burning again, when they knocked too late. They have therefore a stronger hope as regards the final end, if in the interval they shall have thoroughly made amends for their present carelessness; but the *unprofitable* servant who is of no use to the Lord in his kingdom, just as the one before who beat his fellow-servants and rioted, just as he who was found without the garment, is at once cast into outer darkness, while the diligent ones enter into the bright marriage-room and mansion of joy. Into this prison of pain he cannot, of course, take with him his Lord's talent of grace, so long despised by him, laid aside as *useless*, only thus hardly kept for the reckoning; it is *taken* from him, and, notwithstanding the objection against this startling command of the Lord, even by those who are to execute it (Luke xix. 25), given to him who already has most. Here, in the first place, we see again that the Lord desired the gain, not for his own reaping or gathering; that so far also the diligent servants are in nothing profitable to *him*, in that other sense of the word in Luke xvii. 10; Job xxii. 2, 3. Then there appears here, again, at the end of the parables, the great fundamental principle of God's kingdom and house, which,

* *Πονηρὲ καὶ ὀκνηρέ*—an accidental assonance from which Schleiermacher inferred that the discourse was spoken originally in Greek, probably in Galilee. One may thus be over-fine.

in Matt. xiii. 12, marked their beginning;* this is of great significance, and indicates that as well the first as the last giving and taking on the part of the Lord proceeds according to the same rule. In Matt. chap. xiii., we reserved for this place the full development of this saying of the highest justice, which sounds contradictory and unjust; but there is properly nothing now to be explained; as the entire parable has already furnished the explanation. Von Meyer's note at that place, "*Whosoever hath*, in which every thing depends only on the desiring to have, not despising and well using"—is, indeed, true as regards the sense; the expression, however, does not quite satisfy us, and we would rather denote the three decisive ideas which it implies thus: the *being able to receive*, *holding fast*, and *using well*. The first giving, distributing and sowing of the Lord is done, it is true, in the way of a general offer, but can only become actual *giving*, when it meets a receiving in the hearts of men, or the field: this is the first having on our side, the capacity to receive in faith. The unbelief of the unsusceptible, is indeed—inasmuch as the Lord still offers—a *not willing* (that this one should reign over us, should give his gifts to us!), but precisely therein the *not being able*, which the gift of grace removes. Only the servants who had come when the Lord called: Come unto me, whosoever will belong to me, and serve me! who, therefore, had already an obedience of faith, an open and outstretched hand for the gift, received then something for further management. Thus the slothful servant was at the first also one who *had;* although perhaps that he received so little may have lain in his inferior δύναμις or "ability" (with a new sense of that first word which, however, is not the sole sense for all cases). Now, all depended on the not despising, or *holding fast* and preserving of what had been received. Was the talent not well enough kept in the hole or in the napkin? No, the slothful servant *despised* it as "his Lord's money," with which nothing was further to be done; although he had received it, he had yet not truly *taken* it, and appropriated it to himself: therefore the sentence at last, Take it again from him! only corresponds to the evil word of his own mouth, Thou hast that is thine! In a certain sense, indeed, he had it up to this time; yet this having was no true preserving or keeping, he had only hoarded up the seed dry, instead of letting it bear fruit. Therefore this is finally decisive: Whosoever will rightly hold fast the gifts of the Lord must *use* them, with diligence and labor, in order to their increase; for this they are, according to their nature, given: keeping and profitably employing are one and the same thing. Works are the nourishment of faith, the diligence of faithful use is the oil for the burning lamp; doing nothing in the strength of grace, and bearing no fruit from its seed, is enough for the judgment which again takes away that which one seemed to have, but in reality had not. Observe here an important limitation of the apostolical saying in Rom. xi. 29, so often one-sidedly misunderstood; for it is clear as the sun that the Lord again takes what he has given, when the receiver does not rightly take hold of and use it. Preliminary judgments according to this principle manifoldly occur even now, so that in the one, the grace which was not carried into work is lost, lost to him even out of the hole in which he had secreted it, as he will find when he feels inclined again to look after it; on the other hand, the grace which has departed from others is, as it were, manifestly given to him who is faithful. What the *final* state of the case will be, however, in regard to all these things and relations—this only the fulfillment of the prophetic parable and saying will make quite clear; when the Son of Man shall come in his kingdom, to strip many who are accounted children of the light, of the last glimmer which is still in their possession unused, and to turn them quite naked into outer darkness.† "How wretched, how incapable, how dark, how hateful such a man will be, no one can now conceive; because there lives no man upon earth from whom his pound is taken, let him be as bad as he will"—this remark of Roos sounds strange, but it is true when we understand it of the natural gift, which is still always present. See what has been already said on Matthew xiii. 12.

* Again a proof that Matthew has not merely transferred here what was said at an earlier period.

LAST ADVENT: GENERAL AND FINAL JUDGMENT.

(Matt. xxv. 31–46.)

Could Christ have spoken of his coming three times in succession, and that so differently in each instance, if an actually different fulfillment did not correspond to each of his words? First of all, a coming, not personally, but as the lightning, a manifestation in order to judgment, by the eagles gathered to the carcass, when his people have *fled;* then a *visibly* personal coming, already with great power and glory, in order to a separating judgment upon *his called* ones, when the elect are gathered together, and enter into the kingdom; now again a ὅταν δέ (this δέ is not to be overlooked), "but when" and a τότε, "then," certainly still a *different* one from that at ver. 1, and a last separation of all who are not yet separated, in which his own people appear with him as already justified and not coming into judgment. (Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17, with 2 Thess. i. 7–10; and mark these two things, a promiscuous mingling as regards detail, and yet a perceptible distinction between an *intermediate* and *last* coming of the

† This idea belongs here properly to the whole; and has not (as alleged by Neander) been unsuitably brought over from Luke into Matthew.

Lord.) Is then Christ's own prophecy of the last coming also a *parable*, like the three that precede? Strangely enough, commentators, in other respects intelligent, nay, acute (even Lange), speak of it as such; as if the single expression, "*the King*," justified this, while every thing else contradicts it! *The Son of Man* stands quite properly and expressly in the foreground; the angels, the nations, the kingdom, the fire, the devil—all these are not parabolical, and certainly also not the *throne* of glory, which will be incomparably more real and unfigurative than any that has ever hitherto stood upon earth as a prophetic figure of it. The single parabolical feature in ver. 33, which is introduced by a ὥσπερ, "as," ver. 32 (it is surely not usual to insert in this way one parable into another), is carried out only for a moment, and as was natural, nothing further is said of speaking sheep and goats. Finally, the speaking of those who stand on the right hand and on the left, is easily understood; just as many things which are not to be taken exactly literally, yet quite as little to be taken parabolically. Therefore, "nunc plane et sine figuris." So *plane* or literally, indeed, that a certain echo of the condescendingly parabolic *tone* is not to be mistaken, even at the conclusion: thus the world-Judge speaks simply also for children concerning the end just as Moses did of the creation, so that the prophetic mysteries are covered as with a slight veil; but yet, along with this, there are many things, the greatest and most decisive that could be spoken of beforehand to the sons of men by the Son of Man, here openly declared with a calm clearness and dignity, which we cannot enough admire when we think that he spoke all this a day or two before his suffering! Here the *condescendingly* sublime poetry of the New Testament, in contrast with the prophetical *rhetorical flights* of the Old Testament, appears in its most striking form.

Verses 31–33. *His glory*, twice with highest emphasis: this is more than chap. xxiv. 30; for here it is the entire glory of the King upon the throne, of which Rev. xx. 11 speaks. *Then*, and not till then, will he thus sit and judge as Judge of all the world; as, since Gen. xviii. 25, nay, since Enoch, such a last general day of judgment had been announced and expected. The ἅγιοι, "holy," before the ἄγγελοι, "angels," is certainly to be cancelled; yet as an early opposition (which originally meant others in addition to the angels, until the two words afterwards came together), it is a hint at what is evidently pre-supposed in ver. 40, namely, that the saints, already gathered around him, now encompass the throne of the King with the angels—already belong to his glory (Rev. xix. 14, 8; Jude ver. 14; Zech. xiv. 5—which also is partly fulfilled at the middle Advent). *All* the angels, *all* the brethren of the first-born of the kings of the earth (Psa. lxxxix. 28; Rev. i. 5, 6), *all* nations, *i. e.*, all men, living and dead (Acts x. 42; Rev. xx. 12, 13)—what a scene! First they are gathered—presented in the body before his throne at his almighty call (John v. 28, 29); then all that till now was not yet separated, although already different, is *separated* with a final definitive separation and decision. While, since chap. xxiv. 31, the fate of the others remained as yet in a certain obscurity, *all nations* are now evidently placed in antithesis to the elect of his kingdom, to those who were called as virgins or servants, and even already separated: in consequence of mistaking this circumstance, this last judgment was for a long time not rightly understood. *Then* comes the recompense to *every one*, κατὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν, *according to his works* (chap. xvi. 27; Rev. xx. 13). At last appear also before him those who had *hitherto* been led indirectly by latent unconscious grace without the knowledge of his person; whose *Shepherd* this King alone not the less was and is. Those who are now accepted of him were already his *sheep*, as in John x. 16; and he himself personally fulfills in them the word elsewhere committed to his messengers, Behold here is your King, behold here am I! The Son of Man sits upon the throne, again the King is the Shepherd, and easily and safely, as a shepherd upon earth, does he seek out *his flock* for his kingdom, and separate the sheep from the goats, according to the prophetical word (Ezek. xxxiv. 17), which at that time did not yet extend so *far*. The sheep are the tractable ones, who were obedient also only to the indirect, concealed, call of grace, to the eternal mercy which taught them mercy; the *goats* are the refractory, proud, injurious, with allusion to the prophetical usage, as in Isa. xiv. 9, and elsewhere. But *not* also stinking, wanton, etc., as even Von Meyer would unwarrantably carry out the figure.*

Verses 34–36. As in the parable of the servants, as already in the Sermon on the Mount, chap. vii. 22, so here Christ does *not* speak of *all* who are judged in detail, according to the condition and desert of each; but "adduces a test," brings forward two extreme classes, under which all must range themselves, on the right hand or the left: this also is to be well obseved! Here for the *first time*, Christ designates himself, not parabolically but quite properly, *King*, as afterward only again before Pilate. The *King* of all nations now opens *the kindom* which *each one* along with the others, and yet entirely for himself, now inherits. His "*Come!*" is addressed now for the first time also to those who have not openly had, or fully accepted the preaching and invitation, chap. xi. 28; but yet have become equally with the others, and now completely the blessed of *his Father*. For, in his Father's name and authority, he has led and prepared them by his Spirit; and now also the judgment is com-

* Sepp mentions the he-goat of the great day of atonement as the antithesis to the Paschal lamb, and further notices the Jewish usage, according to which all Goim or gentiles, as children of Edom or Seir (the hairy one), were called goats of the desert, but Jacob the lamb.

mitted unto him by the Father (John v. 22–27). They are already saved from the curse of sin, blessed of the Lord (Gen. xxvi. 29; Psa. xxxvii. 22, cxv. 15; Isa. lxv. 23); and this is now made gloriously manifest. For them also is the kingdom prepared from the *foundation of the world*, which however (here equivalent to πρὸ καταβολῆς, John xvii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 20), designedly goes back only to the creation of the human race. It is now not merely the kingdom of the Son of Man, in which were as yet tares and offence, but the kingdom of the Father, at the same time, however as the completed, manifested, kingdom of Christ, comp. Matt. xiii. 41, 43.* The being *blessed*, as also the *inheriting*, excudes all merit, apart from the gift and grace of the Father; the *for* which follows in connection with the works of mercy, is therefore to be understood accordingly, as an acknowledging manifestation by their acts of the worthiness wrought in them. *The King* addresses, however, a strange word to them, which they, of course, are not able at once to apprehend: *I* was the hungry, thirsty, homeless, naked, sick, imprisoned one, to whom ye have shown kindness.†

Verses 37—40. The *righteous*, now declared to be such by the gracious judgment of the King, actually do not know that they have done such acts of kindness to him; and every interpretation which perverts and misconstrues this their simple confession is false, and does not yet know who these favored righteous ones are. Their humble reply is truly no mere empty phrase of modesty, which would be very unseasonable on such an occasion, before this throne; it is also no *forgetfulness* of their good works, such as is spoken of at chap. vi. 3,‡ but it is plainly antithetical to the distinct consciousness of grace received and profited which the ἴδε, "behold," of the faithful servants, vers. 20–22, expressed. It is plain from this ἴδε that the disciples of Christ must then know what he means to say to them. Such are evidently not the persons here meant; *these* righteous ones are clearly distinguished at ver. 40 from "his brethren;" and that not merely "as the bridesmaids from the bride, the servants from the domestics!" The just made perfect, and the Church of the first-born, Heb. xii. 23, are now already around him in glory; they come no more into this judgment (John v. 24; 1 Cor. xi. 31), but now judge the world with him (1 Cor. vi. 2), inasmuch as the conduct towards them as towards their Lord is what decides; but they had already been presented at an intermediate judgment (Rom. xiv. 10), and now receive on this great day their complete crown (2 Tim. iv. 8).* They were once upon earth for the most part poor, wandering, and indigent; *there were some of them* to be found among all nations, and in them the great King, who actually was and lived in them, went begging, so to speak, incognito, in order to try the rest of men, for the judgment.† Therefore, that the righteous, who are here accepted, had done their good works for the sake of Christ, to serve him—and thus the works were named only as the evidence and effect of faith in *his person* (to speak with our narrow theology)—so much does this lack of being true, that they actually do not know this, and their ignorance can only express itself in the question, When saw we *thee?* For, that they have done good to *others*, who were in need, they know well. We find fault, therefore, with Krummacher's interpretation of this text in his *Bremen Sermon*.‡ It is the false interpretation which has been current so long, and which rests on the erroneous opinion, still pretty general among believers, that Christ here announces a general judgment upon Christians and heathen; contrary to the express statement at ver. 32. So much remains true, that certainly here also, works are only valuable and decisive as the expression of the inward character and state of the heart; moreover, that a knowledge of the name of Jesus is pre-supposed in the righteous, as in chap. x. 42, xviii. 5; for until the Gospel has been every where preached there is no last judgment. So much is true; not, however, that (according to Neander) a general confession of faith in Christ by all men may here be taken for granted, which would contradict all prophetical theology. The speakers here exemplify the lowest class of those who stand as righteous before the judgment-seat, such as are not yet come to full decision, and yet are prepared for this, to

* As at Ephes. v. 5 (see my interpretation of this Epistle).

† First, nourishment, *i. e.*, *meat and drink;* then covering, *i. e.*, *lodging* (συνάγειν, אסף, *hospitia excipere*) and *clothing;* lastly life, *i. e*, *health* and *freedom*. Comp. passages such as Job xxii. 6, 7; Isa. lviii. 7: Ezek. xviii. 7; Tob. i. 20; Sir. vii. 34; James i. 27, ii. 15, 16. In ancient times, especially in the East, persons in prison might for the most part be visited; it was no strictly solitary confinement. For the rest, the Catholic Church should not have presumed to increase these *six* works of bodily mercy (which is also a complete number) to the number seven, by adding the apocryphal one of "burying the dead."

‡ Although even Lange abides by this: These merciful ones are also humble, they do not remember that they had acted as such angels of mercy upon earth!

* We enter our protest here against the entire import of the remarkable essay in Tholuck's *Litt. Anz.* 1848, Nos. 38, 39 (although it professes to connect itself with our statement): and must emphatically reject all mere Jewish parabolical speaking concerning the *last* judgment.

† He speaks here certainly only of his *brethren*, not in any wise of men in general, in so far as there yet lives something of him in every man, as Ullmann (*Stud. u. Krtik.* 1847, p. 164) very doubtfully, at all events in an exegetical point of view, wrongly maintains.

‡ *I, My, to Me, Me,* these are the words upon which the emphasis rests here. *Jesus was the life of these people*, on his account they did this or that, etc.

whose *humility* the others (although with more distinct consciousness) willingly and becomingly join themselves; of these, however, actually holds true what Von Meyer's note says, as indicating the only right interpretation, "Wherever there exists a preponderating love to mankind, there is grace yet possible." We say, in addition: There *already was* the preparing, blessing grace, the love of the Father, out of which the love that covers a multitude of sins (1 Pet. iv. 8) has proceeded; the mercy of the not personally known Shepherd and King, which alone could make them merciful (Matt. v. 7); the faith that sanctifies and saves; the faithfulness which is tractable to the leading of God! Again, however, not merely as Braune speaks of the "Christian instinct" of yet undeveloped Christians, in "whom Christianity was an undeveloped power, whose faith did not come the length of saying Lord!" for these righteous are actually in part also such as have hitherto been *heathens*.* Such also as might not yet be able to say with consciousness and experience, as that converted Hindu: Me, when hungry, Christ has fed; to me when athirst he gave drink, etc.† Thus, at last, does mercy abundantly triumph over judgment (James ii. 13)—only those are cursed into whose hearts nothing at all of the love of God, that draws all nations, had penetrated. That there is not required in all to whom the King will at last entirely reveal himself, a faith in him which has already reached a dogmatical form and expression, is with a solemn protest here certified against our harsh and narrow theology. Let this be duly considered!

Verses 41–43. As the sheep, who now for the first time come to know their Shepherd, are yet as in a last outbeaming of love joined to all his righteous, sanctified, elect ones, as fellow-heirs of the same kingdom—even so, on the other hand, the accursed are actually ripe for the everlasting condemnation, although the deficiency in works of love which is held up before them, not indeed to be viewed outwardly, gives the ground of decision. These two addresses of the King concerning the *having done or not done* are, as it were, a significant *curtain* which hides the wondrous depths of the divine guidance of all souls, even to this limit: only read the superscription which truly corresponds with the innermost course and state of the thing, and exercise thyself accordingly in inquiring and explaining what is its meaning in connection with all the teaching of Scripture elsewhere, for to this Christ would here draw us; beware only of bringing in that which would be foreign and contradictory to what is simply said. If the evidence adduced from the works, vers. 35, 36, and 42, 43, leaves unexpressed in the background much that concerns the bottom of the heart, which those who are addressed know and experience as the proper ground of decision, the two *sentences*, vers. 34–41, are not the less on that account most decisively and plainly declared, so that between those on the right and on the left, any further and third class remains for ever impossible. It is the first and last, the only curse from the mouth of him who was to bless all nations; which irrecoverably falls upon the class here brought forward as a specimen, along with all the cursed and rejected. That they have before heard, and on their part rejected, a "Come unto me," addressed to them in some sufficient way of divine invitation, is so self-evident that the Judge, as the announcer of his judgment, does not need now to say it. The rejection is the same as in chap. vii. 23, at the close of his first discourse; here, however, it stands in a striking, precisely marked antithesis, word for word, with the reception of the righteous. Come—Depart—now even more strongly: *from me!* Ye blessed—Ye cursed—but *not* of my Father; for they have themselves chosen the curse which drives them *from him*, the Son, while the righteous now fully and finally come by the Son to the Father. The *kingdom*, with all its glory and bliss—the *fire*, with all its misery! which is prepared for *you*—which is prepared for *the devil* and his angels, the partners of his fall; for there is for men no *decretum reprobationis*, no book of death, no hell of their own, because the blood of Jesus has atoned for them all; only those who would become the devil's obtain at last his portion. The kingdom prepared *from the foundation of the world:* instead of this it is now—the *everlasting* fire. For only that which is good is in the counsel and will of God everlasting *a parte ante;* what is evil, with its torment, only *a parte post* The hell of the devil who was created as an angel was, no more than his sin, ordained from the creation, but the hell was prepared from the beginning of his sin: for *the devil*, *i. e.*, since a devil was; comp. Isa. xxx. 33. Only the *inheriting* of the blessed has no antithesis, and can have no other than that it is omitted for the cursed. For the rest, the fire is the inextinguishable continuation of the great conflagration of the world, which is to break forth from the centre of hell (2 Pet. iii. 7, 12, 13), and which is met by the avenging fire from God out of heaven (Rev. xx. 9); Rev. xx. 10 is here pre-supposed to have already taken place. Were the unfaithful children of light before cast out into a darkness—now a fire receives the children of darkness, which fearfully lights up their darkness. What have they *done* to deserve this? Certainly as evil-doers much that was evil and only evil; they have certainly also in part hated and persecuted Christ and his followers; at all events they have kicked against his shepherd's staff (as goats), obstinately and completely resisted his gracious leading. All this, however, is not specified; but only the one thing, that in all their doings not even one good work of true love is

* This correct interpretation is recognized also in Keil's *Opuscula;* recently Alford has expressed himself in favor of it.

† Calwer, *Missionsblatt*, 1841, No. 22.

to be found, which might have showed this resistance to be *not* complete, on which the love of the gracious Judge that covers many sins might, on account of the love which was yet there, be able to graft a gracious sentence. The exact repetition of the particulars in the address to the rejected (from which those foolish preachers, to whom the sublime is too simple, seek to escape by greater abridgment or variation), indicates the exact care with which the Judge will, in the case of every individual, overlook and omit nothing that specially affects him. With respect, however, finally to the fearful *curse*, we observe that in it the *end of the pontifical office* of Christ is clearly expressed: He who after a once offered *sacrifice* still sat upon the throne, in order, Melchisedek-like, to *intercede* and *bless*, has now no *intercession-prayer*, no *blessing* more, for the condemned. The first and last curse of *his* mouth must be an irrevocable one, and he remains *the King* over all throughout eternity (the לְעוֹלָם however Psa. cx. 4, with its *αἰών*, is expired). Dan. vii. 14 (Luke i. 33) stands written now also of the priesthood.*

Verses 44, 45. The reply is, as regards the inner sense, the same as in chap. vii. 22, although the persons are different in the two passages; here it is the worst, most hardened class of all the condemned, with whom the others would willingly put in their word, and lyingly protest even in the moment of well-deserved judgment, *if they could*. Christ will certainly, at the day of judgment, not literally allow the damned "still to speak for themselves" (which strange thing Roos finds here) —so far the literal truth is not to be pressed; but their thoughts are reckoned before him as if they were expressed in words. *Many* have oppressed and persecuted Christ also in his followers, as Acts ix. 4, instead of letting themselves be taught; *all* have been *goats*, as they are called; *these* here have perhaps done some so-called good works, but not to *him*, not to God or for God's sake, hence they have had no earnestness and zeal of love, which is always and in every thing like itself, but here and there one of the least of Christ's disciples has been hard-heartedly passed over. This is enough to show how it has stood with them in other things *besides* these decisive sins of omission. Now every thing is made *manifest*, now the entire want of any truly good work, of any actual acknowledgment of Christ as concealed in his disciples, alone condemns—the entire not-having of that grace laid open to all (with or without the name of Christ), which has atoned for and covered also the sins of the blessed. Now, however, Christ, also the *Son of Man* and Shepherd, King and Judge, reveals himself as the centre of all the inner leadings and relations of the human race: Ye did it *unto me*, ye did it not *to me!**

Verse 46. Final fulfillment of John v. 28, 29 (Dan. xii. 2); as the fourth Gospel further lifts the curtain. The eternity of misery is quite as *endless* as the eternity of life;† *after* this *ἀπελεύσονται*, "they shall go away," according to the terms of their sentence, ver. 41, there follows no *Δεῦτε πρός με*, "come unto me," again, in any *æon* whatsoever.‡ When the present world passes away, and all that has been prepared in God's decree comes into full realization, then first begins the eternal misery of those men who are *associated with the devil;* of whose restoration there is not the smallest word to be found in the whole Scripture. As the righteous received their sentence beforehand, so that the damned must hear it, so now the condemned go away beforehand without seeing any thing of the glory of the blessed. First comes Rev. xx. 15; then over the closed abyss of the lake of fire, the new world for the blessed, Rev. xxi. and xxii. Only in accordance with this is Rev. xxi. 4 to be understood—from *their* eyes, *i. e.*, the eyes of the blessed; and ver. 5, *all things* new, *i. e.*, in *this* new world. For there still *remains* what is said at chap. xxi. 8, 27, xxii. 15, 19. We cannot otherwise read the Scripture, nor otherwise understand Christ. The enduring misery of such as fall to the devil is a deep mystery, just as is the devil's first fall; but it is at the same time quite as clearly attested as is the eternal life, the mark and prize of our heavenly calling in Christ Jesus. Follow, thou who art called, as a sheep the good Shepherd, obey his gracious invitation, *Come unto me!* with which the first part of this commentary upon his words closed—then wilt thou not hear his dreadful curse, *Depart from me!* with which we must now warningly close the second part.

* Not as if in Heb. vii. 24, 25, an atonement *ever* open, ever going on, were meant.

* Of which profound truth (comp. our remark on John v. 37) what Hase would teach us is only a very distorted presentation; viz., that this judgment is conducted "according to the rational law of *humanity* itself, which Christ *as it were* personally represents and exercises."

† Against this exegetically irrefutable sentence, Oetinger in vain maintains that misery *cannot*, in the nature of the thing, be equally everlasting; see in Auberlen, p. 492.

‡ In vain does Lange find a ground of consolation here in the darkness which envelops the rejected, for the words present a clear and unconditional contrast.

THE GOSPEL OF MARK.

TO THE UNCLEAN SPIRIT: HOLD THY PEACE.

(Mark i. 25; Luke iv. 35.)

Our exposition of the sayings, as recorded by Matthew, concluded with the words in which the Saviour of men pre-announced his final, unalterable, judicial sentence. These words are, "Depart ye cursed into the everlasting fire which has been prepared for the devil and his angels"—therefore not prepared for you men, but for the devils; not indeed from the foundation of the world, but from the time that there have been, and because there are, devils. The new commencement of the Lord's public sayings, as resumed in Mark, is from the very first in accordance with this their termination in Matthew. We here see, in the first chapter, the Son of God whose coming to us is the *Gospel*, introduced by the forerunner in the name and in the concluding words of the prophets; anointed and glorified from heaven by the Spirit, and the voice of the Father; tempted by Satan, spared by wild beasts, served by angels; followed by disciples whom without delay he had called; acknowledged and named by the *devils* whom he expels from men, but rejecting with marked sternness their final enforced testimony. He has come to deliver men, to judge devils: this the latter know earlier and better than the former; for heaven and hell bear testimony to him for behoof of the earth—"the kingdom of spirits knew him even under the form which concealed him from the world." So far the scene which the second Gospel discloses to us is the same as that of the first. But the whole is delineated, all at once, within very brief compass, in great, simply and sublimely powerful strokes; so much so that the very first chapter expresses clearly the special character of Mark's Gospel as indicated by us in the Introduction. We observed in our first Preface that any one Gospel, even that of Mark, gives clearly, strongly, and incontrovertibly enough, the truth, ever verifying itself afresh, on which, as on a sure historical basis, the doctrine of the Church stands. If we contemplate and examine thoroughly this single *first chapter of Mark*, what a fulness of testimony does it contain, encircling on every side the one who stands in the midst; what antecedents and consequents are there connected with him alone; how great is the assurance of this second writer,* who knows that he also writes and testifies of Jesus through the Holy Ghost! How entirely unconcerned is he about the doubts or oppositions of his contemporaries or of future generations! And yet every thing is written with a wise regard for the future.

Mark has the special gift of sententious brevity and of graphic painting in wonderful combination. While on every occasion he compresses the discourses, works, and histories into the simplest possible kernel, he, on the other hand, unfolds the scene more clearly than Matthew does, who excels in the discourses; not only do single incidents become in his hands complete pictures, but even when he is very brief, he often gives, with one pencil stroke, something new and peculiarly his own. It is very instructive and interesting to consider these peculiar gifts of Mark; this however is foreign to the design of this work, as these peculiar gifts have to do rather with the narratives than with the sayings—as, for example, in the expression, ver. 13, "He was with the wild beasts." On the other hand we have now to do with the narrative at vers. 23–25.

In the synagogue at Capernaum† there is a

* For we repeat that "the result of sound criticism will always be to prove that the order in which the Church has arranged the four Gospels is the correct one, whether viewed externally or internally."

† Mark and Luke anticipate the later occurrence. Mark, with his carefully used εὐθέως, has given, vers. 21, 22, partly a general description, such as that we have at Matt. iv. 23 (εὐθέως is the word he employs from the beginning to denote the rapid course of the Lord's life, as he passes from one great and important event to another); here he passes over, in the first place, the choice of the disciples, the Sermon on the Mount, the Leper, the Centurion, and steps forward into the midst of the first teaching and working of miracles, a scene of paramount importance for the beginning of his Gospel. After this he carries forward his historical narrative till ver. 39. Then, however, he introduces, at last, the healing of the leper; let it be

demoniac, who, of course, has crept in unobserved. The proximity of the Lord compels the unclean spirit to make himself known by bearing testimony to Jesus through the utterance of a loud cry. There is nothing peculiar in the fact that the Lord expels the spirit: there is something peculiar, however, in the fact that the spirit knows and names the Lord.* The injunction, "*Hold thy peace*," standing, as it does, by the side of "come out," is new in Mark, and is of great significance. Christ will not suffer himself to be named and praised by the devils. To them, and to their dark knavery, he is sharp and severe. He has none of his Saviour-tenderness for those who are condemned and reserved for judgment. He never permitted *the devils*,† after the first attempt, to proclaim that they know him (ver. 34), although they often made the attempt, chap. iii. 11, 12. The address of the spirit here, ver. 24, is partly parallel with that other address, chap. v. 7 (Matt. viii. 29). In three respects, however, it is peculiar. First, in the ἡμῖν and ἡμᾶς, *us*, the utterance of the single spirit speaking in name of the whole body of the powers of Satan. Secondly, in the Ναζαρηνέ, "of Nazareth," by which he at once addresses the Lord; not merely making use of the appellation common at the time (Luke xviii. 37), but undoubtedly using the word because this name of contempt, given to Jesus in his state of humiliation, was destined to be brought into honor on earth, in hell, and in heaven (Mark xvi. 6; Acts ii. 22, xxii. 8). Finally, in using the name, expressive of mediation and victory, borrowed from the prophecy of the 16th Psalm, or at least closely connected with it, and very specially denoting the person of Jesus as the antagonist of hell, "*The Holy One of God.*" (Erasmus correctly translates this phrase by *Ille sanctus Dei;* compare the other appellation which generally corresponds to this one, Luke iv. 41; Mark iii. 11. Ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς is a question, as in Matt. viii. 29.) He breaks forth with an ἔα of anguish (not "desist!" "let us alone!" as if it were an imperative from ἐάω, but an interjection ah! woe! Heb. אֲהָהּ in anticipation of the judgment, of which the associates of the devils also shall in time to come be made partakers, Heb. x. 27. "Let us rather give testimony to thee." But the Lord will by no means be thus publicly proclaimed. The devils malignantly and maliciously, with all fear, anticipate the plan of his life with a view to perplex him in regard to it, and to prepare for him (as Mark iii. 22 follows after verse 11) scandal and suspicion. Therefore, as the Master, he does exactly what (Acts xvi. 16–18) his apostle afterwards did; and what, unfortunately, his disciples now-a-days often fail to do when they do not reject, with sufficient decision, any testimony given from hell in their favor. "*Hold thy peace*," he says. The spirit, yielding a reluctant obedience, *cries out* at least once more before he departs; but he dares not utter one other word after his Judge has shut his mouth.

TO PREACH IN OTHER PLACES ALSO.

(Mark i. 38; Luke iv. 43.)

The three Evangelists unite in relating that the miraculous cure of the mother-in-law of Peter brought many sick persons to Capernaum, on the evening of the day on which it was wrought. But Mark and Luke add that our Lord, early on the morning after this day, a day spent in labor and in preaching, retired into the wilderness. In the narrative of Luke especially, we may observe how the noise and the concourse increased (iv. 14, 15, 32, 37, 40–42); and this suggests the cause of the withdrawal of the Lord into the wilderness at this time, in order to collect his thoughts in solitude, and prepare himself afresh for dealing with others. According to Mark, who undoubtedly knew most exactly the real state of matters, it was "Simon and those with him," who hastened after Jesus, and said: All men seek for thee; it is not only we that wish to have thee for ourselves, but all men are in this same state of mind. The view of Luke, which is indeed in substance the same as the above, is that the multitudes, ὄχλοι, go after him desirous of bringing him back; the οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ or "those with him" of Mark may also have been individuals whom the people had dispatched as their representatives. There is thus a struggle for him, the result of the many instances of healing and of the expulsion of devils which had taken place; men are determined not to lose sight of one in whom such power resides. In the midst of all this press, however, the Lord is altogether as calm, serene, and collected on the subject of the work which

observed, however, without a εὐθέως and with the indefinite expression καὶ ἔρχεται. Thus the incident in the synagogue, as is obvious from ver. 29 (and with this Luke iv. 38 agrees), is to have its place assigned to it between the 13th and 14th verses of Matt. viii.

* Acts xix. 15: "With Jesus I am well acquainted, and Paul I know."

† Not "*the sicknesses*," or "the sick!" We may see how impossible it is that such was the meaning of "possessed" as understood by the Evangelists.

had been given him to do, as he had been, when, according to the preceding narrative of Luke, he was expelled from Nazareth. He needed, according to Matthew viii. 17, to collect his thoughts and to strengthen his soul in solitary prayer; but when found out and disturbed, he immediately recognized the interruption as an admonition from his Father to work: He feels no annoyance at the intrusion, but is ready once more, in all kindness for men —"I am at your call, I have had enough of rest." But he does not so give himself up to them as to return back as they desired to a place in which he had labored enough; the way on which he was sent, to which his Father calls him, leads him further on, that *all men*, whether they seek him or not, may partake his benefit. He who commanded the devils to be silent, will by no means suffer himself to be lauded with turbulence even by men, as a mere worker of miracles; when matters are taking this turn he goes away, as he does every where else in similar circumstances. The import of his address given in reply to those who seek him and hold him fast, which Mark and Luke record in different words, but to the same effect, lies thus in the double antithesis: Not here only, but *elsewhere* also; not merely to work miracles, but *to preach*.

The reading in Mark ἄγωμεν ἀλλαχοῦ, *Let us go elsewhere*, which rests on good external authority, is in this way recommended and justified: it brings εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις, "into the neighboring villages," into more exact similarity to καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν, "and the other cities," of Luke, and gives strong emphasis to καὶ ἐκεῖ, "and there." The Saviour of the world, sent in the first instance to Israel as Minister of the Circumcision, could certainly not continue to reside in one place, or even in several places in succession. He must proclaim, testify, and work, every where; at least he must travel carefully over the populous public cities or large market towns of Galilee—the great theatre which was assigned him; as, for many reasons, he had it not in his power to confer favors either personally or even by means of the apostles upon all the cities of Israel before the judgment (Matt. x. 23). There is thus given, at the beginning, part of the explanation of the reason of his travelling up and down the country. The other reason is strictly connected with this one: That I may *preach* there also, namely the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, as Luke explains it; compare Mark i. 14; Luke iv. 18, 19. For *therefore*, says he, and not only to heal the sick and those possessed with devils, have I come, and been sent. *There* we have, still further, in the very first chapter, an explanation of the design and value of his working of miracles; such as we find near the beginning also of John, chap. iv. 48. Miracles were wrought only to introduce and confirm the word; never in such numbers as the people desired; but always to such an extent only as was good for directing them to that work, which he was always commencing afresh as his proper work, the preaching of the word.

The expression in Luke is, "therefore am *I sent*;" that in Mark, however, is assuredly the original, "therefore I *have come forth*"—for the reading ἐξελήλυθα is to be preferred. We must not, however, with Pfenninger, adopt the superficial rendering, "I have come forth from my domestic retirement and obscurity;" and certainly not, "I have come out at this early hour *from the city* into the wilderness, in order thus to escape being followed by the crowds of the citizens of Capernaum." This exposition* is very plainly refuted by the reading in Luke, ἀπέσταλμαι; which shows us that we have here in Mark a remarkable instance of one of the expressions peculiar to John's Gospel put into the mouth of the Lord, "I have proceeded forth from the Father, and come into the world"—although this designedly is not expressed so plainly at the beginning. In fine, it is to be understood that the Lord, by the expression before us, declares his prophetical office to be merely the first and immediate object of his life (as he does also in John xviii. 37), without prejudice to other duties, as we know, and as he himself elsewhere declares. He knows, however, his way and walks in it, rejecting every false claim, firmly and securely; to preach the Gospel from place to place is quite as sacred a duty in its own time (to speak with Luke, *I must*), as it is afterwards, when the hour has come, to suffer, to be silent, and to die. Let a single word be sufficient to point out the practical import of this saying to those who are sent out by him as heralds, according as their vocation is to one city or to one nation.

THE SONS OF THUNDER.—(THE LITTLE SHIP READY.)

(Mark iii. 17 [9].)

To introduce into this exposition of the Lord's discourses all his sayings which are indirectly quoted or indicated, is a task beyond our ability; and one, moreover, which we have not the least desire to attempt. We proceeded on this plan throughout the Gospel according to Matthew. Occasionally, however, there must be exceptions. Thus, for example, in the very passage before us, Mark iii. 9, though there is no more than a mere indirect indication of what our Lord on one occasion said to

* Which, however, very unexpectedly, Lange (with Stolz) is inclined to prefer.

his disciples, we would by no means withhold that saying from our consideration merely on account of the form in which it appears, if there were in it any thing of special import. This, assuredly, there is not; it forms one of those merely human utterances of human intercourse, which the Evangelists, for this very reason, rarely quote directly, occasionally indirectly, but most commonly omit altogether. The scene, which is parallel with that of Matthew xii. 15–21, merely shows us the Lord again withdrawing himself from men; as much from their pressing throng, as from their active hostility. He is desirous of having provided for him the means of proceeding by sea as often as he finds it convenient to do so; frequently retiring from the place altogether, and frequently, at least, from the "press," to a quiet place where he may preach the Gospel, as in Luke v. 1–3. He wisely provides for this as a matter of human arrangement; and therefore enjoins his disciples to see to it that a small ship wait on him (not at this particular time merely, but generally); that it be ready, in order that he may enter into it, as we find him frequently doing, as often as the multitude renders this desirable. Thus we behold the Saviour not merely manifesting "a regard to suitable accommodation," as Bengel correctly remarks, but also with all humility as a man planning and arranging for what his divine wisdom finds to be good; taking due precaution against the pressure of the multitude, as often as he trusts his person in the midst of it. Here lies the spirit and substance of this saying, which so far, has not been recorded in vain, or without a lesson for us.

The *giving of the names* by our Lord (ver. 17), and the statements made by him on that occasion, are certainly of much more weighty import—certainly not merely a subject of exegetical curiosity, as Gurlitt superciliously affirms. By the insertion of his catalogue of apostles at this place, we see that Mark refers (ver. 13) to the choice of the apostles which took place previous to the Sermon on the Mount (Luke confirms this, vi. 13); but that, at the same time, he appends to this a more general view. Consequently we are by no means to understand that all the names were given precisely at this time; but as Simon was surnamed Peter at an earlier period, the sons of Zebedee may have received their appellation earlier or even later, as Boanerges. There are two similar and common names: since Mark evidently means to say that they were to be so called not only when spoken of together as a pair of brothers; but also that each brother by himself was to be a Son of Thunder. We have already expressed our sentiments (pp. 16 and 307 on the giving of the names considered in itself. Our view is that on these two disciples was conferred the honor of a new name as being men of a like spirit; for the same reason which led to their being taken with Peter into a narrower circle within the Twelve. If this be so, it is certain that their name indicates *two* things: *first*, a description of their natural character (as brothers, as sons of Zebedee), a character full of meaning and power; secondly and chiefly, their *apostolic character*, for the new name which the Lord gives them is assuredly a name summoning them to their office, and prophetic of things to come. Hence every view which entirely disregards either of these is false. Most assuredly is that view false, which finds in it a mere expression of *blame;* for the Evangelist has, with perfect simplicity, placed the appellation *Peter* by the side of their honorary titles. The Lord by this title designated them neither as "boisterous" nor as "hot-headed men" (as Von Ammon has expressed himself, and refers us to רגשׁ); but most certainly, though not without a warning running side by side, he indicates a good natural ground in them, out of which his grace will afterwards produce something of powerful efficacy. To connect the incident related at Luke ix. 54, 55 with the giving of these names, is so far correct that these brothers, who generally spoke and acted very much together, and were very closely bound up with each other, were men of a strong ardent spirit, and not in the least of the soft and effeminate character which unfortunately and without any reason has been supposed to have belonged to John. The idea that at the time when they would have called down fire from heaven the Lord gave them this name, in the way of a reprimand and "that they might always be reminded of their enemy," as Tholuck says, is simply to be rejected. For as Olshausen convincingly remarks, there is not a single instance in the whole New Testament, or even within the entire compass of Bible history, of a reproof being given by affixing a name. Moreover, this false combination, in the case of the Evangelists Mark and Luke, cannot be maintained with a due regard to their inspiration. Mark would not, in his catalogue of apostles, and by the side of the name of Peter, have fastened firmly and solemnly upon the brethren an epithet which, on this supposition, the Lord assuredly did not intend should remain with them. And Luke (whose Gospel, besides, refers to that of Mark) would not have recorded other matters and omitted the most striking point, had these words been uttered on that occasion.

That Mark's translation, *vioi βροντῆς*, "Sons of Thunder," must be correct, is self-evident, and is confirmed by Christian antiquity. And though we cannot exactly restore the root of the Aramaic word (for the roots רגז, רגשׁ, רעשׁ run into one another, and we know little of the dialect then in common use), this much is certain, that the thunder is here used in the sense of power to shake. The Hebrew word רַעַם is used in this sense. The point of comparison is not the *secret nature*, nor the *terrible effects* (and so on in their fanciful applications) of the thunder; but the *power of the word*, as in Psa. xxix. and Psa. lxviii. 34. Even heathen antiquity speaks of powerful el-

oquence as thunder.* Theophylact, in his μεγαλοκήρυκες, "great preachers," gives the simplest expression of our view; but on the other hand, by his addition of θεολογικώτατοι, "most theological," introduces an idea for which there is no warrant. On whatever occasion the Lord may have said "Ye are or shall be called Sons of Thunder," he must have conveyed to their minds, "I know that out of the depths of the strong feelings of a fervent heart there shall break forth a *powerful* testimony of the word. I will therefore make you as my apostles, at a future time thunderers with the thunder of the heavenly word." It is not exactly (as Meyer, and Luther's marginal note have it), "I will make you fiery, terrific, evangelists and preachers;" for that would be lightning instead of thunder. We know nothing further of James, who met an early martyrdom. But John's thunder-power is sufficiently seen in the sharp edge, the fearless and unimpeded march of his majestic *testimony*, by the side of that stream of abounding love which prevades it and sheds its halo around it.

PARABLE: THE SEED GROWING OF ITSELF.

(Mark iv. 26–29.)

We have already pointed out (p. 248) how this beautiful parable, the peculiar import of which has, in consequence of its simplicity and brevity, been commonly, but most unjustly, overlooked, fits into the cycle of parables in Matt. xiii., like an extra one omitted there, or an intermediate clause thrown in as a bond of connection. It is not merely an *appendix* to the preceding parable (as Braune says), but an independent link in the chain. To consider it as another version, the product of inaccurate memory, of the parable of the tares (to which it appears appended even in Rieger's *New Testament*), is a piece of great folly, originating either in irreverent treatment of the sacred text, or in a superficial reading of the text on the part of such believers. Neither can it have been given at one time by the Lord as a simple basis which he afterwards and on another occasion expanded into the parable of the tares; it is, generally, no mere modification of another parable. For, in the first place, Mark gives from vers. 1 and 2 to ver. 33 an exact account of the many parables delivered at the same time; and in the next place this extra parable, not belonging to the kernel of the seven, has a fundamental idea altogether peculiar to itself, and one which has nothing to do with the tares among the wheat.

Seedtime and harvest: this was the general fundamental tone of the first four or exoteric parables in Matthew. The seed *grows* on till the harvest; this was the chief note at the end of the second, Matt. xiii. 30, which the third, ver 32, again takes up. In all probability, therefore, this parable given here by Mark, the idea of which is remarkably and completely contained in this *growing*, takes its place as a transition from the tares to the grain of mustard seed. The seed once sown grows, according to its own nature, *of itself* from its own impulse and power of life, with this we have manifestly the immediate reference and limitation with which our Lord here speaks of it. The self-inherent power of growth of the kingdom of God (as a whole and in individuals, great and small), in reference to what *we* know of it, and what *we* do to it, in its independence of human care and labor—this and nothing else is the theme, as Lisco has well said, and as Brandt's Bible, guided by its special object, has for once happily expressed the true meaning. The man who overlooks this must find himself in the predicament of saying of the main subject of the parable that the description is not to be pressed, that it is not the main thing! *Seedtime* and *harvest* are mentioned only briefly at the beginning and end: the idea lying between these, viz., "the kingdom of God has been established broadly and deeply in order that its development may proceed from within," comes forward strongly in the two intermediate verses. It is affirmed that the growth proceeds at certain fixed times; secretly, without the knowledge of man; of itself, without the cooperation of man; finally, also, in a natural progress from one step of advancement to another

The *man* who sows the seed, τὸν σπόρον (not his own seed, αὐτοῦ; as in Luke viii. 5), is throughout this parable not the Son of Man, the divine sower, properly so called. For, first, the sleeping during the night is not applicable to him. And although this may be interpreted as descriptive of appearances (*it seems to us* as if the Keeper of Israel slept, not looking after his seed), yet the ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν αὐτος, "he knoweth not now," is decisive—an expression which, especially when so strong as it is here, can in no sense be applied to him. For, the seed is neither more nor less than the energy of the Lord; his power, Spirit, life; even the the Lord himself. How should he then not be cognizant of its most secret spring-

* Plato and Demosthenes are called *tonantes* by Columella (*Res rustic. praef.* i. 30); Cicero, after Aristophanes (*Acharn.* 530), speaks of Pericles exactly in the same way.

ing and growth?* The person of the sower, therefore, is varied according to different didactic purposes, like the seed and the field; and the man who sows the seed in this parable is a disciple and servant of the kingdom, one who labors in and about the kingdom. Particularly is it one who scatters the seed abroad upon others; though the analogy admits a certain application to the heart which has received the seed, and its subsequent care for itself. Further, as in nature the fruit produces seed, or the self-propagation of the plant is the seed (Gen. i. 12; Isa. lv. 10), so here the σπόρος or seed, ver. 26 (exactly what in the two preceding parables is termed the seed of the kingdom), and the καρπός or *fruit* are to a certain extent identical and run into one another. What is said in ver. 21 of the lighted candle, may so far be applied here: will any man have merely fruit without at the same time casting abroad seed? (Additional remarks on this subject will be found on p. 255.)

Verses 26, 27. First, therefore: The kingdom of God in regard to its growth, its great development, from seedtime to harvest (a development, however, which proceeds onward through an oft-repeated seedtime and harvest), is of the following nature. *A man scatters*, or men *scatter seed abroad:* it is, therefore, always spread and propagated by human instrumentality; subject to this condition, however, that the springing and the growing of the seed are beyond the knowledge and control of the man who had scattered it. He lets day and night succeed each other according to the ordinary course of nature; he leaves the God of heaven to bring day and night over the earth, an operation beyond the reach of man; and remains quietly within his own sphere, the sphere allotted to man: he sleeps during the night, and is awake during the day. Assuredly the reverse, indolent sleep during the day, is not permitted; on the contrary, the ἐγείρεσθαι, or the daily new awaking, expressly includes all diligence, carefulness, and attention on the part of the *laboring* husbandman (2 Tim. ii. 6), rendered necessary by the place which he occupies. Not to concern himself at all about the seed after he has once cast it abroad were certainly culpable neglect; for, the looking after it, that it be not destroyed, or that the field be not turned up, the watering it and such like occupations, form still so many parts of the prolonged duty of the sower, just as the education of children forms part of the τεκνογονία, 1 Tim. ii. 15. But our Saviour means to say this (and in doing so to glance at Matt. xiii. 25), that no one need be in painful anxiety about it; he is not, after he has sown his seed, forthwith to go to sleep altogether; but he is permitted and enjoined to take that sleep during the night which the necesities of human nature require. We may from the figure make a still further application, and limit Eccles. ix. 6 by Psa. cxvii. 1; thus finding out the due medium between useless tormenting anxiety and ruinous thoughtless indolence. This much is certain; all that man can do in protecting and helping is a mere trifle; the great business of springing and growing goes on without us, chiefly in the secret fruitful womb of *night*, as is well known to all who are acquainted with nature. There is a truth corresponding to this in the hidden progress of the growing kingdom of God: the nights of men and of nations quietly force the seed even more effectually than do the days, although here again the sunshine and the life-dew of the light are indispensably necessary for conception in the womb of darkness.

The expression "night and day" here signifies two things. First, the necessary *amount* of the time intervening between seedtime and harvest; so many days and nights must elapse ere the blade, the ear, and the full corn in the ear, appear in succession. Secondly, the *quality* of this time, or the favorable influences of weather and fructification which the days and nights given by God contain within them. This is the usual way with the seed in the ground. Upon this we might consider that in regard to spiritual seed, the Lord God on his part gives only favorable weather, and nothing but his blessing (1 Cor. iii. 6, 7). Here then are entirely *excluded* both the knowledge and the influence of man. Especially the knowledge as to the "how" of this secret and wonderful thing (ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν); on the other hand, all the most secret shooting, forcing, springing, in the kingdoms of grace and of nature, lie open before God, because this is his very work. Mark this well, ye preachers and educators, in opposition to all anxious Methodism.* Apply this also to your own heart, ye anxious spirits; beware of the petty measurement of the daily and hourly barometrical state of your feelings and

* In Von Gerlach we read: "After Christ has scattered the seed he exerts no influence by his personal presence or by outward means upon its growth." But ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν αὐτός means a great deal more than this. Even *non curat* cannot be said of the Lord, who truly looks after his field. With equal violence to the text, Alford understands the expression as applicable, at least at the same time, to Christ and his servants: to the former, "*He knows not how; i. e., from bodily absence, he watches not how, witnesses not how.*" But the words will not admit of this—and the sense, moreover, is not true. For Christ continues to influence by his *spiritual* presence; effectually watches and protects.

* The good Wesley, in commenting on this parable, cannot away with this; hence he gives as the meaning of "sleeping and waking, night and day," exactly the reverse; *that is, he has it continually in his thoughts.* [This feature of the parable, however, is quite as much directed against inattention to the spiritual progress as against solicitude respecting it; for the sower wakes as well as sleeps. Indeed it applies solely to a mistrustful inquisition as to the divine growth in *others*, and cannot be meant to discountenance self-examination, however earnest and frequent.—Am. Ed.]

spiritual life; beware of watching, and brooding, and refining; beware of keeping diaries in such a sense as this. Ye must not childishly uncover the seed, and look how the growth goes on.

Verse 28. Still less can we draw upwards the seed and the stalk with the hand, so as to produce a more rapid springing and growth. Every false help is excluded. Man (ver. 26) has no need to know any thing about the matter, or to render any help at all; for the earth brings forth its fruit *αὐτομάτη*,* "of herself." This means, naturally; because of the principle of vitality made inherent in the seed. Assuredly to hope for harvest without having sown is stupidity. It means more: For the *earth* bringeth forth—originally endued by God with the fertility which meets the seed, and which he continually renews and fertilizes by influences from above: assuredly stones and rocks form a surface on which nothing grows. The *αὐτομάτη* excludes only the co-operation of man (the *αὐτός* immediately preceding); it includes the energy of God, which is at work in all things. It has now been sown, it has its own part to act; you may now be quiet and act yours; see that you procure good seed, do your day's work in sowing it, then *wait* (James v. 7). "Earthly seed is long in springing up; imperishable seed is longer still." It is only when the seed comes forward of itself—when *it grows up*—that it is shown to be seed. When covered up, and apparently dead, it bursts through the ground, rising from the dead, having been brought to life and having grown when *below* (in the night, in secret); next it continues to grow, springing further up when above ground (in the day time, in the light). The sprouting below ground was a concealed growth, the growth above ground is a continued shooting and sprouting; we know, however, and understand, as little of what is above as we do of what is below, as little of the day as we do of the night.

Once more, we have the natural progress of the plant from stage to stage—the most observable feature of the season between seed-time and harvest, and of the vegetable world during that period of the year. The *three* stages mentioned in the parable correspond to the children, young men, and fathers, 1 John ii. 12, 13; only in general, however, and without any sharp boundary lines. Hence, after the *πρῶτον, first*, we do not find a *δεύτερον* and a *τρίτον*, or a secondly and a thirdly, but merely an *εἶτα, then*; for there are no intermediate stages and transitions: the meaning is, one after the other, and not before; as at the end the harvest is after and not before the ripening of the fruit. (A man does not sow grass or ears of corn; neither does he reap and use *them* as such.) As the *root* spoken of in the first parable (ver. 17) is pre-supposed in the springing up, so must the ears stand upon the blade, and the corn must find the ears in which it is to grow. The blade is still like tares, as the little children in Christ are still "as carnal," 1 Cor. iii. 5; the ears, on the other hand, seem even ready for harvest, before they have received the corn and are *filled* or ripe. Our Lord gives every thing here in a figure drawn from nature, simple yet full of meaning, that we may meditate upon the kingdom of God. In this figure he brings prominently forward the most important fundamental features of that kingdom; he teaches us not to despise quiet perennial growth, not to lose heart because of small beginnings; but to wait without any precipitate misconceptions, for the right termination.

Verse 29. To the eye of the true husbandman the fruit *presents* itself with *sufficient distinctness* at the proper time, as ripe; *i. e.*, quite full, as *fruit*. This idea, in contrast with the concealed condition of the plant at its origin, and with its uncertain appearance at the intermediate stages, is expressed emphatically by *παραδῷ, affords itself* ("is brought forth"), —a word which has been manifestly selected for this very purpose; (on its middle signification see Winer, § 29). The idea meant to be conveyed is therefore not merely, "of its own accord also," but still further "as he himself also knows." The fruit visibly ripe invites to harvest. It is only in its most general application that *this* harvest can be regarded as denoting also the last great harvest of the whole world before God; for, as has been already said, the parable in the first instance speaks of the manifold human sowings and reapings which intervene between God's seed-time and God's harvest. The harvest therefore, in the first instance, is the human harvest, with a view to a sowing to be again immediately commenced. Do not come back with the harvest wagons immediately after thou hast sown a little, but let the earth and the seed have time; dost thou see, however, the fruit, then immediately (*εὐθέως*) put in the sickle, Joel iii. 13. The Lord here again designedly changes the expression: he does not speak of reapers as in Matt. xiii. 30; for here it is the people connected with the farm that are the sickle-bearers; there is no need of angels. (*Ἀποστέλλει* is not a *Latinism* of Mark's, *immittere falcem*, but a Hebraism of our Lord's discourse, as in Joel iii. 13, שַׁלְּחוּ מַגָּל, *ἐξαποστείλατε δρέπανα*; even *ὅτι παρέστηκεν* stands literally there.) The man must now appropriate to himself the corn that has grown up; he reaps it, and in doing so he gathers it together, that he may again sow it out to advantage, in order to be always acumulating fruit to life eternal (John iv. 36). His design is not to store up in granaries, that he may rest and enjoy himself before the time. The parable begins again at the beginning; and thus the growth of the kingdom advances before men upon the earth. We have here, on the one hand, very peculiar thoughts, deeply hidden in their simple expression; yet, on

* Even Philo applies *αὐτομάτος* to what the earth brings forth without the labor of man.

the other, the significant selection and arrangement of these expressions, makes the meaning clear in its simple unity. This parable given by Mark is not therefore an inaccurate version of some other parable; neither is it a rough and unfinished draft, drawn up hastily on the spur of the moment by the Lord, and intended to be afterwards wrought out into a larger form. No, it is a parable which to a right *exegesis* becomes self-interpretating; yea, it is a most precious gift of the Lord to his servants, preserved by the Holy Spirit through the instrumentality of Mark, containing a very essential supplement to the other kindred parables, a very wholesome warning on the subject of all human interference with the sowing and the reaping of God, a complete explanation of what the growth of the seed properly is, and how that growth goes on.

EPHPHATHA, AND THE PROHIBITION TO SPEAK OF IT.

(Mark vii. 34–36.)

This one single little word, "*Ephphatha*," though soon translated into every language, as here in the first instance it was translated into Greek, is a word of mighty power and import. It was so when first uttered by the Lord to the man who at that time was healed; and to the people who praised this new miracle in common with all the other miracles of this miracle-working Physician. It is of still greater import to us who know better, and should praise better, him who makes all things good which have been made evil by sin—who by a pure work of opening and loosing the bands, brings a restoration to the first creation in which all things were very good. But, in order to bring ourselves into contact with this mighty word of the Lord's lips, we must consider in connection with it the whole instructive history, and especially those actions of the Lord by which he accompanied the miracle, and by which he also intended to *speak* to the dumb.

He would not and he could not be concealed; the Father sends to him every where, even on the confines of the heathen world, the poor and the miserable for his assistance. He is returning to Galilee, through the midst of the half-heathen Decapolis, still tarrying and turning aside by the way. It is not an individual case of the miracles mentioned in Matt. xv. 30, as the harmonists have been accustomed inaccurately to represent it (although afterwards Matt. ver. 31 may fall in with Mark ver. 37), but an earlier case which occurs by the way, that Mark here details; who has preserved for us two cases of healing, here and in chap. viii. 22, connected together by very peculiar circumstances. (The Septuagint, and in like manner Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, use μογιλάλος and ἄλαλος indifferently for אִלֵּם; see Exod. iv. 10, 11; Psa. xxxviii. 14; Isa. xxxv. 6, lvi. 10: the enraptured song of the people after the event had taken place classes the μογιλάλος among the ἀλάλους. Yet it is evident from the history generally, and also from the ὀρθῶς of ver. 35, that the man was only a βραδύγλωσσος or ἀγκυλόγλωσσος—an old Lexicon has μογιλαλεῖν, βατταρίζειν—a פַּאקָא, a *stammerer*, as the literal Peshito has it.) It was the case of a man whose malady is clearly distinguished both by the Lord and his Evangelist from possession, such, for example, as we find at Matt. xii. 22; Luke xi. 14. So much the more remarkable is the ceremonious and protracted operation of the Lord, instead of the customary laying on of hands, which is what he was here asked to do: he does not work the miracle for the sake of the people; he does not show his power in the manner prescribed by them, and which was the usual manner of healing. The miracle in this case is an act of kindness to the poor man; and the Lord in working it acts so as to awaken his faith, with a view to this bodily cure as well as to salvation of a better kind. Oh, with what kindness does he still condescend to each one's peculiar necessity, and give us exceeding abundantly above all that we are able to ask or think! The faith which he would awaken with a view to unloose the bands of the soul comes from hearing. But, because the poor man, whom our Lord designs not merely to restore thus suddenly to the perfect use of his bodily powers, but whose desire for blessing, and whose confidence in him, he would also first excite so as to lead him to utter greater praise and thanks, is shut out from the use of language, our Lord therefore *take him apart*, and, having thus secured his undivided attention, speaks to him by signs. This is manifestly the special reason why on this occasion he envelopes the healing power in so many external actions, touching especially the ears and the tongue. Even the *spittle*—in this case as in that of the blind men, in chap. viii. 23, and in John ix. 6—is really no medicinal application; but a symbol employed, with his other actions, to denote very significantly the energy proceeding from his person. Grotius remarks that he employs nothing except what comes from himself; we are reminded of more than this, namely, of the streams of vital energy (so repeatedly referred to by the *physician* Luke) proceeding from his holy human body, as they operate at present in his glorified state, and as they then operated in combination with the might of the Fa-

ther which at all times was his. Further, we are to regard the looking up to heaven as intended to indicate this last idea to the deaf man and to ourselves; so that we have here a parallel to John xi. 41. But the holy *sigh* (to the understanding of which, as Kleuker says, a verbal exegesis is as little sufficient as is any system of psychology with which we can be acquainted) was an utterance, proceeding from his divine and human natures, and characteristic of his office as High Priest—an expression of his sympathy with this and with every malady of sinful humanity, bodily and spiritual all in one; yea, with all trouble and sickness (which assuredly sin has brought in and still continues to bring in) felt by him as near at hand, and represented by this dire calamity.* In contrast to those fools who fancy they have discovered in the narratives of healings peculiar to *Mark* something which will enable them to account for miracles on rationalistic principles,† the simple wisdom of Luther may teach us what the exposition of a spirit of faith brings up from the depth at the right place. "It was not drawn from him on account of the single tongue and ears of this poor man; but it is a common sigh over all tongues and ears, yea, over all hearts, bodies, and souls, and over all men, from Adam to his last descendant. This Gospel thus depicts Christ, that he as man took such an interest in thee and in me, and in all of us, as we ought to take in ourselves, when he was involved in the sins and sufferings in which we are involved; and that he sighs over the very devil who has been the cause of the sorrow." Luther also, who on other occasions is hostile to all playing with allegory, admirably indicates that this sympathetic sigh breaks out especially over the deaf and dumb, at least that it is on such an occasion that the Holy Ghost has recorded it. We hold also that there is good reason for supposing that it was exactly under this bodily emblem that there came up before the thoughts of the heart of the Saviour of men, on the one hand, compassion for spiritual blindness, from which proceeds also, as in the case before us, the incapacity of the tongue to speak and to praise God; and, on the other hand, the lamentable evils of tongue-sins all over the world. Luther renders prominent this latter point: "Our beloved Lord saw well what an amount of sufferings and sorrows would be occasioned by tongues and ears. For the greatest mischief which has been inflicted on Christianity has not arisen from tyrants (with persecutions, murders, and pride, against the word), but from that little piece of flesh, which abides between the jaws; it is it that inflicts the greatest injury upon the kingdom of God. I speak of this, that after Christ has loosed the tongue and given it the Gospel, it should inflict such extraordinary and great injuries. It is a fearful thing to see a man's head cut off; but a false sermon, yea, a false word which has gone forth in the name of Christ, takes off the heads of souls." Thus, according to this, Christ must have been thinking upon the injurious tongues, and also upon the shameful ears which will not hear any thing else except such false injurious tongues (2 Tim. iv. 3, 4). We add to this: perhaps also, and in the first instance, he was thinking upon the sins which this man, on whose body this miracle of healing was wrought, would hereafter commit with his tongue and ears; and that it might have been better for him not to have received the help which this Ephphatha brought. We believe that these and similar thoughts made up the hidden substance of this *Ephphatha, uttered in a sigh*, and hence we have given them as expository of it.* "Ah, that I, O my Father which art in heaven—Thou knowest how these things are—Ah, that I could *open* and unloose the ears and tongues of all men!"

The Ephphatha is the first word which the ears no longer deaf must hear. And what is the first word which the tongue loosed from its bands (its strings and feebleness, as in Luke xiii. 16) spoke? It is not recorded. Instead of it we have the *prohibition* to make known the miracle. Among the "them" whom our Saviour charged not to make it known, is undoubtedly comprehended the man who was healed. Thus the gift of speech was scarcely given him, when silence was enjoined; in order that he, or at least we, might learn that right *hearing* consists in *obeying*, the right use of the unbound tongue consists in its willing bondage with a view to obedience.

* Chrysostom to the like effect: "Pitying the nature of man, and the degradation to which he was brought by the hater of all good, the devil, and through the failure of our great progenitors."

† As e. g. De Wette calls Mark "the patron of natural interpretation."

* The tribute of praise in Mark. ver. 37, uttered by the people, puts us in mind of Gen. i. 31, at the first creation; but if the people, when the Lord said "be thou opened," really thought of "let there be light" (as Von Gerlach supposes, though we are doubtful), they must have entirely misunderstood the meaning of the *sighing* cry.

THE GRADUAL HEALING OF THE BLIND MAN.

(Mark viii. 23, 25, 26.)

We have here a second narrative of healing by Mark, containing a description of a particularly circumstantial procedure on the part of the Lord; and not certainly a mere specimen of what had happened on other occasions, though not recorded by the Evangelists, but with the clear and express stamp of distinctive truth. We still see how each Evangelist brings forward his peculiar gifts, supplementing and completing the scenes described by the others. This blind man was brought to the Lord at Bethsaida, the eastern town of that name, and which was also called Julias. Our Lord treats him with a condescension similar to what he had shown to the deaf man on a former occasion; entering into his necessities and circumstances, of which, however, we know nothing more than what is here recorded. He also acts in the exercise of his wisdom according to his own discretion, differently from what he had been asked to do and from what would have been convenient for himself: he not only touches his eyes as he had done on another occasion, Matt. ix. 29,* but takes pains to lead him away out from the crowd; which certainly is more than he did on the former occasion (*ἀπολαβόμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου κατ' ἰδίαν*). The immediate reason why he did so was to withdraw the man from the first effect of the gaze of the crowds; and to prepare for him a more blessed object for his first glance, under the free open canopy of heaven, as in John ix. 7. Then the slow gradual process of healing is remarkable; indicated by the question put after the first touching of the eyes,† "*if he saw any thing?*" There must have been in the condition of this man some special reason why he was brought thus step by step to the full light; and though we do not, in the case before us, see through this, yet we have here represented to us the long-suffering wisdom and gracious condescension with which our Lord must deal with by far the greater part of those who are spiritually blind When he therefore puts to us the confiding question, let us not, when we are only beginning to see and are seeing things as yet indistinctly, reply with a too proud, hasty, and full "yes;" but let us be as sincere as this man was. He saw figures which he recognized by their walking to be men: they appeared to him, moreover, to be as yet quite as indistinct as trees.* But now our Lord lays his hands upon him the second time, and addresses to him a second friendly word, "Look up again"—or, "See now," in contrast to the former question, and announcing a complete recovery. For this probably is what Mark means to say by his very curiously ambiguous phrase: *ἐποιησέν αὐτὸν ἀναβλέψαι*. This might mean, "he gave him sight again," "he *made* him again see completely;" compare *ἀναβλέπειν*, chap. x. 51; Matt. xx. 33, 34, xi. 5, where, however, this sense is not probable. But, because this result is for the first time strongly announced in the following context, we should understand the expression in accordance with the whole history in the first mentioned sense: "he bids him look up" (even although we may not be able with Luther to see the "again"); compare *ποιεῖν* almost equivalent "to command," Luke v. 34. Finally, the general sense of the injunction not to go into the town, nor to spread abroad the report outside the house (see at chap. v. 19, p. 147), the intimation neither now nor at any future time to tell it to any one *ἐν τῇ κώμῃ*, "in the village," if he should have occasion to enter it; has already been ascertained when expounding similar sayings of frequent occurrence. It almost appears as if this Bethsaida, to which our Lord gives prominence by the repeated *κώμη, village*, was for some special reason not to be permitted to hear; perhaps this might be one reason why our Lord led the blind man out from the place. (Last of all, that nothing whatever may be overlooked in Mark, we may remark that the *μηδέ* is not altogether grammatically wrong, as Winer supposes, but stands instead of *καὶ μή* on account of the implied antithesis to "sending him to his own house.")

* From this we see what as far as he himself was concerned he *could* have done in all cases. But in every act of healing which he wrought he *sought* to include and use man's advancing faith and to care for the necessities of the sick; and it is in this that we are to seek the true reason of the variety of procedure in different cases.

† Mark gives in the first instance *ὄμματα*, sights organs, which in this strict sense corresponds to the *ἀκοαί*, chap. vii. 35 (comp. Heb. v. 11); afterwards he employs the usual word *ὀφθαλμούς*.

* "The masses of people which they had left behind in the distance appeared to him like a dark forest; only the trees walked" (Lange). He was *born* blind; therefore, of course, he knew nothing about trees.

THE TRUE GREATNESS OF THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST; THE NOT FOLLOWING WITH US; THE FIRE AND SALT PREPARED FOR SELF-DENIAL.

(Mark ix. 33–50; Luke ix. 48–50; [Matt. xviii. 3–20].)

We have already in our remarks on Matthew considered all those parts of the passage before us which have parallels in that Gospel. A special consideration, however, of Mark is necessary: partly because he gives us, in common with Luke, the remarkable interlude, ver. 38–41; and partly because he gives us, what no other Evangelist gives, the profound utterances about the worm and the fire, the fire and the salt, and in general has preserved a peculiar account of the sayings of our Lord spoken at this time—concluding sooner, yet at the beginning preserving more of what was delivered. Referring to what has already been said on Matthew, we must request the reader to take a fresh general survey; this will satisfy him that the theme and leading thoughts are essentially the same in this new account.

The true *greatness* of the disciples of the Lord among themselves *consists* in humility and love; and *is obtained* by self-denial. Thus Mark elevates to the rank of a main section what in Matthew, vers. 8, 9, came in only as a secondary thought; and then he leaves it. Matthew, on the other hand, goes on to narrate what the Lord further said on the subject of the *foundation* on which this greatness rests through the grace of the Redeemer, and the *manifestation* which it shall assume in the community or Church. It *consists* in humility and love! This position, this great fundamental principle of the kingdom, addressed solemnly to the twelve apostles from the seat of teaching and of judgment, is uttered in the first instance in opposition to the proud φιλοπρωτεύειν or ambition of the disciples among each other. It is exhibited, first by a most peculiar and decisive expression, ver. 35 (which we must regard as having been uttered *before* the third and fourth verses of the eighteenth chapter of Matthew, although the same in sense as these verses); and then by the *figure* of the little child brought in. Upon this, however, Mark, ver. 37, merely traces out the sentence parallel to that in Matt. ver. 5, with an addition repeated at an earlier period; for, from his efforts at brevity, he merely takes up the one saying, in which there are sufficiently indicated both the greatness graciously attributed by our Lord to the little ones, and also the duty on our part thence resulting of loving them. For this reason he gives the *extended account* of the statement which Matthew omits; occasioned by the confession of the disciples that, acting under the influence of pride *towards others*, they had questioned a certain man, and their "we" had risen up in an arrogant and exclusive spirit against other followers of the Lord. To this the Lord replies—"Without arrogance (which manifests itself in *forbidding*, in strong contrast to *assisting* or *acknowledging*) think the best of others; without seeking the honor that may arise from their externally following me in your company, ver. 39, 40. Rather believe, and forget not, that even the smallest thing done on behalf of the kingdom of God is graciously recompensed by God, ver. 41." (Just so ver. 37 is repeated by our Lord from Matt., chap. x.; but here he will utter it in this connection, "Take care only without boasting of it, that ye yourselves belong to Christ.") Finally, "Offend not one of those little ones, who believes in me," ver. 42. In this again Mark concurs with Matthew ver. 6 (p. 335).

The true greatness of the disciples *is obtained*, and also secured or rendered permanent, by *self-denial*, by putting away or destroying the real ground of the offence in one's self. Mark (passing over the other opposite in Matthew, ver. 7) gives this as fully and literally as our Lord uttered it. *Hand*, *foot*, and *eye*, separated by the thrice repeated rigorous declaration—"It is better for thee now to put to death the offending sinful member than at a future time to fall into eternal death!" (Vers. 43–48 is parallel with Matt. vers. 8, 9.) It is only by a wholesome mortifying fire and salt that man escapes the unquenchable destroying fire; but the easiest and the best way is to use salt for self-denial, ver. 49. "*Therefore* found upon such willing self-denial your true *dignity* before others (as salt of the earth, always itself first salted, *in humility*); and your *place* among yourselves (as messengers of peace to the world, united in love!)" ver. 50. This is a natural conclusion at which the Evangelist may well break off.

Verse. 35. This is one of our Lord's repeated sayings, which here agrees particularly well with the intimation of his sufferings given in ver. 31—"This is the very way in which I, your Master, go before you." Comparing Matt. xx. 26–28, xviii. 4; Luke ix. 48, xxii. 26, 27, we see that our Lord does *not* intend to say any thing of a threatening nature—"Whoever will be the first shall be the last, as a punishment of his pride!" This statement—generally elsewhere true as given in Matt. xix. 30—is in this passage blunted and turned aside by the humility in the exercise of which a man willingly humbles himself as the ἔσχατος or *last* in order to his becoming really the πρῶτος or *first*; the addition of the word διάκονος, *servant*, in this verse, as well as the whole connection in Matthew, shows that this is the sense meant to be conveyed. Whoever in *humility* looks upon himself as the last, will be found ready to devote himself in love to others, as their servant in helping and in serving them. Let him who

desires great things seek true greatness in denying himself; in giving himself up entirely to that love of the Master which will lead him to serve him, to realize him, to work in his strength. The ἔσται, "shall be," signifies, first, Whosoever φιλοπρωτεύει, *is ambitious*, in the true and right sense, will forthwith show it when put to the test: it goes, however, beyond this and becomes a hortatory imperative. If we take the θέλειν πρῶτος εἶναι, *wish to be first*, in the good, praiseworthy, and therefore commanded sense, there remains of course the simple, strong key-note of the saying. Still, we should not be averse to apply, even in different ways, these antithetic sentences of our Lord's, constructed, as they are, with such admirable simplicity. Thus, for example, we may understand the one before us, as the words admit—"Whosoever cannot but observe within himself the (natural and false) desire of pre-eminence (φιλοπρωτεύειν), let him humble himself on this very account; let him acknowledge that on account of the desire to be the first which is deeply fixed in his heart, he is really the last—*therefore*, for the very purpose of impressing this on the contrary upon himself, with a view to wholesome resignation and self-denial, let him become externally, as is right he should, the servant of all!"

Verse 37. This saying, with which Luke begins, ver. 48, and whose abbreviated form is found in Matt. ver. 5, is repeated here entire from Matt. x. 40. It appears, therefore, that the promise there applied to the twelve with special honor, is now extended in similar terms to the very smallest child; this is precisely the meaning and the design of its repetition in this place. "Do not suppose it is applicable to *you* alone, or even to you chiefly: I declare it to be the Father's will that every one of those little ones in whom not only I begin with my whole grace to dwell and to work, but also the Father who is in me and one with me, shall be received and acknowledged; not despised or offended, but humbly honored and served, as much as the greatest."

It is very natural that John should have felt himself impelled to make a confession, somewhat as if he were putting a question, in regard to an act of injury which had taken place in violation of this statement. The proud heart might have been too ready, as the disciples hitherto had been, to appropriate exclusively to itself such great promises, and to conclude, "*We* aught therefore to be received for his name's sake which we acknowledge and bear upon us." But the word of the Lord, "one such little child," gives rise to the counter-question, "Shall we really thus esteem and received *every other man*, on whom we find thy name? has, then, every one who chooses to own and to use thy name a right forthwith to do so, without first becoming connected with us?"* The "I" which broke out in the contest of the disciples among themselves, about pre-eminence, has no sooner been dismissed, than it immediately returns, at least in the shape of a common "We" of the disciples set up against others. *John* does not mean to take upon himself exclusively the blame of the κωλύειν or *forbidding:* hence we cannot reasonably find here an expression indicating any highly impulsive character peculiarly belonging to him, such as we have in Luke ix. 54.* John, *by this*, rather shows that he had felt our Lord's remark (rather than Peter, who, not apprehending so promptly the meaning of the sayings about humility, laid them up in his heart). Under this feeling he begins in the name of all to ask and to confess, "Was then what we did *not right?*" It is only in this way that we can understand the interjected ἀποκρίνεσθαι or "answering;" it is exactly because it is used of John that we cannot suppose him to have said nor to have asserted, "Was not this certainly right?" Nor can we suppose, as some have done with extreme perversity, that we have here an example of arrogance of spirit aptly condemned. In the honest narratives of the transactions of this period, there is to be noticed the echo of the tone and feeling which prevailed at the time: εἴδομέν τινα, "we saw *one*," looking down upon him somewhat slightingly. This "somebody" perhaps one of John's disciples who had not yet begun externally to follow Jesus; or perhaps even a believer who took the liberty of pursuing his own separate path, but had in reality cast out devils in the name of Jesus (more than one devil, Luke expressly τὰ δαιμόνια); and had not merely "made the attempt to do so," was not such a one as the sons of Sceva (Acts xix. 13), but one who *could do* more with his faith, which was by no means feeble, than the disciples themselves (Mark ix. 28) were able to accomplish. Perhaps they felt annoyed at this, if the event happened at a later period. Enough, they forbade him; and why? *He follows not us.* Oh, how often even till the present day have Christians had nothing more to object to their fellow-Christians than this! In Luke the expression appears somewhat softened: οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν, "he followeth not *with* us;" that is, he followeth not *thee* with us,† in our company. (Still, this may be the Greek

* This is quite a correct connection. There is, therefore, no vestige whatever of what Neander supposes; viz., that John, from misconception, without understanding the proper sense of the expression, took a strange view of the words, "My name." The want of understanding is in this case rather in the expositor.

* Niemeyer in his *Charakteristik*, for example, generally rather peculiar, says, with half truth, "A noble soul is commonly at first intolerant." Braune has a more correct and finer observation, "John was, perhaps, in the least degree too quick in forbidding; but he soon repented of it in his heart, and was not long in feeling the guilt of the deed."

† The Syriac Version supplies עמן בהיך, and we also (p. 230), adopted for the time this view.

construction of ἀκολουθεῖν with μετά (of which Pricaeus on Luke has given examples), as in Rev. xiv. 13. We prefer taking this view, because in this case the reply of our Lord οὐ καθ' ὑμῶν comes in with effect.) Then, also, in the exact version of Mark—"he followeth not us"—there is a sharp, self-condemning, self-convicting expression of that proud imagination in which the "we and us" almost forgets the Lord himself; in which *they* intrude into the place of him, to follow whom is and must ever be the great concern.

Verses 39, 40. The humble and timid question, which the disciples could scarcely venture to utter, is abruptly and decisively responded to by the instructive answer of our Lord, which, taking the particular case by the roots, gives forth a general and deeply impressive utterance, and one which it becomes our own age (as Braune well remarks) to lay particularly to heart. The confessed prohibition he prohibits in turn; and then in a condescending manner assigns his reasons for doing so. "Never forbid after this the casting out of devils in my name, either to one man or another in a similar case:" the αὐτόν, "him," thus brings out the indefinite τινά, "one"—so that "any one who may do so" is meant—(the future with οὐδείς γάρ indicate the same thing). In former times, Num. xi. 26–29, Joshua would have forbidden the two men, Eldad and Medad, when they prophesied in the camp, the Spirit of God being upon them, on the ground that in regard to external order they were not connected with the others; but he did not know that they were accepted before God, and that they had only not gone out with the others to the tabernacle. Moses even in that age did not regard their formal defect, proceeding apparently from an innocent mistake, as a reason for depriving them of the Spirit which had been bestowed upon them (supposing this in his power), but, on the contrary, gave expression to the large-hearted wish that the whole people of the Lord might prophesy; and most assuredly there can be no such thing now, under the grace of the New Testament, which works at large and unconstrained, as a confining of the Spirit of the Lord to this or to that place, to the communion of this or of that party. The Spirit bloweth where he listeth: where is the man who will or can hinder him? Wherever devils are cast out, there is the Spirit of God, Matt. xii. 27, 28; wherever the name of Jesus is confessed, the confessor of that name is accepted before God, whether he stands in our roll or not. This, at least, is the view which our Lord, in the first instance, teaches us to take of this incident, in so far as our *own* knowledge and conduct are concerned. He extends the special case of casting out devils to the general idea of ποιεῖν δύναμιν, *working a miracle, i. e.*, effecting or performing any thing, in his name; and thus, in condemning the disciples, negatives the manifest *conclusion* to which they had been brought. Anticipating a case which might occur, he says, graciously and convincingly—"Whosoever uses my name for a good work, so that virtue and the Spirit are manifest, will not be *able* forthwith, *shortly thereafter*, to reproach or revile me, as for example to attribute my own casting out of devils to Beelzebub." For, as John Von Müller says, "he will be convinced by it," viz., that there resides in my name an effective power of truth. Or he will not probably prove such an inconsistent and perverse man as ταχύ, "lightly," *forthwith*, almost in the same moment, to revile him whose name he himself had used with such effect. Compare the expression of the apostle, 1 Cor. xii. 3, which may be understood as meaning that to confess Jesus as Lord, with the powerful conviction inwrought by the Spirit, and at the same time to curse him, cannot co-exist in the same individual. But how now? Are there really none who call Jesus Lord, and yet not in the power of the Holy Ghost? Were there really no hypocritical miscreants who yet cast out devils and removed mountains? (Matt. vii. 22, 23; 1 Cor. xiii. 2.) Assuredly no where do we find it asserted that the working of many miracles (ποιεῖν δυνάμεις πολλάς) is a sure proof of real communion with Jesus. We remark that in the ταχύ there lies concealed something like this, "Ye should wait a little before ye judge and forbid." Is there then really *no one* who may unwarrantably perform deeds in the name of the Lord? Certainly; but to know such is reserved for the Searcher of hearts, or for us after successive manifest evidences of hostility towards the Lord. We observe, therefore, that the Lord can mean by the general statement which he appears to lay down without any exception only this—"*It becomes you thus to think;* ye ought, in every case, in the first instance, lovingly and humbly to assume it to be so, so long as ye see nothing else than what ye tell me, a good effect resulting from the use of my name against the kingdom of the wicked one, in the confession and conduct of any one." That this is the proper sense becomes still more evident in the following verse, which certainly rejects the οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν, "he followeth not us," as an insufficient reason. This following statement can by no means be regarded as unconditionally true in all cases, any more than the preceding one; for many may take the name of Christ into their lips, may preach his Gospel ἐξ ἐριθείας and προφάσει, "of contention" and "in pretence," Phil. i. 16–18. But the great apostle, when he leaves in the background the εἴτε προφάσει εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ, "whether in pretence or in truth," and that in a case which left little room for doubt—when he suffers not his joy at the preaching of Christ to be disturbed by the hostility manifested against himself—speaks and acts in the spirit of the Lord's statement now before us, which dictates to us nothing but the modest *presumption* of good in others with which it is proper for us to act.

Verse 40. We remark, by way of introduction, that the reading ὑμῶν, *you*, instead

of ἡμῶν, *us*, in Mark is undoubtedly the correct one, and this both on internal and external grounds. This passage is one of those which show clearly the necessity of a revision of Luther's Bible; for the "us," put here into the mouth of our Lord, disturbs and almost destroys the whole sense of his most important saying. The fault of the disciples is exactly this, that they presume to set up an externally visible communion with themselves, instead of communion with the Lord, as a mark by which to judge a man; and the exact way in which our Lord expresses his disapprobation of this is by employing a "You," sharply turning away the case from himself, so as to form the counterpart to their proud "We." Ye need not at once conclude that whoever is not with you is against you; ye should rather take it for granted until something to the contrary appears that he is for you. Moreover, there would be room for many mistakes if the expressions "against *you*," or even "not with you," were made a test—but "to be also not with me," that is, "against me," is an unerring test. We may look back upon the other correlative saying, Matt. xii. 30 (Luke xi. 23): "He cannot and he will not so bind himself up with his people, not even on any one occasion with his apostles, as to sanction the maxim of man's judgment, *no salvation without our Church, or our communion;* he lays down the 'You' in strict opposition to this." (Let this be repeated from p. 230.) Our Lord, on one occasion, says, "*Our* friend Luzarus," John xi. 11; "That *we* may not give offence," Matt. xvii. 27; and on one single occasion, with a far reaching sense, "Thus it becometh *us* to fulfill all righteousnesss," Matt. iii. 15. But this is the whole: every where he discriminates exactly, and uses the "*we*" only in connection with outward circumstances. Here, at least, it was impossible for him to say, "we;" for it is exactly in opposition to the presumption and rash judgment of the disciples that he is constrained to discriminate between communion with him, which in most cases can be known for certain only by himself, and communion with them. Olshausen fails to perceive the exact meaning of the saying, inasmuch as he applies to different persons the two sayings which are meant mutually to supplement and limit each other: "He who has been called to spiritual service must be against the Lord and his cause if he is not engaged in positively promoting it; but he who has been called to less than this, yea, he who stands dependent spiritually upon his superiors, is reckoned as on the side of the cause of God, if he only keeps himself free from the wide-spread hostile influences that are around him." For the "whosoever" in *both* sayings lays down a rule which is entirely general; to discriminate the sphere of its operation on both sides must be effected in another way. Every one, as we have remarked on Matt. xii. 30, is called to spiritual work of some kind or other; but it is not always necessary for him to proceed according to the form and manner of this or of that community of the called.

The well-known treatise of Elwert (*Studien d. Evang. Geistl. Würtembergs*), has in like manner entirely failed to bring out the sense; the author supposes the great difference between the two sayings to lie in the μετά τινος and the ὑπέρ τινος εἶναι, or the being *with* one and *on one's part*, the former according to him denoting inward unity of heart, and the latter outward community and operation. We might as well on the contrary take μετά as denoting mere companionship and expressed co-operation (as this undeniably is its ordinary use), and ὑπέρ, on the other hand, internal relationship. For that ὑπέρ literally denotes by itself a relation of working, of acting in favor or in behalf of another, is an entirely groundless assertion, although Ullmann repeats it (in the treatise hereafter to be named). At all events the ὑπέρ τινος εἶναι does not point to work, but to internal condition and feeling.

In the second saying, Mark ix. and Luke ix., so far as regards its commencing clause, or the οὐκ ἔστι καθ' ὑμῶν, "is not against you," it is certain that our Lord is not speaking immediately of the state of mind or internal relation to the followers of Christ, and consequently to Christ himself; though we cannot, consistently with truth, affirm with Elwert that the whole statement has nothing whatever to do with this internal relation. For how can the words "is for you," merely mean "he is serving your cause," "promoting your objects?" It is certainly not to be supposed that the apostles had a cause other than that of Christ, an object different from what he had; Elwert himself acknowledges that "the cause of the apostles is here to be regarded as identical with that of Christ." When our Lord, in the first saying, proceeds to remark, "Whoever gathers not with me scatters abroad" (this certainly refers to *work*), he asserts the inseparable connection between inward state and outward work, as we have explained the passage.* According to this clear statement we must deny that the "undecided" may in the very least "be profitable to the cause of Christ."

The contrast of both sayings lies, therefore, manifestly in something altogether different. First and foremost in this, that in the one case, the Lord says "against *me*," and in the other case, "against *you*." How can any one overlook this? Assuredly in relation to the *person of Christ*, there can be no μετά, "with," of mere external communion, least of all in the intention, since he is here speaking as the Searcher of hearts and the Judge of hearts, not only about temporal relations, but also in regard to all future time, and in reference to both kingdoms. In the second saying he adds

*Elwert's evasion is very naive: "The gathering and the scattering is only a continuation, in the form of a proverbial saying, of what had been formerly affirmed, and the words are not to be taken literally." The acknowledgment sadly betrays his own want of understanding; in any other case there would be no possibility of comparing the two sayings!

this: "To be *with me* must not be supposed necessarily the same as to be *with you*, in a manner that shall be visible and subject to your judgment." For, in the second place, there is the clear difference: Christ, the Searcher of hearts, pronounces a decisive judgment, makes it manifest to the heart of each; but in our case, where no such judgment can exist, all that is required in the ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐστιν, "is for you," is manifestly a kind assumption, a taking for granted in the meantime. "Let such a one be to you as if he were for you (and for me)—until something occurs which proves him to be the reverse. Speak thus of him."

Elwert, without any reason, introduces into the case the very questionable position, that "*absolute decision for Christ may not strictly be assumed of any one*"—that to demand this "in order to a work rich in blessing," will in the end "destroy the Church itself and all activity in it on behalf of Christ." Such an assertion is exactly the opposite of the first saying in Matt. xii. 30. What in this is relatively true, will always, at the same time, have an influence upon practice; thus the meaning to the apostles might have been—"In so far as any one is still undecided, in so far he acts against your cause and mine." But to understand our Lord as saying, "Whosoever is only not absolutely against me may, with some degree of blessing, work on my behalf,"* is the very thing which the former statement has sharply and unquestionably denied.

Christ in the second statement refers not *merely* to the toleration, so dear to some, of imperfection and half decision (this *in us* may be appropriate)—not at all to the blessing in the objective power of the means of salvation irrespective of the personal character of him who administers them, etc. These are matters irrelevant to the subject on hand. But he testifies, in the verbally clear contrast of the two sayings, that communion of being and of working with him (these two are inseparable, and both are imperatively necessary) is not altogether bound up with the communion of external fellowship, association, participation with his people. There is here a contrast, but there is no contradiction. We see scarcely an appearance of contradiction in the two sayings as soon as we take them in their proper literal sense, without turning aside to general, irrelevant thoughts.

We do not therefore understand how Ullmann can set out with the assumption of a contradiction to be solved—as he has done recently in a treatise *on the supposed problem* (*Deutsche Zeitschr. fur Christl. Wissensch.* etc. 1851. No. 3, 4).† Even he finds first and foremost in the second saying the proposition "that every one who is only not against Christ is for him"—a proposition which neither was nor *could be* uttered. Even he appears not to observe that Elwert's result is an entire misinterpretation, and endeavors to find in the difference of the prepositions μετὰ and ὑπέρ (a difference of little moment in this passage), a false key. In the end, however, he comes to a right conclusion, as we have already seen he did once before—that in the second saying our "Lord does not so much speak about the relation to himself as about the relation of fellowship with his disciples." Our view, on the other hand, is that the contrast and difference are clear without any "not so much" of qualification. What Ullmann regards merely as a secondary difference we regard as the first, the very decisive, and assuredly the only one—"that in the more severe saying our Lord speaks in the singular and in the first person, and, therefore, only of himself, of his own person; but in the milder saying, on the other hand, in the plural and in the second person, and, therefore, of the disciples and of fellowship with them." This we thought we had set forth long since in our exposition, and that we had deduced every thing which rightly flows from it: that it is not in the state of the soul and conscience towards Christ that the fundamental difference is to be explained; there, there is an absolute "either—or" as to being on the side of Christ, as to working with him, as to being united with him; this internal relation, however, always remains in some respects not perfectly cognizable to human eye and judgment. No Christian community, therefore, no visible Church, however constituted, may adopt the fault of Roman Catholicism and say that there is no communion with Christ and his people except in it.

We earnestly beg the reader's pardon for this digression on the exegetical literature of the day; we have been led into it by a desire to indicate once for all, on some prominent passage, the relation in which we stand to it. We return from this digression to our usual course, and observe in conclusion, that we must mark, consider, examine the immediate occasion and cause of the action and word of the apostle John, in order rightly to understand the reply and the rule here given by Christ. The faithful and wise Teacher lays hold of this individual case in its deep general significance and symbolical import; he sees here all Popery in the widest sense of the word in its kernel, rising in the assuming We of his beloved apostles; and therefore he decidedly rejects and condemns it for all time to come. His word rebukes the smallest beginnings of

* As Elwert, p. 128, understands the second saying, and pays no attention to the fact that the expression is not ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ in this case. This certainly is not to notice the chief point.

† We still less understand the praise there (p. 22) bestowed upon the totally useless treatise of Elwert. But certainly exposition, proceeding strictly from the word, is so little a matter of concern with these systematic and historic theologians, that even Ullmann himself *begins* with the commentators in expounding his views: some take this, and others take that, as the object of the saying. Oh that our interpreters would first of all read and reflect upon the text and its connection! I first read *it* myself, and then consult the commentaries.

assumption, as well as its full development in the "Church which alone confers salvation;" it protests against all restraining and quenching of the Spirit with rules, forms, and pretensions which have their origin in "Us," against all binding of the gifts of grace to any communion or succession, against all narrow-mindedness of confession, system, and method. Our Lord is most assuredly a God of order in his Church; and inculcates upon his people, *as the rule*, fellowship with each other, and, so far as possible, exact uniformity. But inasmuch as his people are very much inclined to misunderstand this order, and to substitute, first, the best form, and also by degrees some other form, instead of the internal reality—for this very reason *his Spirit makes exceptions*, and he himself *gives us in this passage the rule* for these exceptions in the last extremity, as well as for a whole wide field of human assumption which will quickly see unjustifiable exceptions. Oh, how far and deeply does his brief master-saying penetrate, if only the hearts of his disciples were willing to receive it! "Bind no man so to your doctrine as that ye shall say, he speaks not as we speak, therefore we regard it not though he also as well as we owns and praises our Lord. Bind not the people to your ways—Whosoever does not as we do, does not right. Finally, never in this, or in any other sense, bind any one to your communion unconditionally—Whosoever does not adhere to us does not follow us, but is regarded by us as one who is not a follower of the Lord." Our Lord speaks on this subject in the spirit of kind concession, because he has the apostles in his presence:* in *our case* there may be very good reason for a man being *against* us and yet no opponent of the Lord; it may rather be in obedience to our Lord's will that he is opposing what is faulty in us. But, finally, even where an organization among ourselves may be compared to the circle of the apostles, the rule of the Master remains in its integrity. Peter, John, and James, durst not have said to Paul, "Thou mayest not preach the name of Jesus, we know he hath not called thee," even though Paul had inquired after them still less than he did, and had carefully avoided altogether their communion.

Verses 41, 42. In these verses Mark again turns into the train of thought in Matthew: first, a further retrospect towards those sayings, Matt. x. 40–42; and secondly, in opposition, the warning against giving offence, the ground and meaning of which we have already set forth in our exposition of Matthew. (The correct reading is undoubtedly ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε—although this form, common at a later period in the writings of Paul, occurs no where in the four Gospels except in the passage before us.) The expressions of the Lord alternate between kindness and severity, between promise and warning. Scarcely has the Saviour expressed disapprobation of the assumption of the disciples, who would not acknowledge as a follower the man who followed not them, than he begins again to assure them of the dignity and honor which still remained for them in the presence of the Lord (assuredly here, according to ver. 37, common to them with every little child), and scarcely is this said to them than they are again impressively exhorted to avoid on their part offending any little one. For, that in the kingdom of heaven we should be loving children, honoring one another reciprocally and equally, is, as we have already seen on Matthew, the fundamental thought of the whole of this saying of the Lord.

Verses 43—48. Mark does not give here, "according to his usual way," a paraphrastic version. What Matthew has drawn in brief stands here in its original fulness. It is not to be imagined that the strong, thrice-repeated, astounding expression concerning the worm and the fire had its origin any where else than in the lips of our Lord himself; and here as the natural sequence of this expression, we find a corresponding threefold word concerning the hand, and foot, and eye. The import of the saying we have already expounded in the Sermon on the Mount, and afterwards at Matt. xviii.; we may here notice the very regular distribution of the particular expressions so as to produce a significant variety in the repetition. To go "into life," "*to enter* into life," "to enter into *the kingdom of God*"—this is the one series, over against which are the alternates and counterpart "*to go away* into hell," "into fire unquenchable," "to be cast *into hell fire*." This is not a wide and empty fulness of words, but a solemn and emphatic address which presents to the mind at each turn a new view of the important matter. Πῦρ ἄσβεστον, *unquenchable fire*, does not refer to the language of John the Baptist; but is an original application of the terrific threefold warning quoted in the following clause from Isaiah, a quotation which Mark alone gives us. The excellent J. F. Von Meyer—a man too little known in the theological world, and whose grateful scholar I shall ever with pleasure acknowledge myself, without, however, adopting from him what I regard as erroneous, and in whose doctrine, particularly of the final quenching of the fire, I can never sympathize—threw out on one occasion, referring in a letter to this passage, the brief expression, in opposition to my views: "Thrice is less than once." This expression, if I understand any thing at all by it, can only mean that a proverbial saying is not to be interpreted too strictly in a doctrinal matter. There would be some truth in this, were it the case that our Lord was uttering a mere proverbial saying; not, however, to the extent of enfeebling the essential fundamental thought. Our Lord, however, is quoting *a passage of Scripture* (which had certainly become a proverbial saying in Israel), as is manifest from the αὐτῶν, "their," quoted literally from Isa. lxvi. 24, and the use of which had not been oc-

* Because of course it was said of them in a correct sense, Whoever is really *against you* is also against me (Luke x. 16).

casioned by any thing hitherto said. (Nay more, *he strengthens* the expression there to a certain extent by the simple finally decisive *οὐ τελευτᾷ, οὐ σβέννυται* instead of the future in Isaiah, *οὐ τελευτήσει, οὐ σβεσθήσεται;* in like manner by leaving out the second *αὐτῶν*, whereby, as absolutely confirming the *ἄσβεστον*, there remains the pure, plain expression *τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται!*) We dare set nothing over against this, we dare not consider it as an indefinite Old Testament expression, such as we have in 2 Kings xxii. 17; Isa. i. 31, xxxiv. 10, and in similar passages; but as a clause expressing the full truth corresponding to such typical passages as those which stand (Rev. xiv. 11, xx. 10) at the end of the New Testament and of the whole sacred volume. Least of all is it conceivable by us how "death itself can, shall, and must die of its own sting, and hell of its own pestilence."

We have already seen how thoroughly the Lord, when quoting passages especially from Isaiah, opens up their depth of meaning. We have here a new proof of this. There (chap. lxvi. 22) the eternal existence and endurance of the seed and name of the righteous before God in the new heaven and the new earth had been dwelt on in the preceding clauses: corresponding to this we have here (ver. 24) the perpetuity of the dishonor and shame and suffering and pain of the condemned. Over this there may be thrown there a certain drapery of figurative language; here our Lord brings forward the real truth in the most unfigurative language—the same Lord who, in Matt. xiii. 30, 40–42, knew no other way of explaining the figurative fire except by the literal fire. What Judith, with Jewish pride (xvi. 20, 21), addresses merely to the heathen, who torment the people of God, and Sirach vii. 17 (19) to all the ungodly in general—our Lord here, though he is in the very midst of a most friendly address, in which he accommodates himself graciously to little ones and children, threatens to these his own ransomed beloved, blessed little children, if they will not perfect holiness by self-denial and the mortification of their own sin. *The worm* (in the first instance emphatic instead of "worms") denotes here the internal corruption proceeding from death itself; see Job xvii. 14, xxi. 26; Isa. xiv. 11; Sir. x. 11; the *fire*, the destruction of a corpse, anticipating the worm, and proceeding from without, such as took place in the valley of Hinnom, and not a mere reference to the custom of burning instead of burying—this is the idea which gave rise to the expression in Isaiah, where mention is made of the *carcasses* of the people who had sinned against the Lord. Whatever is represented as pictorially horrible in bodily death is wrought up into an inconceivable figure, and predicated of the peculiar horror of second and eternal death. The word of prophecy here announces that both the *worm* and the *fire* are together; although in the imperfect figure it is only the one *or* the other that can exist, because the one excludes the other. And what in the case of the undying death is the import of the one and the other in their duality? Even those come short of the right sense who understand by the worm the gnawings of conscience in the soul, and by the fire the burning pain of the body; because *both* are applied in Isaiah to the body, as they are here in the mouth of the Lord to the body of sin and death with its unmortified members. In the resurrection, the whole is indissolubly reunited: body and soul enjoy together the bliss of life, or experience together the pain of death. The worm, therefore, rather denotes the self-corruption, the self-infliction of the man who has been doomed to death; and the fire the effect, corresponding to this, of the righteousness and holiness of the living God. But the consuming fire cannot annihilate the worm; the worm cannot die by being consumed so that the fire finding nothing more to prey on should be quenched.* These are hard, terrible secrets: may grace save us from understanding them in the depths of Satan, Rev. ii. 24! The expositor can only intimate that they are set forth in plain and certain words.

Verse 49. We have again an extremely simple and plain statement, if we consider it in regard to its literal import. To grasp its meaning, however, in the connection in which it occurs, is one of the most difficult efforts that exegesis ever made—an effort which can succeed only by a profound insight into those fundamental ideas which are peculiarly biblical, and by renouncing every *ἰδία ἐπίλυσις* or "private interpretation" of the sacred word. We begin to spell out the passage with *πᾶς*, "every one," and inquire who is meant by it. It has been correctly observed that the masculine *πᾶς* is always connected with something understood which limits or defines its general character. What is this here? Erasmus translated "*omnis homo sicut omnis victima*" (*every man as every victim*). It is soon seen, however, that this is too wide a grasp. For, in this case, to "be salted with fire," must denote, or at least include, the pain of eternal fire. We learn, however, from the second clause as well as from the following verse, that in reality the salting must denote the opposite of the consuming, agonizing burning; if indeed this is not apparent in these two words themselves. We include here, as it is proper we should, the *γάρ*, "for," which certainly belongs not to the immediately preceding sentence, but to the entire threefold exhortation—Cut it off and pluck it out, *for* it is *better for thee!* This "*for*" introduces the strong, clear, and urgent consideration, "Let not this trouble and terrify you, for there is no other way; we must be prepared by fire and salt for God

* Even the excellent Roos gives us this most arbitrary interpretation: "Where the worm of the damned dieth not *until* it hath totally consumed them; and the fire is not quenched *until* it hath totally destroyed them."

as a sacrifice—that is, if we would escape eternal fire." Therefore, *Every man* who would not come into Gehenna, but would obtain the *better part*. Not, as many think (that we may guard against misunderstandings beforehand)—Every one who will not be salted by willing resignation and self-denial, must sink into the fire! For, as was said, the salting fire, in common with the salt, denotes the opposite of the πῦρ ἄσβεστον. "To salt," does not signify "to destroy;" but "to preserve," "to render durable and acceptable." Although that fire assuredly never completes its work of destruction, yet this is alone what, as pure fire, its object is; and that those who burn in it are never consumed by it, but unceasingly endure it, does not arise from the fire, but from the undying worm. Our Lord does not institute any comparison between those who are condemned in fire and the burnt-offerings—or between those who are sanctified and the meat-offerings—as we shall see if we read and spell on without bringing to the passage any new idea of our own. Πᾶσα θυσία, "every sacrifice," is strictly parallel with πᾶς; and the θυσία, according to the passage quoted from the law, means not merely the מִנְחָה or offering: the "and" between the two clauses is manifestly also, indeed properly speaking exactly, equivalent to, "as;"* for, whatever is salted with the salt of the covenant (and this might be done with fire or merely with salt), is certainly an acceptable *offering*.

The Lord has a little before quoted a passage of Scripture which rests upon a similitude taken from nature; he now quotes, in the literal ἁλὶ ἁλισθήσεται, "shall be salted with salt," the passage from the Mosaic law of sacrifices, Lev. ii. 13, but gives to this ordinance a sense, in the connection in which it occurs in his discourse, which unfolds its typical import. The future intimates that the ordinance is to be retained and perpetuated in New Testament times. Dost thou ask, as a theologian, where Christ has taught and established a system of typology? Thou hast here the indisputably clear axiomatic utterance of his mouth, in which he deliberately takes for granted an essentially valid sense, not merely for this particular passage, but of course for the whole ceremonial law in which it occurs. We cannot certainly write a book within a book upon the whole typological system of the Levitical sacrifices; still the main features of this system may be briefly indicated. First, as to the *burnt-offering* to which the fire in this passage points us—What is shown, what is meant by the fire in which the sacrifice was consumed and ascended to God? Bähr† has recently repudiated very decidedly the old view according to which there was nothing in this fire except the hell fire of eternal condemnation. Kurtz,* also, who generally opposes him, is not disposed to acknowledge this fire as any thing but the emblem of purification and holiness; agreeing with Bähr, he finds an irrefragable proof of this "in the similar and simultaneous burning of the meat-offering with the sacred incense, oil, and salt." We are not disposed altogether to resist these consideration to the extent of renewing the old limited view; as little, however, can we altogether agree with them. For, although it be admitted, on the one side, that the fire as a sweet-smelling savor of the Lord must indicate a reconciliation to his good pleasure—*i. e.*, the offering was accepted by God as an offering of propitiation; and grace and not wrath was manifested in this, that "the Lord has his fire in Sion and his furnace in Jerusalem" (Isa. xxxi. 9)—still, on the other hand, it must be maintained, as Kurtz at least knew well, that in this reconciliation the punishment was inflicted upon the victim offered in sacrifice—the avenging sentence of the merited death and destruction. And this, in our opinion, lies not merely in the preceding slaughter and shedding of blood, but quite as much in the consuming fire; just as the putting to death contains in it a returning to life in order to pleasing God, an offering presented as if it were something *living in death*. The burnt-offering is in the first instance Christ, and in the second place we in him. Now, therefore, exactly in so far as the wrath of God, and death as the wages of sin, have to do with the death of Christ, who yet is life, and gives us life, to the same extent, and neither more nor less, does the *eternal* fire belong to the fire of the altar of burnt-offering. Of this fire, not without the most significant connection with that of which our Lord has spoken, it is written, "the fire on the altar shall burn, and shall never be put out; eternally shall the fire burn upon the altar, and shall never be put out" (Lev. vi. 12, 13). Compare for the individual offering, ver. 9. Here both are embraced in one: the warning allusion to the fire which consumes in righteous wrath; together with the reconciling grace which converts this same fire of holy love, into which we must all enter in fellowship with the Saviour given for us, from a destroying into a quickening fire, into a propitiation. The fire assuredly is, in reality, only one, and of one kind. Kurtz speaks in the first place of light and warmth; in the second place of a *quickening*, and therefore of a *purifying* efficacy; and in the third place of death bringing *destruction* as what is yet to come (p. 89, 90). This connection is correct; but the order must be reversed. In the first instance, as is clear in nature and Scripture,

* The so-called ו *exæquationis*; thus both Fritzche and De Wette regard it here.

† Whose well meant purpose to consider the *symbol* as such, without regard to *type*, is impracticable, and must, therefore, necessarily involve him in many errors. We cannot thus separate what God has joined together.

* In his important treatise on the Mosaic sacrifices (Mitau, 1842).

fire consumes; and if there were no sin in us the light of God would never be fire to us. It purifies and quickens us only in so far as it condemns and casts out sin, puts death itself to death, Isa. iv. 4.* *Wherefore*, also, in the unburnt meat-offering which denotes the new life, praise, and obedience, there is at least an intimation of the *fire* in the salt; as the salt, on the other hand, is seen in the sin-offering and trespass-offering, as confirming the covenant, and preserving before God.

We have now reached the very heart of the matter; and may understand the expression before us, in which our Lord designs not merely to point us to a single isolated precept, but to give us a key to the centre of the whole sacrificial system. He speaks at once of the fire and the salt of the sacrifices; embraces both in one by the one word ἁλισθήσεται, which he applies to both. "Fire is salt and salt is fire"—says Stilling.† "The salt is a condensed embodiment of fire"—writes Von Meyer.‡ We have here, however, a solution not only of the apparent but of the real opposition; sacrificial symbolism supplies us with the key. The same fire of the divine purity, holiness, and love, which must, in the future state, unquenchably burn the unclean, the impure, and the dead in eternal destruction, must, at least in this world, *salt* every one who would come into contact with it, must sanctify him by putting to death every thing within him that is worthy of death, by a gracious, condemning, purifying destruction of the sin, accompanied by the deliverance of the sinner. This, and nothing but this, is the thought of the Lord: see 1 Pet. iv. 12, 17; Luke xxiii. 31. But he expresses this in the typical language of sacrifice; both because this language supplied him with the briefest and most comprehensive expression, and because in Isaiah, whose concluding words he had quoted, two of the preceding verses had affirmed that the saints should be brought to the Lord for a meat-offering, Isa. lxvi. 20, compare lx. 7; Mal. i. 11; Rom. xv. 16. Even the fire consumes only that which is combustible: if the worm in Gehenna should die, the fire also would be extinguished, and there would remain in the ashes the pure salt, the basis of things allied to fire, and which resists all destruction as well as corruption. Now the *grace* of God in the *sacrifice* converts for us the fire itself into salt; yea, it covers and softens, to the greatest possible extent, its unavoidable effect, in the mere salt. Salt, in the Old Testament, although it is called, Lev. ii. 13, "the salt of the covenant of thy God," and mention is made, Num. xviii. 19, "of an eternal covenant of salt," does not depend for its meaning on any allusion, such as has been derived from profane writers, to a common, friendly meal—like the eastern and western proverb "to eat with another a bushel of salt"—but on an allusion to its being akin to fire, to which, at the same time, it is a marked opposite.* Salt is imperishable, it resists the action of fire, it has an indestructible endurance; salt also makes what it salts thus durable; still it does this exactly by its burning power and effect, bringing with it in another form the salutary fire. This is the covenant of God with man; the covenant of delivering and preserving grace with the sinner in the sacrifice of reconciliation.† It has been falsely supposed that no salt was applied to the burnt-offering; but the regulation for the meat-offering, Lev. ii. 13, is extended in the concluding sentence to every offering (כָּל־קָרְבָּנְךָ; and קָרְבָּן is the general name for all offerings, Lev. i. 2). Our Lord accordingly says here πᾶσα θυσία, and in Ezek. xliii. 24, the burnt-offering is salted, to show that the fire has been changed from a killing into a preserving fire.‡ The salt of the offering is certainly not (as Michaelis in his *Typische Gottesgelahrtheit*, pp. 63, 64, and Oetinger in his *Wörterbuch*, p. 426, singularly enough, considering the miserable mistake, agree for once), the rendering of it indestructible for the eternal fire of vengeance.§ The mere salting, finally, is the mild-

* It by no means follows, however, as Von Meyer once wrote to me, that "the eternal fire consumes only sin, this being what is represented by the animal sacrifices;" for the question is, Can sin in any case be separated from the sinner in the way of judgment, destruction, without faith in grace?

† Hence at the highest point the two appear once in complete unity (Deut. xxix. 23).

‡ "The nature of salt is of itself fiery," says Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* 31).

* We cannot (like Bähr, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, 3) hold to the sense of *the covenant* from the passage in the Pentateuch as the only one which the Lord must have had exclusively in view; for, that passage does not exclude, it rather suggests, a wider sense (if we correctly understand *the covenant* according to its radical idea); and the Lord manifestly speaks of salt and fire in regard to the effects which they produce. We leave our readers to compare our exegesis with the treatise of Bähr, which, correct though it be in many respects, does not apprehend the proper kernel and connection.

† "Salt is what preserves the earth, and fire and wind (spirit) are concealed in salt. Take dust by itself, its power arises from its combination with salt" (*Visions of a Prophetess*, Hamburg: by Perthes, ii. 172). "The basis of all matter is salt, as is seen when any substance is burned and the ashes all washed" (Von Meyer, as above, i. 336, where there is also given an explanation of Isa. li. 6, different from the common one, and which makes the word parallel to the *rags* of Jer. xxxviii. 11, 12).

‡ On the use of salt in heathen sacrifices, see Rosenmulleri *Scholia* on the passage in Leviticus.

§ Compare Oetinger, as edited by Auberlen, p. 151, etc. "In order that the fire of hell may do him no harm, he must be salted with fire; *i. e.*, he must be pervaded by the heavenly corporeity of the flesh and blood of Jesus." Is this exegesis? The modern resuscitation of Oetinger renders it necessary to advert to his errors and confusions. Very frequently only his fundamental ideas are correct·

est form of exempting and preserving against all other fire.

Of what, therefore, does our Lord speak in ver. 49, after he had previously spoken of hell-fire? He means and he very plainly mentions three processes in relation to ourselves. The terrible portion, which is the final issue, is the proper *consuming* fire. The better portion which he advises us too choose, and which he recommends to us as a voluntary self-offering, is to allow ourselves to be sanctified by the *salting salt.* In the middle between these there stands an intermediate clause—the *salting fire;* and of this also he says that every one must experience it, that no one without a burnt-offering can become a meat-offering before God.* He intends to teach that in order to escape condemnation, there remain for us *two* means of becoming holy and happy. Nitzsch, in his sermon on the Saying before us, names these with perfect accuracy: "The salt of truth, and the fire of affliction." Braune calls the salt, "Evangelical doctrine, the truth of the Gospel." The mere being salted would thence denote the voluntary purification of our souls, in obeying the truth through the Spirit (1 Pet. i. 22): thus the life which mortifies the old man would enter in the gentlest manner possible, although even thus the Gospel must show its burning power against sin. For, "the holiness of God, manifested with the grace of God, in all its consequences, effects, and demands, is the salt of truth of which we speak"—grace chastises us so severely for the denial of our ungodly nature, that "we must read in the last sufferings of our dying Redeemer, that if we sin willingly there remains no more sacrifice for sin." But who has become an offering of God without the aid of affliction which, through the accompanying help of God, constrains us to obedience? Consequently, we must not sever the two united means of grace; they always go in every variety of way together, as the Lord here embraces them in one view. In themselves they are not entirely separated; because the salt burns as well as salts, and the fire salts as well as burns. Even the word is a fire (Jer. xxiii. 9), in the same way as the Holy Spirit is (Matt. iii. 11). Besides in every case the rod of affliction is indispensable (Heb. xii. 6–8); and, on the other hand, no affliction is salutary unless the word of God accompany it, or be recalled to our mind if we have forgotten it. Each of the two former gives efficacy to the other; but the salt is, and continues to be, assuredly the main thing even when fire accompanies it. The conflict teaches us to attend to the word (Isa. xxviii. 19), and the word renders the conflict salutary to us. Finally, if we have thus far understood our Lord, we cannot submit at the end to any limitation drawn from a theological system, as to the fire of judgments destined yet to heal and to deliver—as Bengel does, who finds it necessary to add, "in this life, however." For that a *salting* with fire may still be possible and real, there as well as here, in Sheol as well as on earth, as is frequently intimated elsewhere in Scripture, our Lord here is as far from denying as he is on the other hand from being able to say of his πῦρ ἄσβεστον or "fire that is not quenched," that πυρὶ ἁλισθήσεται, "it is salted by fire."

Verse 50. Our Lord passes from the fire that shall never be quenched to the fire that salts; from that remote fire to the mildest salt which contains fire. In so far as we are a meat-offering, well pleasing to God, certainly not without a burnt-offering to be prepared in the first instance; and also afterwards, in so far as we would be, and would continue to be such, among each other and before the world—are we exhorted in the most gracious manner never to suffer this salutary and necessary salt to be wanting, never to suffer it to be lost. The fire must, alas! afflict us because of sin, and itself cometh of evil; Salt is and alone remains relatively the best for us, the unmingled good (καλόν, which of itself can and will help to the καλόν ὅσι, vers. 43–48), which works out our preparation even in the fire. Hold this fast, *have it*, keep it, and use it well—is our Lord's word to his disciples. "The more salt there is in you, the less will you need fire." This fire stands alone in the hands of God: *ignem habere non est facultatis humanae* (it is not in human power to have fire). But to receive and to hold fast the power of sanctifying truth for voluntary obedience in self-denial, and to reject our own inward corruption (to forsake all that we have, as the passage in Luke, xiv. 33, 34, is again explained in harmony with the above)—this is good and beautiful. Our Lord thus returns to the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 13). The light, though contrasted with fire in its mild and beautiful illuminating power, cannot nevertheless be without the pungency of salt, in order really to do its work effectually: "would ye be the light of the world, then show yourselves also as the salt of the earth." The salt of God is good, the power of his truth and the effect of his Spirit; but ye children of men, as always previously salted yourselves with this salt, must also become another salting salt. This salt, in its secondary effect, condescendingly so-called, which salt ye are, may alas! become saltless (ἄναλον); its calling, its name, and appearance giving the lie to its nature, its vile end standing in marked contrast to its good beginning: beware of this, for man can-

---

he fails altogether in rearing his superstructures. I regret that I have not as yet seen his special treatise *Das Geheimniss vom Salz* (Stuttgart, 1770). Still I can refer to his *Denkmal der Lehrtafel des Prinzessin Antonia* (Tübingen, 1763), where, pp. 379, 388, there is a full discussion on the *Sagings* of Jesus by Mark; for the critical consideration of which this is not the place. Compare what Auberlen, pp. 445, 446, has contributed on this subject.

* Therefore not as Hamann (i. 112, 113) for once superficially writes, "Instead of the fire we escape with the salt." This latter is merely "the sense of our sins, and faith in him who has extinguished the fire of sin." There is *no* understanding of the text here.

not be renewed and born again the second time. Has the strength of the first sacrifice become annihilated by a complete apostacy, there cannot be a second. How, in this case, would ye again help yourselves? O how many great lights of the world and of the Church, who allowed themselves to become deficient in salt first in their own hearts and houses, and by and by in all their light and teaching, have finally fallen into this condemnation! Therefore *have*, keep and use well, the salt of truth *in yourselves*—that truth which works holiness and self-denial within us, lives through the energy of grace and of the Spirit, and mortifies sin. "Then and then only shall ye have and keep peace also *among yourselves* as disciples." Again, "maintain peace and *love*, in order that ye may not lose in contentions the salt of *humility*:" the one acts and reacts reciprocally upon the other. Hence after this our Lord turns back to the fundamental theme of his discourse, which he had prosecuted from vers. 34, 35; and, hence, Mark may conclude with this saying, leaving out the further statements given by Matthew, xviii. 10–20. We may notice the contrast ἐν ἑαυτοῖς and ἐν ἀλλήλοις, "in yourselves" and "among one another," introduced into the unity of the necessary connection:* the inward humility, which always judges itself, and which thus rightly appreciates the real worth and greatness of the lowly and the poor, is the already valid holiness of those who are still sinners, secures the peace of love, and is secured in it. In the first instance, certainly, and above all other things, let each man judge himself only, and exercise patience and forbearance towards others. But then, in the next place, this is not enough of itself. Olshausen remarks, "As salt does not salt salt, but that which is unsalted, so also ought the vital energy of the children of God not to be dissipated in mutual strife, but applied to the quickening of the world." Very good, if all disciples and brethren were one mass of pure salt! But when a brother sins, I ought to punish him even as a brother, according to the more full directions given by our Lord in Matthew. I must show my love, working peace and bringing the influence and might of brotherhood to bear upon him in truth, not in a soft insipid style (like the pietistic reciprocal fondling of each other by the dear children of God), but according to the necessities of the case, with all sharpness of punishment. Consequently, also, "Salt yourselves one with another, in order that all together may be able to salt the world; but do this in the exercise of that lowly love which rightly exercises and rightly endures punishment." The ἐν ἑαυτοῖς and the ἐν ἀλλήλοις run mutually into each other. Let your speech (and your conduct), first, towards each other, and secondly, towards every man, be at all times not merely ἐν χάριτι, lovely and loving in forgiving grace, but, at the same time (and the genuine χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ is never any thing but this), seasoned with salt, and made effective for improvement and edification (Col. iv. 6; Eph. iv. 29). This is something more, something better than the Greek *charis* (grace) of amiable intercourse with one another, on which many saltless persons are again in their insipidity expending much false diligence. The salt of the disciples of Christ means something very different from the Attic salt which Stilling (*Heimweh*, iv. 246) though in a style not Attic, satirizes—"It is good for nothing but confectionery!" The ancient Catholic Church had in view the salt of Christ, when they used that substance at the ceremony of baptism, and on other occasions. It is only of it that the proverb in Horst's *Dämonomagie* holds true: "The devil cannot endure salt, and all the dishes at the devil's meals are without salt." Search many of our modern festive entertainments, and you find it alas! to be so: but be not present at such without introducing the salutary offence of the cross among the false charities, without introducing in season and out of season (2 Tim. iv. 2) your little grain of salt, provided you have any, to the vexation of Satan and to the salvation of his saltless companions in the name of the Lord. Again, ye brethren, quarrel not among yourselves, if one goes abroad and another stays at home; but punish only this in yourselves and others, that ye who are the salt of the world, instead of salting it, feed together on what is unsalted.

THE WIDOW'S MITE.

(Mark xii. 43, 44; Luke xxi. 3, 4.)

Mark preserves, in a few words (and Luke agrees with him, or copies from him, almost word for word), an externally lovely incident from the last days of our Lord—an incident which, in its simplicity, is still as fresh and expressive as ever it was. The saying of the Lord which occurs in connection with this incident is, we may observe first, the last which we have to consider of the new Sayings given by Mark; as we have resolved to follow, in the first instance, all the Evangelists only up to the history of the last sufferings. There is little of *explanation* needed, for the simple incident and the saying express of themselves a clear meaning: still it is right to call attention to the easily overlooked connection of the whole. Immediately after the denunciation

* In yourselves salt, among each other peace—as Hamann correctly points the antithesis.

of woes upon the Pharisees, consequently also (as Matt. xxiii. informs us) after the announcement of the judgments upon Jerusalem, and of the desolation of the temple, after the terribly sharp word of farewell, "Ye shall henceforth see me no more," he does not *at once* go forth—no, he sits down quietly once more to *observe* what is going on in this temple. By his very *silence* he says, "Have ye, whom I have now upbraided, any answer to return? I am ready to hear it." Before this he has had many questions put to him, and he has always been ready with his answer. In holy wrath, and in the language of rebuke called forth by the zeal of love, he has spoken his last public temple-discourse, and no man has dared to reply to him, but he lets it depend on them whether it is to be his last. He does not seek to escape from the wrath which he had provoked by his powerful rebukes, for his hour is not yet come—after such a discourse he sits quietly down. This is one general point. Still further—he sits down right opposite the treasury-chest, to observe how the people put in their contributions.* During the few preceding days he had *taken a view of every thing* in the temple (Mark xi. 11); he lingers here before he leaves it: for what other purpose but to manifest his condescending patient sympathy with the sanctuary, now desecrated and given over to destruction; and then to intimate symbolically what in future he would by no means fail to do in every house and sanctuary of his people as the rightful Lord and supreme guardian? It has been supposed that our Lord takes notice of the pious widow contributing out of her absolute poverty in order to draw a contrast that might put to shame the rapacity of the Pharisees, who devour widows' houses, on which he had previously been pronouncing condemnation in the 40th verse of the preceding chapter. This idea, however, appears to us to destroy the tender beauty of his conduct and of his saying. We suppose that after the lamentation of his Saviour-heart, as recorded Matt. xxiii. 37, had been uttered, he does not return to the same strain; he has entirely finished his rebukes, and he has no intention to renew them. He rather calms his agitated heart, by kindly condescending to any trace of godliness which is still to be found† in that den of thieves so soon to be broken up; and rejoices over two mites brought to this temple with simple good intent for the sake of God (Luke εἰς τὰ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ). This is a lofty contrast between wrath and love; like what we find in Matt. xxi. 13–16; the healing of the sick and the joy in the hosannahs of the children following immediately the words of rebuke. What manner of man is this! He is never exhausted in the immovable depths of the love of his holy soul, never unduly excited and moved by the most powerful outbursts of judicial zealous testimony; immediately after a discourse like the preceding one, he has again the calmness, the delight, the ready mind to search out and observe the smallest good.* Did he then feel and act thus in the flesh? How does he now look down upon the gifts and offerings in every little church and community, upon what is given and done in the whole world, that he may try it according to its value, its want of value or relative value, especially that he may not overlook the smallest thing; and that he may cry to the churches for each individual, "I know thy works," and at last proclaim to all from the judgment-seat, "This ye have done, this ye have not done!"

His disciples ought to learn, observe, and lay up in their minds for all future time that he thus sees and shall see. He calls them to himself, as to witness "an official act," in order that they may learn something great from this little incident; in order that he may bequeath to them and to all his future disciples a word of truth which has ever since been of eminent use in guiding to right judgment those who hold office in his Church; and in encouraging and gladdening many a poor man who has given willingly out of his poverty. But at this time it was not designed that the widow who passed by should hear her own praises; the remark was made confidentially to the disciples alone. Although it might certainly be true that the greater part of the money collected in this chest was applied to evil purposes, and did not go to uphold the true worship of God, yet the Lord pays no regard to this, but looks at the heart, the good intention of the giver. There is something in his saying, though infinitely higher and deeper, which bears a resemblance to the exclamation uttered by the martyr Huss, when

* The γαζοφυλάκιον is not a chamber, or the לִשְׁכָּה of the treasury (it is not possible that John could indicate this by the ἐν, viii 20—access to it would scarcely be open); nor is it one of thirteen שׁוֹפָרוֹת or (so called after their form) chests for free-will offerings which were to be found in the woman's court, and of which Sepp (iii. 309) gives a very correct account; but, as the article shows, a particular collection-box, to which also Josephus alludes in his *Antiq.* xix. 6, 1, and in other passages, where he uses another word. Mark and Luke have made no error or mistake; we know nothing exact about the matter.

† So far there is something true in the remark of Braune, though expressed by him in too strong and general terms: "In order to recover himself after his discourse against the Pharisees, to take refuge in the piety of the people." The observation of Lange is more correct, and conceived in a finer spirit: "That he might leave the temple with a warm look of blessing upon the true piety found in the old temple service"—namely, upon as much or as little of it as was to be found.

* "It was assuredly no littleness at such a time, when every influence was united to destroy the Redeemer, that he should with calmness of spirit and a heart full of sympathy observe what is related in this short paragraph. Who could have thought that at such a moment such a story could have been told of Jesus?" (Stein on Luke, p. 227).

a little peasant brought a small piece of wood to increase the flame of his pile, "*O sancta simplicitas!*" For there was indeed such simplicity in *this case;* when a poor widow denied herself of her poverty-penny, which she had carefully saved up, in order to make a little more full the temple treasury, which truly stood in no need of it.* But how far is he from the spirit of those who, to show their wisdom, would blame a humble, well-meaning heart!

Our Lord gives emphasis to the expression of his mind by a "Verily, verily, I say unto you" (Luke, "truly"). There were many rich people in Jerusalem, who assembled in the temple before the feast, and whose wealth was displayed by their gifts, though in most cases with Pharisaical ostentation. Still our Lord does not draw the contrast in such sharp outline, because he has now no satisfaction in uttering the language of reproof; he does not expressly, for this time, blame and contemn the others; he takes the mildest view of every thing. He merely places over against all the gifts from the *rest* (what was certainly a light and small remnant), the two farthings of the poor widow, as being greater than all in his view and in the view of God. He speaks positively; gracious condescension and heart-felt joy become apparent in the very fulness of the language by which he confirms his assertion of the mere relation between her possessions and her gifts. At the same time, however, his intention is not merely to estimate a relative *plus*, but in doing so, to point out the zeal and ardent impulse of her heart as it prompted her to give and offer in simplicity to the house of God. So far from having any thing superfluous, she is in need, and might have asked alms privately or publicly; but instead of doing so she gives away out of her need the last pittance of her poverty, all that she has in her possession.* Her means of subsistence, her daily supply, consisted of two very small pieces of money, which together make up a *quadrans*, or a fourth part of an *as*, to which Luke correctly reduces the amount for the convenience of his Roman readers. Was not this imprudent and strange? She might reasonably have retained one of the two small pieces, if she was determined to give an offering at this time—this would still have been the half of all that she had.† But she gave the whole, thinking now in faith of nothing beyond; only now moved, as we manifestly see, on close observation, by something special in her spirit to this frame of gratitude and offering; so that, completely forgetting herself and her poverty, and the morrow, she rises up and gives all that she has. The Lord knew this —we ask not *whence*. When he looked upon any one with the whole strength of appropriating love, he could read by a glance what was in the heart; when the Father designed to give him a word for the world, he gave him, in the particular case, the wonderful knowledge of what otherwise would have been concealed. Thus, in this homely utterance, the majesty and condescension, the greatness and the kindness of the Lord, are again united; thus it stands for us like a testimony taken from the midst of a life and conduct throughout of a similar character—telling us who he was who died for us, what divinely-human clearness of vision, and fulness of love, dwelt in him, even in these last days.

* In so far we have here *indirectly* what Lange would put too much in the foreground, a confirmation of the objection of Jesus to the Pharisees, who robbed widows' houses.

* Attested by Luke, simply and strongly, "all the living she had;" by Mark still more strongly, "all whatsoever she had."

† The prescript of the Talmud, that one λεπτόν shall not be given to the treasury (Sepp, iii. 311) must then have been in force; and this was accordingly the *least* of the offerings.

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.

THE FIRST PREACHING IN NAZARETH.

(Luke iv. 17–27 [Matt. xiii. 57; Mark vi. 4].)

The first two chapters of the third Gospel, as we observed at the very beginning of this work (p. 1), reach to a point further back than the commencement of either Matthew or of Luke; and manifest an aim the opposite of that which characterizes the prefatory verses of John, regarding the Word made flesh. It is for this cause that Luke's Gospel leads us at once to those introductory events, lying far back, which preceded the birth of Jesus Christ, through the power of the Holy Ghost; lets us hear the announcement of Gabriel, the songs of praise of Zacharias and Mary, the glad tidings of the angels to the shepherds, and the praise of Simeon and Anna; and next gives us the only record which we have of the first Saying (earnest of what was to come), uttered by the Son as he grew in the Spirit, concerning his heavenly Father. It is hence entirely in accordance with this character of the Gospel of Luke, that instead of the summaries of the public Sermon on the Mount delivered in Galilee, Matt. iv. 17; Mark i. 15, we have an exact (as it were esoteric) narrative of the first appearance of our Lord in his own Nazareth. For here Bruno Bauer is most assuredly right, in opposition to Ebrard, in maintaining that a *first* appearance is here related. This is so patent on the face of the whole transaction, and in all its details—from the quoting of the text in Isaiah, down through the fastening of all eyes upon him, and the "to-day" of his own lips, to the wicked close—that it is impossible to have a clear view of any one thing, if we are to suppose that Jesus had on a preceding Sabbath spoken in the synagogue at Nazareth. And then, what other than the first appearance, or nearly so, could it have been? Why all the wondering and offence taken on any occasion subsequent to the first? There is nothing against its being the first visit in the expression κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ (a pure Attic Greek phrase), "as his custom was"—an expression which has been very generally misunderstood. These words refer not, as Schleiermacher supposes, to our Lord's habit of teaching in the synagogues: such a habit, in so short a period, could not yet have been formed. In this case they would form a continuation of the 15th verse, and would be sufficiently tautological. Moreover, we should find the Redeemer here already in the middle of his duties as teacher; and Luke would have antedated this apparently late event to favor his own plan. This εἰωθὸς (which certainly does not denote a habit beginning no longer ago than yesterday or the day before, see Matt. xxvii. 19, Acts xvii. 2) depends not upon the rising to read and speak, but upon the going into the synagogue at Nazareth, and is manifestly to be read in close connection with "*where he was brought up.*" Luke, casting his eye back from Nazareth, manifestly connects his narrative with chap. ii. 51, 52, making it, as it were, a continuation of the account there given. We consequently perceive in this a notice extremely important, which brings before us, though in a single accidental trait, the entire private life of our Lord, as subject to all authority; viz., that hitherto he had been accustomed to attend this* synagogue at Nazareth as a silent hearer. He had not withstood all the folly and perversion which, in the reading of the word, must have proceeded from many lips, because the Spirit had not yet anointed and sent him to speak.† It is quite correct to take a deep view of the statement, and reason out the conclusion, that Jesus, from his twelfth till his thirtieth year, had attended every Sabbath day as a devout hearer: we cannot strike this great record out of Scripture except by an exposition which is not only false in itself, but which produces confusion also in other directions.

Further, we have already explained, p. 278, that we regard the visit to Nazareth, recorded in Matt. xiii. 54–58 (Mark vi. 1–6), as a second visit paid at a later period; and the account there given, notwithstanding all its apparent

* The only one in the little village; for the plural in Matt. xiii. 54, which is expressed by Luther, is a false reading.

† Therefore he had never up to this time *read aloud*, as Bengel supposes; this would have been inconsistent with his condition, though his keeping silence would not. Sepp (ii. 122, comp. 62) thinks of him also as the Maphtir or reader, perhaps also the interpreter in the synagogue at Nazareth: but this is a very absurd idea, which must disappear when narrowly examined.

similarity, as by no means in all respects identical with the first appearance which Luke records in the passage before us. From an independent and firm conviction we abide by this view; and shall neither appeal to the learned in its favor, nor discuss at any length the arguments of its opponents. Schleiermacher's critical research has very far from succeeded in establishing the identity of such different histories recorded in such different connections: an identity which cannot be held without a strange violation of Scripture. Where the Evangelists give no positive chronological data we hold that we are at liberty, and that it is our duty, to assign any place we please to their narratives—to such narratives, we repeat, as are given in a general way, and not in chronological sequence. But when we find a clear and express connection of time, we regard, in conformity with our principles of criticism, these terms as at least so far inspired that they cannot record any thing which is historically *false*. This is the case here. We must not vaguely read Matt. xiii. 54 as meaning, "He came (among other things) *also on one occasion* at an early period to his native city;" because to simple readers (and it is for such that the Scriptures are written), the καὶ ἐλθὼν, "and when he was come," according to all rules of language, depends upon the μετῆρεν ἐκεῖθεν, "he departed thence," of the former verse 53, and this again upon the ἐτέλεσεν τὰς παραβολὰς ταύτας, "he had finished these parables." Similarly, in Mark vi. 1 the ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν, "he went out from thence," depends upon the preceding chapter, the fifth, by a self-evidencing chronology; inasmuch as only the cures mentioned in Matt. ix. 27–34 come between. And there are assuredly many histories anticipated by Matthew which come between Matt. xiii. 52 and 53. But the fact that the Lord visited Nazareth after and not before the discourse which he delivered in parables, is firmly established, and cannot be overturned. Where then is there, in Luke iv. 28–31, room for the performance of the several miracles which Matthew and Mark relate as having been wrought previous to the *second* visit? There is an undoubted difference; and it is quite as "theologically" arbitrary as is any thing to be found in the exposed theological nakedness of Strauss, Bauer, and Co., for Olshausen to say, "He probably healed a few sick before speaking in the synagogue at Nazareth," and then to remove the contradiction which thence arises between this and Luke iv. 23 by adding, "such cures may have been wrought in the quiet family circles," so that the rest of Nazareth knew nothing about them. More orthodox theologians have ceased to treat the written word as Schleiermacher of old did; and it is said that, in *such* instances as the above, Olshausen, otherwise of precious memory, should have to be classed with that old school. Finally, Alford holds it "utterly impossible" that Jesus should have been thus treated at his first visit, and should then have expressed wonder at their unbelief on his second visit. But we simply reply that it is precisely at their *confirmed* unbelief that he expresses wonder; at their continued unbelief after their former outbreak of passion, and the disgrace which followed it, after his long continued teaching and working of miracles.

Thus, the first visit to Nazareth, an event which comes in between the 13th and the 11th and 12th verses of Matt. iv.—which is related by Luke, and alluded to by Matt. iv. 13—furnished the cause why our Lord selected Capernaum as his place of abode; he visited Nazareth at a later period a second time. Fearlessly, though they would have put him to death, did he afford them a second gracious opportunity, kindly dealing with them and not giving up his own native city. It can scarcely be thought that he has at once *altogether given up* his own unhappy Nazareth for its first sin, though that sin was certainly a grievous one. The denial of his *return* once more strikes out of his life a trait as beautiful as it is significant. On the other hand, it may well be imagined that the inhabitants of Nazareth, though a little ashamed of their first outbreak of passion, and not disposed to act in the same way against the Lord, after the lengthened and strong demonstration which they had received of his character, would still continue to cherish the same sentiments and adopt the same language, πόθεν τούτῳ ταῦτα, "Whence hath this man these things?" Then, in regard to the accounts given by Matthew and Mark of the address and the reply—accounts which by no means give a conversation between Jesus and the Nazarenes, held literally and exactly in this very way, but only a general view of what was stated and of what followed from it—we are not indisposed to grant that there is an echo of the former incident in their narrative; and, so thinking, we shall give in one exposition the kindred and blended results of the two visists to Nazareth*

* John iv. 44 is a mere note, which is quite unintelligible except on the supposition that John had in his view other well-known records. All intelligent critics are prepared to admit that he generally supplements and refers to the synoptical Evangelists; consequently "it cannot be compatible with sound principles of hermeneutics not to regard that exposition of this passage in John's Gospel which makes it agree with the other Gospels, as the most obvious and most natural one" (Bäumlein, *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1846, 2). We accept this with the greater confidence as the "Jesus himself *testified*" cannot in the language of John be merely "a remark of the Evangelist" (as Weiseler asserts), but must be a reminiscence of a saying, and a well-known saying, of the Lord. Jesus, however, did not give his *testimony* as to a prophet's not being honored in his own country so frequently that "he was accustomed to say so;" he merely said so once or twice in Nazareth. It is not absolutely impossible that John gave to the saying of the Lord a wider *application* of fulfillment; and that on this occasion he alluded

The incidents related by John, from chap. i. 35 to chap. iv. 54, come in chronologically between the 13th and the 14th verses of the chapter before us. The first appearance of our Lord in Nazareth falls in with this commencement of his work of preaching and working miracles in Galilee—with his visit at the feast in Jerusalem, and a short residence in Judea—for naturally he left his own city for a little while, but would not let it wait too long for him. He had already been residing in Capernaum, John ii. 12. In that place, after the *second* miracle, with which John ceases (John iv. 54) generally to enumerate, or indeed fully to narrate, the miracles wrought in Galilee, he still wrought a few others; this, however, is doubtful, see afterwards Luke iv. 23. From that time, however, he took up his proper abode at Capernaum, as Nazareth had cast him out. His preaching in Nazareth certainly took place *before* the Sermon on the Mount; and was no other than a preliminary and lowly commencement of his *evangelical* work, exhibiting its utmost fulness of grace—a private prelude, as it were, to that magnificent *beginning* which was immediately to follow.

Here spake he "the gracious words" (*λόγοι τῆς χάριτος*), which the Holy Spirit has not seen fit to record for our use, but whose substance we may gather partly from the text drawn from Isaiah, and partly from the opening word as given by Luke in the 21st verse. So, too, we have here the first word of his mouth to a private circle, uttered with all the grace of a divine *captatio benevolentiæ;* and, though with a perfect knowledge of their unbelief and envy, in the mildest possible form—I have come to fulfill; it is of me that the Scripture prophesies. And this beginning of the word—by the Spirit who anointed him to preach the Gospel—is similar to that which we afterwards hear on the day of Pentecost; viz., a *passage from the prophecies*, with an announcement that this prophecy has now come to pass and is fulfilled.

But the hearers would not hear in faith, and were offended at the son of Joseph. The subsequent address, which followed this gracious preaching, in which he still continues with the same kindness to utter to them *the words of truth* (ver. 25), is peculiar to Luke. In this address our Lord directs the attention of those who despised him to the general unbelief of Israel, as manifested against the prophets of God from the beginning till now; and in doing so he ponders within himself, in the spirit of prophecy, what at a future period he would be compelled openly to express, Luke xiii. 33, 34. First of all, *anticipating* any further expression of what they might *say*, he exposes to them their unbelieving, contracted, provincial, sign-demanding, thoughts; and yet he pleads on their behalf that they were only like the rest of Israel, yea, like all other men, by quoting a *second* proverbial saying, ver. 24, in reply to the former one which he had put

---

to Judea, because of our Lord's birthplace at Bethlehem, in opposition to Galilee. Origen was the first who adopted this view; he did not however suppose that there was any reference to Bethlehem, but regarded Judea as the native land of the prophets generally, which assuredly it was not. So Wieseler supposes that John alludes to Bethlehem. But when we reflect that this ingeniously imagined allusion to Bethlehem as the Lord's birthplace (it is no where spoken of as such in John's Gospel, not even in chap. vii. 41, 42), and the extension of the idea of *πατρίς* from little Bethlehem to the whole of Judea, are exceedingly strange—that Jesus (and here, at least, Lücke is in the right), at the commencement of his course, was well received in Judea, as is related in chap. iv. 1, ii. 23, iii. 26—that (according to Bäumlein's correct remark) *πατρίς*, where it occurs in connection with this well known proverbial saying, uttered as a testimony by Jesus, must decidedly have the sense of "the place of his home"—that *πατρίς* in the writings of the synoptical Evangelists themselves, to which John allüdes, is the usual designation of Nazareth—further, that the natural cause which gave rise to the proverb "that a prophet is not esteemed in his own country," does not exist in the birthplace which the prophet had long ago left (most certainly not to it as denoting the country in which it lies), but to the place of abode where he had for a length of time lived like other men—and finally, that even John, as at chap. vii. 41, and at a later period, chap. xviii. 5, 7, and also in a very appropriate passage, chap. i. 45, 46, was acquainted only with the common *opinion* in regard to the origin of the offence taken at the Lord, that he was *of Nazareth*—we shall be inclined to give due weight to the view taken by Cyril, and which was long the prevailing one, in opposition to Bruno, Bauer, Baur, Ebrard, Wieseler, and others, and by no means to regard it as "deserving of notice only at the first glance," as Lücke supposes. The view of this last mentioned writer, who finds Galilee in the *πατρίς* and considers *γάρ* as equivalent to "in fact" (Jesus found here in Galilee not such faith, without miracles, as in Samaria), is, we agree with Wieseler, "very hard." Hauff does not mend the matter (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, 1), who sees "a comprehensive view of the effects of the work of Jesus in Galilee," and, contrary to the meaning of the word, explains *ἐμαρτύρησεν* as meaning, "Jesus himself, like all other prophets, must furnish a proof of this adage!" Our judgment therefore is, that

---

John indicates, very briefly, the cause of what he is afterwards to mention, that Jesus went to the *land* of Galilee generally and not specially to *his own* Nazareth (as might have been expected according to chap. i. 45). In chap. iii. 22 at least, there is such a distinction, viz., between Judea and Jerusalem—a distinction which it has been erroneously supposed as not to be thought of. *Or rather* (and this we believe is the whole truth, if *every thing* be considered), John has in his mind, ver. 44, the whole *preceding* occurrence at Nazareth, gives a general preface in vers. 43. 44, and then goes back and gives the full statement in vers. 46–54. In this case we see the accuracy of ver. 54—we have the nobleman's son referred to *before* Luke iv. 23. Bäumlein gives in general a good defence of the application of this passage to Nazareth; and Gemberg agrees with it (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1845, 1). Here also for once we agree with Sepp (ii. 236), according to whom John mentally understood the clause: *οὐ δὲ μετέβη εἰς πόλιν Ναζαρέτ, but he went not to Nazareth.*

into their lips, regarding "the physician only for others." This more immediate Israelitish proverb—summing up the well-known, melancholy result of all Israelitish history—contains in itself a description of *faith* (the reception of a testimony), as a necessary condition which he would require; and also of *unbelief* as the cause of his rejection—an event which he was well aware was near at hand. Upon this he gives two most striking examples of this too true saying, drawn from the history of the first two great prophets and *workers of miracles;* but certainly he cannot say any thing to show that the *truth*, which his grace cannot and will not keep back, is at the same time leading him on to the very verge of prophesying that the word of God, which the Jews were rejecting, would pass over to the Gentiles.* He would apparently have said something more, had not their wrath, breaking out into an open tumult, interrupted him by a demonstration that he had spoken the truth; by plain evidence that he was something more than merely Jesus *of Nazareth;* and by such a revelation of the souls of these sinners, among whom he had grown up as the Holy One of God, as revealed still further his long-suffering patience and kindness in this same Nazareth.

Verses 17—19. It must have been a matter of great delicacy and difficulty (humanly speaking, and humanly viewing it, as we are entitled to do) for the Lord Jesus to deliver the first sermon and testimony on behalf of himself in that very Nazareth, and in that very synagogue where he had so long been a humble, silent listener. He referred that testimony, therefore, very specially to the hands and counsel of his Father. He had begun to manifest himself before the world, and had been magnified in many other schools, when an intimation of the Father's will, conveyed through the Spirit, lead him back for the first time to the place where he had so long remained in concealment. That he will not keep silence, is certainly the expectation which all entertain concerning him; still scarcely has any one ventured to ask him to speak, as they would have asked a Rabbi or a man of learning. *He stood up*—which according to a custom existing from the days of Nehemiah (viii. 4, 5), was a special intimation that he wished to read a passage of Scripture, including the usual exposition.† Who cannot but feel the importance of this moment for him and for Nazareth! *What* shall he read, as he certainly does not mean to be satisfied with the mere reading? The *Son*, in his *humility*—with which, on his coming forward after his long period of self-denial he must have been specially filled (to speak again in the language of men)—was not under the necessity of being anxious about this, or of inquiring after it. The *rule* and *wont* to which he had hitherto been subject, accompanies him with its blessings up to this point of publicity and transition; the Father prepares every thing for his hand and for his mouth, in this path of obedience. It is a matter of great importance that the practice of the synagogue, of introducing the text of Scripture previous to the oral address, is here, at the turning point between the Old and New Testaments, consecrated by him, who himself is the substance of all Scripture, and is confirmed anew for all future time. There was delivered to him (by the minister afterward mentioned as the חַזָּן, שַׁמָּשׁ) the roll of the prophet Isaiah, undoubtedly because in the ordinary course a lesson from that prophet fell to be read on that Sabbath. But here is the limit to which the Lord will and can go in compliance with the ordinary course of procedure in the synagogue. He has to testify and to proclaim something new and for the first time. We cannot, certainly (with the worthy country minister in the *Evangelical Kirchenzeitung*), find in the fact that our Lord "left the *Parashioth* and sections and asked a text from his Father," an example to be imitated by us, and to be regarded as sanctioning our modern freedom from ecclesiastical control in regard to the portions of Scripture to be read and preached from. There is still a great difference between our sermons and this Sermon; and, moreover, there are sufficient other reasons against the slavishness of unqualified adherence to prescribed portions, a practice which quenches the Spirit, and forces into the background the other parts of the sacred volume. But this much appears clear to our humble judgment, that Luke by the expression "*found the place*" does not indicate that our Lord opened the roll, searching for and carefully selecting a passage, but that passage was the gift of his Father, provided for him by his guidance; that as soon as our Lord opened the roll his eyes fell upon the right text for his word, and that he forthwith began to read it.

It is, in truth, the most suitable passage of Scripture that could possibly have been found; and, if others admire the wisdom of the Lord in its choice, it comes to the same thing if we acknowledge that this wisdom was on this occasion bestowed upon him at the moment by the Father. We feel at once that no royal and kingly text would here have been appropriate; as the utmost possible degree of condescension was necessary in order that Nazareth might not take offence, except through its own sin, at the first word of testimony spoken by its "carpenter." Hence, in the first instance, mention is made only of his having been sent and anointed by the Holy Spirit *to preach* (a fact which becomes immediately obvious); and only of *the Gospel for men's broken hearts*—in expressions that spiritually interpret the *miracles*

* Another illustration of the reason why this sequel to the preaching is embraced in the plan of Luke's Gospel—the Gospel specially sent to the Gentiles.

† Alford aptly reminds us of the title given to Ezra by Josephus: ἀναγνώστης τοῦ θείου νόμου, "a reader of the divine law" (*Ant.* xi. 5, 1.

of healing which the Lord had already begun to work, like the words in which we afterwards read of them in Matt. xi. 5, 6. Therefore in the very first word there is an appeal directly made to the baptism of Jesus in Jordan, which was his anointing with the Spirit; and to that which occurred at the same time, viz., the testimony, which could not possibly be unknown to the Nazarenes, given by the Baptist on behalf of their own Jesus, and which had introduced him to them in the way appointed by God. But still there is not here, as had been the case every where else at the commencement of his preaching, any lofty utterance concerning the coming *kingdom of heaven*, or any earnest word about *repentance*. He *takes for granted* that there are already present some penitent souls who would welcome, as tidings of joy, a proclamation which brought healing of broken hearts, deliverance and redemption from misery; to them this would be, what it it was, the most benignant and most attractive announcement of grace and love—taken from the very midst of all that had in former times been written of Christ. Are we not right in saying that it looks as if this passage had been written for this very occasion and could not have been written in any other way of its fulfillment?

In the book of Isaiah, from the 49th chapter to the end, which may be regarded as the third great section of the whole, the Messianic prophecies become, more than before, yea, as far as is possible under the Old Testament, free from types, clear, and perspicuous. Every thing looks and points straight forward into the future, when Israel shall be delivered by the Lord with an everlasting deliverance (chap. xlv. 17), and brought into an eternal covenant of the sure mercies of David (chap. lv. 3). The spiritual import of this future redemption, deliverance, and preparation for a *true Israel* of God, is every where declared. The wonderful counsel according to which this true Israel should be prepared in the person of the *Servant* of the Lord, who himself is in the first place the true Israel, the fulfiller of all prophecy and more than all this, is pre-eminently set forth and unfolded, chap. xlix.–lv. The engrafting of the people into this Servant Israel, through his expiatory and regenerating and quickening sufferings, is the thrice returning subject for announcement; is three times expressly asserted in the conclusion, and declared to belong to the gracious covenant about to be thus ratified. (The three sections are, first, chap. xlix.; second, chap. l.–lii. 12; and third, chap. lii. 13 to the end of chap. lv.) Upon this, as a sequence, there is founded, chap. lvi.–lx., *an offer* of these mercies of David, that is of the Messianic mercies, in the form of an address, which, containing within it an emphatic contrast, and ascending each time from reproof to consolation, is directed to rebellious, sinful Israel, such as it was at the time the prophet wrote. But the text for Nazareth is not taken from this section; it is taken from the very last one, which speaks plainly upon every preceding subject, and brings the whole to a close—from that first affecting evangelical *invitation* in the lips of the Sent and the Anointed One, through the blindness of Israel, the calling of the Gentiles, and subsequently the restoration of Israel, to the most remote final view of the New Jerusalem created for joy, and of the new heavens and the new earth. I beseech you, I beseech you with my whole heart, my dear brother theologians, read once more the so-called Pseudo-Isaiah, and read with real simplicity, that you may read and understand him as our Lord who here testifies that the Scripture was fulfilled in himself must have read and understood him. Then, assuredly, will you see in the clear light of his Spirit (if only you really pray *for it*) that chap. lxi. 1, 2, 3, was spoken not only by the prophet then speaking, but also through the mouth of this prophet by the other Prophet yet to come, of whom he prophesies, and in whose mouth alone the words reach the full sense for which the spirit of prophecy gave them; a delightful summary of the whole consolation of redemption which he alone is able to preach, and in preaching to impart, because he himself is the Redeemer.

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me: this is he of whom this had already been announced at the beginning, Isa. xi. 2, and afterwards at chap. xliii. 2. *Because* (οὗ εἵνεκεν, יַעַן is manifestly to be thus understood) he hath *anointed* me (therewith): this means in truth the Messiah or Christ; and Jesus must assuredly announce himself as such, even in the very first word at Nazareth. *He hath sent* me to preach *glad tidings* to the poor: that is, this is certainly he whom the Lord and his Spirit sent, according to Isa. xlviii. 16 (on this we request the reader to compare our exposition in the preface to the first part). In and with this בַּשֵּׂר or Gospel message, there begins, at the same time, the חֲבֹשׁ לְנִשְׁבְּרֵי־לֵב, the binding and healing of broken hearts with the consolations of grace, chap. lvii. 15, Psa. cxlvii. 3. In connection with such preaching there is further announced and proclaimed a *deliverance* (ἄφεσις, דְּרוֹר, with reference to the type of the year of Jubilee, Lev. xxv. 10, Ezek. xlvi. 17) for all captives, for all who are in fetters, condemned, held in bondage; consequently for all who are such in a spiritual sense, like the נִשְׁבְּרֵי־לֵב, Isa. xlix. 24, 25—yea, with absolute assurance, a real פְּקַחֲקַח־קוֹחַ in the most complete sense to all who are bound; *an opening* and loosening of all bonds.*

So far, the progress of language and thought in the original text of Isaiah is as clear as it

* There is nothing arbitrary in being willing to take this word, which is exactly parallel with דְּרוֹר, for what it is, an emphatic expression in the redoubled form for the most complete disclosure. See, on this point, my *exposition of Isaiah*, p. 718.

is deep. In what language or translation the Lord read at Nazareth, we do not exactly know; the Evangelist, however, gives this text to his original Greek readers in a form which partly follows the Septuagint (according to the well-known, well-grounded practice of the New Testament), and partly supplies the want of exactness in that version. On our principles of criticism,* we do not believe that he left out *the healing of the broken-hearted* —a clause which is not wanting in the Septuagint, which expresses so correctly the kernel of the saying, and which is pre-supposed afterwards in verse 25, in order to account for the introduction by our Lord of the proverb about the Physician. We maintain, with Bengel, that the correct reading is that which contains the clause in question. Further, as the Septuagint (applying פְּקַחְקוֹחַ to the eyes, as פָּקַח and פְּקָחָה are used in all other passages, of the eyes; and only once, Isa. xlii. 20, of the ears) has translated by *καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν*, Luke retains this expression. For, corresponding really as it does, so far as spiritual captivity and opening are concerned, to the internal meaning of the word in the original, with its double allusion, it also connects the individual passage before us with other kindred passages, such as Isa. xlii. 7, xlix. 9. In order, however, to supply the want thus created, and, further, to show that the Lord meant and used the individual passage in its full sense, as interpreted by the entire prophecies of Isaiah, he adds a passage from chap. lviii. 6, blending the two together: *ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει*, "to set at liberty them that are bruised," which again suits well with the *συντετριμμένοις* or "broken hearted." (The doubled *ἄφεσις* is tautological exactly in the same way as לַאֲסוּרִים פְּקַחְקוֹחַ and לִשְׁבוּרֵי דְרוֹר are in the original text.) It is by no means "a complete interchange of passages, a confounding of words, a failing of memory"—we would certainly not deny this to be the case, if our conscience and Biblical science could find any satisfactory traces of the existence of any thing of the kind any where. We have rather here an intelligent grasp of the passages quoted, so far as their spirit is concerned (furnishing an instructive lesson to the sticklers for mere words), accompanied by a regard to the version then in common use—a grasp such as that which the Spirit of inspiration taught the New Testament writers to take. Is it not, however, a pity, we must here once more ask with our own heart almost broken, to be obliged to annoy ourselves with contending against such attempts to bring down holy writ to the level of a human composition, and to disturb in our own heart, and in the hearts of others, the simple impression of passages such as the one now before us, where the believing reader should have no other feeling but that arising from the power of the great message, the blessedness of the glad tidings for the poor? When will it be noted more than it has hitherto been to believing interpreters in their treatment of the Old and New Testament, that (as Harnack says) the foundation of all true theology is neither more nor less than a broken heart? Truly a broken heart is at no loss to apply to itself in its simplicity the abundance of words, for example, which are given by Luke for this text; and feels also in it the mind of the Spirit through all the imaginary traces of humanity.

Finally, it is not merely Luke who breaks off with the *acceptable* year of the Lord; Jesus himself, as simple feeling will tell us, read no further than this שְׁנַת־רָצוֹן. (Compare Isa. xlix. 8. This is generally the New Testament season of grace, the allusion being to the great jubilee year, Lev. xxv. 10, *the year of grace*, year of favor; not the "welcome year," according to the Septuagint; *δεκτός* cannot be limited to this.) For he will have, as it was fit that he should have, a purely gracious evangelical text for the beginning of his ministry at Nazareth. The clause which follows in Isaiah, "and a *day of the vengeance* of our God, to comfort all that mourn" (with deliverance from their condemned enemies, see Isa. xxxiv. 8, lxiii. 4, "the great day of the wrath and judgment at the close of the year of grace"), occurs in the old versions and Fathers (Vulg. *et diem retributionis*, the day of retribution), but it was obviously introduced from the desire of completing the unfinished text. The Lord, however, had read enough, he closed the book when he had reached this part, and followed up what had been read with the remark, "This day is this fulfilled" with which he began his gracious sermon. And Luke understood this well enough to abstain, on his part, from appending the clause.* There lies, however, in this *ἐνιαυτὸς δεκτός*, "acceptable year," with which the Lord ceases to read and begins to preach, a secondary allusion, exceedingly obvious and beautiful, to what has been called "the Galilean year"—a year peculiarly rich in Christ's gracious preaching. But the reference is not so exclusive as Bengel would have us suppose.

Verses 20—22. Every thing is done according to the rule and custom hitherto observed; this the exact narrative of the Evangelist is designed to tell us. It was the practice in this synagogue, after the passage of Scripture had been read in a standing posture, for the speaker to sit down to deliver his own address: on the contrary, at Antioch in Pisidia, Paul stood up to give the word of exhortation (Acts xiii. 16).† The practice here was in harmony

* Which, with the almost entirely unsatisfactory and fragmentary character of the manuscript apparatus, inclines us more and more to decide according to *internal* reasons.

* Compare on this correct view the (Irvingite) treatise, "on the Counsel of God," etc. Frankf. (Zimmer), 1847, 1, p. 116.

† The later Jewish arrangements as to the pos-

with the Lord's manner on other occasions; for we know that he usually adopted the sitting posture in teaching—an attitude expressive of elevated repose, and which formed a striking contrast to that in which the Baptist called sinners to repentance. In this case, particularly, had our Lord remained standing during the delivery of the gracious discourse, addressed in such accents of tenderness to the heart, his position would not have been, at least, to our feelings, consonant with the occasion. He returned the closed book of the prophet to the officer; probably in conformity to usage, but at the same time because he did not mean to confine himself to the exposition of the text. In our day, when preachers have no new word of fulfillment to add to the text which contains within itself the glad tidings (not even to the text of the Old Testament, as brought before Christian congregations in the light of its fulfillment), it is a bad practice to shut the Bible and lay it aside when the sermon begins. *This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears!* This was the sermon to Israel from the text of the Old Testament; just as at a later period the Epistle to the Hebrews sets before us the utmost depths of Christian doctrine only as the right interpretation of the word of the Old Testament.* *This Scripture*, like every Scripture, and like the entire Scriptures—we are not to construe, "this Scripture in your ears," as if the meaning were "this Scripture which you have just now heard:" ἐν τοῖς ὠσίν ὑμῶν belongs to πεπλήρωται, *is fulfilled in your ears. For, I preach to you, the person who, the substance which, and in the manner in which it is written.* "You now hear the very sermon which the prophet here predicts shall be preached" (Von Gerlach). *This day*—a great era this for Nazareth; the first hearing of the tidings of joy and grace (compare Acts xxvi. 29), the first day of the great year of Jubilee which had now dawned. The Lord himself does not begin from a point far back, with a long argumentative exposition of the text, as was more suitable in his servants (Acts xvii. 2, 3, xviii. 28); but, in the immediate power of the Spirit which was upon him to reveal him as the Anointed and Sent One, he hastens to delivers his testimony in the very first word which he utters. *The eyes of all were fastened on him*, with eager curiosity to see what this son of Joseph, of whom, for some time past, they had heard such great things, has now, after such a long silence, to say to his native city: the Lord places in opposition to this their *ears;* and in doing so, solicits, in the most kindly way, a right hearing undisturbed by their eyes (as at Acts ii. 14); for *faith* cometh into the *heart* only by *hearing* (ver. 18). And now he has preached the most gracious Gospel for the poor, as yet without any demand to practice righteousness in testimony of the grace which brings it, as he did afterwards on the Mount before all the people; so far, therefore, his Sermon is on this occasion a counterpart to that discourse which, after the gracious commencement, took a wider range. Still, we should not have had this lovely, mild, most proper introductory statement (of which Lange very beautifully says "in opening this Scripture he opens his own heart"), wherewith in some small measure to draw a veil over the sin and the shame of the Nazarenes who rejected it.

The first impression produced by this sermon, which is briefly and strikingly described in ver. 22, is not to be conceived of as if the people merely wondered that this carpenter's son "could preach so beautifully"—which would be too much like the modern "vicious practice of perverting preaching from its proper object, and making it the empty vehicle of empty every-day entertainment." No; *this* was not possible, where the Lord was the preacher; and if the conduct of the people could not *at first* be so bad as this, so much the worse was their subsequent demeanor. *All* bore witness to him at first, and in the end all were full of wrath, ver. 28. The sweetness, benevolence, and grace (for all this is comprehended in the χάρις as in the חֵן) which, according to Psa. xlv. 3, were poured out on the lips of the Messiah, necessarily evoke a sense of delight on the part of men (Luke ii. 52); but, when sternness of *truth* follows the grace, the wrath of opposition breaks forth. The Evangelist does not intend to describe the first testimony or praise as having been given in express words: the καὶ ἔλεγον, "and they said," properly follows after this. As the result of deep impressions, they involuntarily give their assent in the first instance to the gracious preaching; at the second step, however, they turn aside; *they wondered* at these gracious words—out of this *mouth*. Instead of hearing simply to receive (*wondering* always denotes the opposite of this, as at chap. ii. 18, 47), they close their ears, and use only their eyes; they look at the mouth, and judge, according to appearance, a false judgment. They are like the blind, ver. 18, who suppose that they see; for their rule runs in perversion of the right one, *Not what, but who.* How must the Lord have restrained and concealed himself during these eighteen long years? How must all the rays of his glory have been drawn in, as the carpenter's son, even the carpenter of Nazareth (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3). Almost perplexed for a moment, as to whether it could be the same person and the same mouth, they here put the question, as being the first which after a variety of feelings and thoughts escapes their lips: *Is not this man the son of Joseph?* Compare, at a later period, John vi. 42. Thus Luke compresses into a few words the entire reference to his common descent and personality, suitably to the first impression which did not then find utterance in more copious terms;

ture, whether sitting or standing, of the teacher or reader, were at that time not established.

*In New Testament times the Gospels would very soon and naturally come to occupy the place of the sections in the reading of the Scriptures.

Matthew and Mark, on the other hand, on the recurrence of the angry, malicious feeling, thus consistently and firmly cherished, quite as truly and as naturally give us stronger and more copious terms. On this later occasion a regular proof had to be obtained that the πόθεν, "whence," of his wisdom and deeds could not be ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, "from heaven:" his mother (after the death of his father) is mentioned as being poor and of no note; his brothers and sisters in this connection manifestly as the full brothers and sisters, the members of one and the same well-known family. "Mere common people, like ourselves, *all with us*—the brothers (mentioned by name) bring him no particular honor—as for the sisters we do not, at the moment, remember their names." Certainly by such *wondering* and *questioning* Nazareth involuntarily and unconsciously gives further *testimony*, though only for the good of others who believe, while they are hardened in anger and unbelief; their witness is *against* themselves.

The son of Joseph had walked till his thirtieth year blamelessly in friendship, humility, and obedience, with the favor of all; like the son of no other Nazarene, of no other Israelite, of no other man; and so as to excite in those who had right eyes and right hearts the presentiment that he was something higher than he appeared to be—this was the case with John the Baptist, after only slight intercourse with him. But the beggarly village pride of the Nazarenes cannot at all comprehend the humility of the Great One; they are ready to say, with his brethren, "He who would be, or who is, of any note, will show himself as soon as possible to the world."* Thus the humanity of the divine Saviour is incredible at first to all of us; and thereby we, in our turn, bear involuntary testimony to the condescending grace of God and to our own wickedness. *Like one of us*—this cannot be any thing particular. Thus Nazareth frankly confirms what other people say of it, John i. 46. *Whence* has this man this wisdom and these deeds? From his father and mother he has received no education, as his brothers and his sisters show; that he has not studied any where else is well known, John vii. 15; consequently, as we do not know *whence he has* his learning, he has nothing that we can acknowledge.

Verse 23. On this occasion, before the people are able to add more words to their first brief expression (which is rather *wondering* than *anger*), and to confirm themselves in their sin, the Lord, who has learned to know them through and through, anticipates them by a graciously forbearing expression of their thoughts. He who has proclaimed himself to be the *Physician of the heart*, shows himself, in proof and token of this, to be the *Searcher of the heart*. The natural train of thought in the minds of these Nazarenes, according to ver. 22, was: Is he not like ourselves? Yet is he the Anointed of God, whom the Spirit sends and in whom he dwells? *Let him prove it to us!* Therefore the Lord says: πάντως, "surely" ye *will* say to me—I know it well before you utter it, and I say it to you; *and assuredly*, in a certain measure, you have a right to say it. That he clothes it in a *proverbial saying*, is partly with a view to its being popularly understood, and partly by way of gracious excuse for them, in harmony with the human disposition which made this proverb.* As, in accordance with the prophetic text, he had announced the healing of the sick, he calls himself a *Physician;* but they understand this misapplied proverb only of bodily healing and help. We do not believe that it was intended to be taken in a strictly literal sense: "Let him work a miracle on *himself*,† make himself a rich instead of a poor man, a mighty instead of a lowly man;" in our opinion the σεαυτόν, "thyself," is to be explained by ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου, *in thine own country*, the common way of applying proverbial sayings being to widen their range. The thoughts of the Nazarenes in their petty pride ran as follows: "As the son of Joseph art thou not ours? We have, at all events, a right to thee, if thou art any thing, and art able to do any thing; why then hast thou not begun among us with thy mighty works? But thou hast done this εἰς Καπερναούμ, *to* ("in") *Capernaum, i. e.*, Capernaum has the honor. We were thy neighbors, and thou hast passed us by to make thyself of importance outside—thou art, like many a one, a physician who will help others, but who can do nothing for himself or for his own house." The indefinite ὅσα is very well expressed by "what great things"—for these will man for ever seek, instead of the humility of Christ, of which he has no conception. Half in a tone of exaggeration, and half also, perhaps, in *irony* (for it is as if the expression in the mouth of the Lord was their own), their ὅσα hints at flying rumors of what he had done in Capernaum, and on which they look with jealous eye: we see manifestly that it could represent only the single miracle wrought on the Nobleman's son; they do not appear as yet to have heard any thing about the many miracles wrought at Jerusalem,‡ in regard to which less offence would

* Still more foolish would be the idea here that the Lord should have referred to or proved his miraculous conception. This, the greatest of all miracles, and mysteries, is assuredly not a foundation on which faith may build, but a fact to be apprehended by faith.

* Only here in the New Testament is παραβολή used for a *proverb*, expressed in figurative language.

† As the words are again heard under the cross.

‡ The events at Cana, perhaps, they regarded as quite uncertain, not deserving of notice; this, at least, would seem to be assumed by the Lord. At all events the ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν we cannot regard (with Alford) as a sure mark of a later period. For, though we were to admit the force of his statement, in opposition to what we have said above, "that ὅσα could not have been applied to one

be taken, as a beginning made at the right place. Inasmuch, however, as they acknowledge ἠκούσαμεν—that they *had heard*—they bear testimony against themselves, that they might and should *have believed* even though they had not *seen* signs and wonders wrought before their own eyes (John iv. 48). Mark how significantly the Lord here once more indirectly rejects the demand for miracles before it is made; as for himself, he absolutely never offers a miracle in demonstration of his mission and preaching.

Verse 24. The εἶπε δέ, "but he said" (Luke frequently throws in such *formulae* in a continuous address) is meant to mark this proverbial saying as one of special note, one that had become well known, and which was afterwards repeated—a saying used on the present occasion in the same sense in which it afterwards occurs at John iv. 44. In Matthew and Mark this proverb (here used in reply to a proverb) is prosecuted into a still narrower circle, "and in his own house;" Mark, in addition to this, and between the two expressions, inserts the clause, "and among his own kindred." The formula in Mark, οὐκ ἔστι ἄτιμος εἰ μή, "is not without honor except," gives the strongest expression: "Is a prophet even in other places, and generally, despised? I say unto you it is not so every where, and in comparison of the contempt with which he meets at home, scarcely any where at all; but if it be so no where else, yet it is certainly so here." The proverb about the physician who should save himself, is generally a human one: the proverb about the prophet, who is in no estimation at home, has also a general analogy for extraordinary men, and witnesses of the truth; but the Lord gives it rather an Israelitish range, pressing home the case. A prophet is a physician for the heart by means of the word. An ordinary prophet, such as those whom Israel hitherto had known, has, as a *man* gifted and sent by God, along with the official character, which he is acknowledged as bearing also, a human relationship also toward the immediate neighborhood in which he has grown up, and here there is no room for unbelief to take offence. In addition to this extraordinary capacity he bears also a common relationship. Now, the Lord humbly places himself in this class of prophets; he desires not to take any higher position than what subjects him to the common lot of prophets (as at Luke xiii. 33), when he rises to preach as one sent of God. In the οὐδεὶς δεκτός, no prophet is *accepted* (which is here quite as suitable for this first utterance as the stronger term ἄτιμος, used subsequently, was for the other), he already points, in passing, to the receiving and accepting *faith* which must bring the *soul* to the true Physician that he may help it.

Verses 25–27. *The Scripture and its testimony to the truth*, which, and here especially *its historical incidents*, the Lord by his own example teaches all preachers carefully to notice and to use—the *Scripture* is more than proverb, it is itself the fountain of all those particular Israelitish proverbs, the truth of which can be proved from it. The Lord, by the 24th verse, had advanced from the narrowest sense and circle in which the Nazarenes understood πατρίς, "country," into the large field—*Israel*, the proper fatherland of the prophets. He might have mentioned the fate of Jeremiah in his own Anathoth (Jer. xi. 21, xii. 6), or something of the same kind, which, being on a small scale, might have been more like his own rejection by the Nazarenes; but, according to the Spirit who is in him, he opposes to the Nazarenes' limited circle of vision a wide and comprehensive view of the subject. In this we see as before partly a mournful apology for them, that *they* acted not worse or otherwise than Israel at large had done; but we also see the earnest rebuking *truth*, which, as they have rejected his former kindness, he cannot now withhold. Elijah and Elisha are the two great prophets who stand at the proper commencement of prophetic antiquity; they are also the two great workers of miracles, whose miracles in many respects prefigured the miracles of the Lord (compare Matt. xiv. 20 with 2 Kings iv. 43, 44, and Luke vii. 15 with 1 Kings xvii. 23). He also will in truth feed the poor and cleanse the lepers. It is to these miracles of mercy that he points; and not to the fire from heaven, or to the bears which destroyed the mockers. Not only through the same traditions as James (v. 17) does he know the exact time during which the heaven was shut;* he knows it also from the revelation of the Spirit in whom he speaks; and further that Elias was not sent with similar aid to any other of the *many* widows in Israel at that time of oppression and distress. When he begins to speak and testify of this matter, he speaks as if all was luminous and sure before his eyes, yea, more than stands recorded in the narratives themselves. (Ἐπὶ Ἐλιόδαιον is a note of time, just as in a preceding passage ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡλίου; compare Luke iii. 2; Mark ii. 26; Acts xi. 28; for the prophets were employed, like the kings and high priests, to indicate eras of time.) That there were also many *lepers* as well as widows, was due to

miracle," it may have been the case that several miracles had been wrought at Capernaum, though only one is recorded. The only thing certain is that these could not have been wrought (as Lange asserts) *before* the *second* miracle in Galilee so specially recorded by John.

* This is not so exactly specified in 1 Kings xvii. 1, xviii. 1. A time of suffering, however, for Israel, was frequently thus measured out (compare Dan. vii. 25, xii. 7); and "the shutting up of the heavens" had been a specially threatened punishment from the time of 1 Kings viii. 35; Deut. xi. 17; hence Sir. xlviii. 3. Braune remarks very correctly that if the shutting, 1 Kings xvii. 1, was threatened at the beginning of the rain season, the half-year preceding would not be reckoned; and 1 Kings xviii. 1, is not inconsistent with the four half-years.

the sins of the time; and reference to this generally is made at 2 Kings vii. 3. The healing of Naaman, who also at first took offence and did not believe, leads back again to the *Physician*. By both these parallel histories, however (which very strikingly remind us of the Canaanitish woman of Sidon, and of the ruler of Capernaum), the design of the Lord is to deliver a genuine prophecy derived from the past and referring to the future. He announces beforehand that Israel would not receive him, its great Prophet and Physician; and, consequently, that his preaching of grace (ver. 18, 19) would, because of their unbelief, pass over to the heathen. All this is well known to him before he preaches; and yet from the beginning he speaks as graciously as if he had nothing before him but broken hearts. It is the manifestation of the opposite of this that first compels him, ἐπ' ἀληθείας, "in truth," to speak in any other strain.

This, however, was *the* truth which Nazareth and Israel, with incurable Jewish pride, will not hear; and which, on every occasion down to Acts xxii. 21. 22, xxviii. 25, calls forth their *wrath*. What happens here at Nazareth is again a symbolical prophecy for the country of all prophets, and of this the last great Prophet; it intimates, what Luke throughout the whole of his two books is ever showing us, that the Gospel must pass over from the Jews to the heathen. This is the first exception to the general glorification of the Lord, as he was teaching in the synagogues; see above ver. 15. They do not suffer him to speak further, they interrupt the worship of God by a general uproar. He allows himself, as if he were a false prophet, who, now that he is put to the proof, cannot make good his pretensions, to be *cast* or *pushed* by the first outbreak of anger into the street; and even, still patiently, to be led to the high brow of the hill by the multitudes now prosecuting their object more quietly—the result of his patience—with the intent of casting him down headlong. What fellow-townsmen are these of the Holy One of God! As his hour is not yet come, passing through the midst of them he goes his way. It is not meant that they were struck with blindness, that he became invisible, or that there was an external miracle. This is the very thing which the Evangelist means to deny by διελθὼν διὰ μέσου, *passing through the midst*. The Lord turns on them a look of majesty hitherto restrained; and they, receiving from him at parting a *sign* of the power of his spirit, are restrained from touching him, and compelled reverentially to make way for him, right and left, as he moves along! "They stood—stopped—inquired—were ashamed—fled—separated," as Pfenninger, with graphic pencil, paints the closing scene.*

PETER'S DRAUGHT OF FISHES AND HIS CALL.

(Luke v. 4–10; [Matt. iv. 19; Mark i. 17].)

In addition to what we have already said, p. 29, on the difference between the first call of the fishers of men and the Lord's present work and word in further confirming that call; and in addition, further, to what we have said in anticipation of our exposition of the latter, a few remarks must still be added, now that we have come to the immediate consideration of the narrative of Luke by itself.* The whole history, from the first crowding of the people to hear the word of the Lord up to the time when those whom the Lord won over to be servants of the word left all and followed him, is throughout of a kind more eminently fitted for typical instruction than most other portions of the Gospel narratives. Few preachers have ever been able to abstain altogether from allegorizing here. But our business is only with the words of the Lord. We have to remark *first* on ver. 4: He commands them *to launch out into the deep*, partly to exhibit the miraculous draught of fishes as contrary to all the rules of fishing; and partly also to withdraw from the eyes of the people the miracle, which was the sign given to apostles in confirmation of the promise accompanying their call. Further, we have to define in all its fulness the meaning of the miracle which accompanied the word. It was designed by our Lord, first, to be a σημεῖον, *a sign*, standing in most direct connection with the preceding preaching of the word of God; *a symbol* of the new call for Peter, in which the old calling is consecrated and exalted by being made a prophetic type of the new. It was, secondly, a figurative *prophecy* of the blessing attached to preaching, of the benediction which should forever rest upon his servants' labors, which shall never cease to operate. It was, finally, and subordinately, a *sedative* to the fear of earthly need in following Jesus. These three points in the history appear to us to be intimately united in one whole. In re-

* We may here correct the mistake of Neander, who supposes that a sense of sin so suddenly called forth in the case of Peter is conceivable only at an early period, at the beginning of his connection with Jesus. On the contrary, such a state of mind is the result of deep experience, when a man is brought into close communion with the Holy One.

* Robinson (*Palestine*, iii. 421) commits a sad mistake when he supposes that Jesus took advantage of the narrow streets of the city to escape from their snares.

gard to the first, it is figuratively taught us that the casting out (the letting down) of our nets, our laboring the whole night through, is productive, as Peter's word shows, of no good without the blessing of God; while, on the other hand, it cannot be dispensed with, for the Lord, in promising the draught, at the same time commands to cast out the net, and sends the fishes into the net, but not directly into the boat. In regard to the second we see that the word of promise, *εἰς ἄγραν*, "for a draught," appended to the command, is parallel to the *ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν*, "thou shalt be a fisher," which afterwards conveys a similar assurance of the result. The third beautifully follows as a consequence from the fact that the Lord immediately and superabundantly recompensed Simon's loan of his boat for preaching; consequently, as he is now sending out Simon himself to preach, he will not suffer him as an unrequited laborer to suffer want. We may notice also as important, how prominently the difference is brought forward between the *ὑμᾶς*, *you*, of Matt. iv. 19, and of the whole narrative before us, and the address to Simon as the foremost and the representative of his disciples. It is for this reason that the Lord selected out of the two ships the one which belonged to Simon and entered into it; it is for this reason that the address in the singular, launch (thou) into the deep precedes the plural, cast (you) out your nets; it is for this reason, finally, that the other expression, ver. 10, is addressed in the first instance to Simon the sinful *man*,* although his equally astonished associates have already received a similar call.

The general expression, "fishers of men," *ἁλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων*, of the earlier call, is modified by the *ζωγρῶν* (a catcher), a word chosen designedly by Luke as the corresponding expression. For, men are to be captured for the kingdom of God; not for slaughter (2 Pet. ii. 12), but to be preserved *alive* (and this is exactly the meaning of *ζωγρεῖν* in Josh. ii. 13), brought to a willing obedience, and thus made serving captives. We may compare 2 Tim. ii. 16, where, though in a bad sense, as much of this application remains as is sufficient to let us see that the expression here denotes the wonderful capture of souls, for a free and willing obedience, by means of the miraculous Gospel-net. *Henceforth:* from this time, when thou a sinful man, in full knowledge of thy sinfulness, now becomest my disciple; and comest to be prepared by me for the higher work of fishing, which also, as a work of faith, must be learned step by step! We may thus in general draw the contrast between this call and their former calling now abandoned, without descending (with Bengel) to any thing so minute as the approaching mission of the Twelve.

THE RAISING OF THE YOUNG MAN AT NAIN.

(Luke vii. 13, 14.)

Ebrard, from a mere oversight, has erroneously assigned this history to the very day after the healing recorded in vers. 1–10. In this he was influenced by the reading *ἐν τῇ ἑξῆς*, without paying any attention to the important variation *τῷ ἑξῆς* (see immediately again chap. viii. 1, *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς*, and over against this, chap. ix. 37, the next day *ἡμέρᾳ*), as we have already pointed out, p. 197. External authorities do not, indeed, decide (the Syr. ליומא is rather opposed to the Vulgate *deinceps*); still, there are other considerations in abundance. Even Schleiermacher, to whom, on this occasion, we may appeal as an impartial critic, characteristically decided that chap. vii. 10 is the conclusion of a connected "collection," and gave the preference in ver. 11 to the *τῷ* as being a *wider* mark of time. Bengel has decided in the same way; and for the same harmonistic reasons which we are constrained to own as important.* For, if the resurrection at Nain, which at all events is placed vers. 18, 19 in intimate connection with the message from John the Baptist, is to be understood as having happened on the very day after the event recorded at vers. 1–10, the narrative will contain many things irreconcilable and inconceivable. For instance, the young man at Nain must have been raised before Jairus' daughter. But, first, when we consider the answer of the Lord to John, "*the dead are raised*," we can hardly think that he would use this lofty language concerning one single event; it gives us the impression that such a thing must have happened at least more than once.† Secondly, the whole history of the daughter of Jairus; the fact that her father, after hearing that her death had actually taken place, does not venture to entertain any

* [None of the critical editions (Griesbach, Scholz, Knapp, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford), however, adopt the *τῷ*, nor is it read in the lately discovered *Codex Sinaiticus*.—Am. Ed.]

* It has been correctly observed that *ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός* is an acknowledgment of personal, special sinfulness, and not merely of that which is common to man: *ἄνθρωπος* would have been used to denote this.

† We cannot deal with the word so wantonly as Schleiermacher does, who supposes that the "Compiler" inserted the narrative here in order to do justice to (to find a suitable place for?) *νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται*.

further hope; with all the details of our Lord's conduct and words; lose their luminous simplicity of truth if we do not regard *that* as the first instance of a resurrection—that is, if any similar fact had already publicly taken place at Nain. We refer, therefore, to our exposition on that passage.* Luke, we infer, who has so many transpositions, hastens forward here to (vers. 11–35) the events of a later period, intending afterwards to bring up the parables, the storm, the Gadarenes, Jairus, etc. This is not applicable, however, as far as ver. 50, for the anointing (the incident of that passage) stands again *undefined* for the *general* καθεξῆς, "afterward," chap. viii. 1.

We have no wish to enter deeply into the harmony; but feel compelled at times, in vindication of important sayings, to point out the place which they really occupy. The two short sayings of the Lord which the history before us contains are so incomparably sublime in their simplicity, that we are almost afraid of injuring them by any added remark; yet the believing reader, coming to such wonderful words, feels the need of a suggestive hint. We see, in the first place, and very remarkably, the deep humility and absence of all ostentation with which *the Lord* (ver. 13), announcing his miraculous aid wrought by the power of God, clothes in the most general expression of human comfort, the consolatory address in which his purpose is announced; and then, in language as simple as words can make it, commands the dead man who was being carried to his grave to *rise*. Pitiable is the infatuation which dreams that men could have invented any thing like this if it had not really so happened. We feel as we read that the simplicity and humility of the Son of Man, who is always like himself, must turn to the exhibition of his majesty and glory. The coming up to the gate of the city, the seeing the great grief of the widow sympathized with by all the people, the allowing the grief to sink into his own heart, the comfort imparted, the aid granted—all together is quite natural to him, because he is directed at the moment by the Father. For certainly he did not on every occasion perform a similar miracle when he saw a funeral, or met one on the road; as assuredly people in affliction did not, on all occasions, venture to cry out to him (it was natural that they should not) to restore to them the dead. They scarcely at any time venture to expect from him *this*, the highest manifestation of his power—a manifestation which even at the very moment of the triumph over death fills our minds with *dread* (ver. 16), for we are poor slaves of death. Even the sisters of Lazarus had no thought of this. But this poor widow is counted worthy; the hour has come for the manifestation of the works of God; the Lord instantly knows and feels this, and rejoices in the opportunity of giving expression to his sympathy in word and in deed.

We do not read that he bade the procession halt. He has no desire by the exhibition of his might either to terrify or to dazzle the people; but he stoops down soothingly to the afflicted widow, whose heart-rending weeping he heard at once from the midst of the throng. It is not for the sake of bringing back the dead to a vain earthly life, but for the sake of comforting the living, that he works this miracle. The *words* here alone unfold the meaning of the great deed. The Lord does not begin by saying, "Stand up, thou dead man!" "Weep not" is the first word which he utters; *this is the only reason* why he works the miracle, its significance lies *here*. Immediately after the ἰδών, "saw," before the προσελθών, "came," follows (ver. 14), with soft approach, with tender salutation, and with strong promise, he meets the widow with one simple affecting word, "*Weep not!*" This time, he uses only the first half of that former expression of comfort, Luke viii. 52; for the second half, in its reference to the dead, would have been here in this public appearance too much. Could he have begun with more of lowly sublimity, of simple majesty, of tender power, more like one whose nature was at once *human* and *divine?* Assuredly, he does not blame or reprove the *weeping* of the deeply-afflicted woman, which the Father had appointed to her for her good: *this* weeping was quite different from the noisy weeping of Mark v. 39; and his address here has nothing of the tone of the rebuke which he uttered then. *His* word is very different from the miserable comfort of the men who say what he said to the afflicted, but can do nothing else. Weep *no more*, weep *no longer!* His design is to say this as a kind promise; undoubtedly he says it in such a way that the word carries with it its consolatory power, as the word that follows addressed to the dead carries with it its quickening power. *Weep not!* Gladly would he bring this to the whole human race in all its affliction and in all its sorrows of mortality: he is proclaiming this even now in the act of applying it to the widow; as a testimony of his boundless love and might to all mourners in fair *Nain*, which is still bringing out its dead, to all afflicted ones in Israel and on the earth. To how many since that day has the Spirit made it the source of consolation, and in doing so given them to taste beforehand the full import of that last great saying: *Weep not!* Rev. v. 3.

This one word is enough. Silently he approaches, silently he touches the bier, only beckoning to the men and making preparation for the great moment. There is a presentiment of what he intends to do; at least no one dares to offer any resistance to the extraordinary interruption; the bearers (advancing according to Jewish fashion with rapid steps) stand still; soon the whole multitude from Nain, and that which was accompanying him

* We would almost venture to suppose, though this is merely a matter of feeling, that Christ did not proceed to his *first* miracle of raising the dead unsolicited by man. That he could do even this, and that he should do it, was to him before this time a matter of trial; and this trial he was now about, for the first time, to make.

into Nain, stops in its progress. Not till all have stood still and are waiting, does he speak his second word. He utters it in a tone not louder than is necessary to enable all to hear; but loud enough for this, because the glory of the Father is now about to appear in the Son before these men. The three resurrection-words, which are recorded in the Gospels, are very similar. In the first the *damsel*, here the *young man*, finally Lazarus by name, in the presence of the great crowd, are addressed, that the dead may hear the voice of the Son of God who calls them as if they were living—then the "arise" for the two who are laid out, and at last the imperative "come forth," to him who had been laid in the grave. Whether the σοὶ λέγω, "I say unto thee," was added by Luke, as it is by Mark v. 41 (compare Luke viii. 54), we do not certainly know; the above analogy might lead us to suspect that it was. Assuredly its import, even though it had not been expressly uttered, is found in the single word קוּם, *arise!* There is no calling upon God, as in 1 Kings xvii. 21; but the most simple command in his own might. There is not even the touching, or taking hold of the dead by the hand (as in the case of the damsel); he touched only the bier. There is no "*Live again*," or "*Come back from the dead*," or any thing like this; no—only the simple "*Arise*," as if the young man were asleep.

And he gave him to his mother. Luke thus directs our attention to two Old Testament histories, 1 Kings xvii. 23; 2 Kings iv. 36; and perhaps also indicates that the Lord uttered a *third* most gracious word to the mother (which is omitted here as being addressed only to the *individual*), as in the ancient history: *Take away thy son.* This is more probable than the other, "Behold thy son liveth," which the Lord already appropriated, John iv. 50. He who does this shall assuredly restore also to all who are separated (whom the kingdom of the Father shall unite), those whom they have loved; that in the general restoration to life there may be also a restoration to personal recognition and special fellowship of love. As certainly as there will be a resurrection will there be a seeing again, and a having again: this also is promised and guaranteed in the three resurrections, typical as these are of the general resurrection.

THE WOMAN WHO WAS A SINNER, AND SIMON THE PHARISEE.

(Luke vii. 40–50.)

Luke, the experienced *physician* of souls and accomplished *painter* of sacred scenes, gives us here one of his most precious histories, the sweet kernel of which poor sinners never will be able to exhaust. The narrative, because of its very glory and importance, stands without any special chronological or topographical note; it is designed to bring generally before our very eyes the Lord in the wisdom of his love, as he receives sinners and puts Pharisees to shame. We must at the outset designate as a piece of very unhappy and shallow criticism, the view of Ebrard, viz., that Luke intended to represent this weak woman as a contrast to John the Baptist, who, though a mighty prophet, yet did not completely understand Christ. When will ye cease, beloved brethren, to cast reproach upon the greatest man born of women, who needed only to understand Isa. xl. and liii. to keep him right in regard to the "Lamb of God?" Assuredly the Baptist had had enough of such sinners before him, in the light of God's presence, to render it impossible that any one of them should surpass him in knowledge of the Saviour (and of his *salvation in the forgiveness of sins*, Luke i. 77). It is not as a contrast to the question of John, but as an example and as an illustration of ver. 34, in the answer of the Lord (compare also ver. 30), that Luke places this narrative where it is. No simple and intelligent reader of the Gospels can imagine that this anointing is identical with that of Mary, which took place at Bethany—an idea which the acute Schleiermacher undertook to defend. The reasons against this are so powerful that one is ashamed to mention the subject. Finally, this woman can by no means be Mary Magdalene; for in that case the same Evangelist would not mention her, immediately after (chap. viii. 2) without any intimation, and as a new person.

Jesus called sinners to him; and allowed himself to be called or invited even by Pharisees (chap. xi. 37, xiv. 1), even by enemies who lay in wait for him, or by cold-hearted inquisitive persons. That this Simon (not the leper who had been healed) had been laid under obligation by any act of kindness or miracle wrought in his behalf, there is nothing recorded to lead us to imagine. His behavior (vers. 44–46) is inconsistent with such a supposition; nor is it necessary to enable us to understand the parallel drawn between him and the woman. The sinner, however, may be called by us *the sinner*, without a name, that every soul who reads of her may think of himself as standing in her place. She *was* a sinner;* up to this time (in Pharisaic language) she had been so; and she was still a sinner before the eyes of the world, although before God the sanctifying change had already begun to take place, through repentance, forgiveness, and love in

* And not merely according to the false assumption of a later reporter of the narrative, as Schleiermacher conjectures!

return for forgiveness. Her great love, however, still remained humble, scarcely laying hold of consolation, in penitence. She had become in her own eyes a great sinner, and this is the real difference between her and the Pharisee: this was what brought her to Jesus. At all events she had sought and inquired after him, as Luke intimates in his ἐπιγνοῦσα, "when she knew;" it is his personal presence alone that is again desired, because (mediately or immediately) she had been awakened, converted, humbled, and certainly also comforted by his word. Had the Lord's invitation, Matt. xi. 28–30 (if Luke's narrative here is in chronological order) at a former period completely arrested her attention and drawn her to the Saviour? It may have been so; yet the καθεξῆς, "afterward," chap. viii. 1, does not determine any thing; and we are in general ignorance of the whole matter, as to what city it was,* etc. The Evangelist finely avoids saying that the sinner *came* to Jesus; this is self-understood under the pressure of her first love, seeking to be assured of the love of the Saviour, and in the deep contrition of the repentance which has already met with acceptance, while struggling to obtain a sense of it. In this marvellous intermediate and transition state of a soul turning to God, and under the influence of strong feeling, we *see* the woman, if either our own experience, or the experience of others, has given us eyes to see her. Repenting sinners have generally a twofold trial to undergo; the mockery of their former associates, and the proud contempt of the virtuous and pious—as we see in the analogous case of baptized Jews. The second of these trials is the more painful of the two; and in this latter test the deep earnestness of the woman is seen. She shuns not the Pharisee's house; she heeds not the eyes that will meet her there: for she knows well that where Jesus is present, no one will dare to thrust her out. She has brought a vessel with ointment; for the purpose of honoring the Lord with what, during her sinful life, she had misapplied to the purposes of vanity and shame.† Not only is this ointment a demonstration of her love and devotion; she intends that it should also be an acknowledgment of her return to God, and of her renunciation of her evil ways. In token of her deep sorrow, her hair, which but for this would have been well dressed, is dishevelled: all in simplicity, and from the depth of her heart. *She stands* behind at his feet—having pressed forward thus far with animation and eagerness—suddenly she is cast down, hesitates, and *weeps*—"not the lips now, but, what is far better, the eyes, give expression to that of which the heart is full."* This is all that she can do, all that she ventures to do, all that she says; but it is enough, and it leads on to every thing else. The tears which fall upon the feet of the Lord open to her the shortest road by which she can come nearer to her purpose. For she must dry his feet; and she takes her hair for this purpose, as slaves were wont to do when washing their master's feet. Now she has *touched* them, and this draws out her whole heart to *kiss* these feet. Soon would she have forgotten all about the ointment; but at length she brings it out, not venturing to approach his *head*.† And last of all, while she pours herself out in the tears of blessedness, which express her sense of the guilt of all her sin, at the very feet of the Saviour of sinners, she thinks of nothing, and of nobody around her, except only of *him*, who receives all in silence, without as yet arresting her by even a single glance. What more could she have? What comfort to her soul is this! Therefore the Lord does not suddenly cut short these happy moments.

A sight to give joy to the angels in heaven! But the Pharisee sees with other eyes, and has other thoughts within himself. He does not express with his lips the import of these thoughts: there is still something good in him. But his doubt whether this Jesus be what he professes, draws its inferences, and in doing so assumes premises that are altogether false. The position is not *in the present case* a false one, that a prophet ought at once to know all men who come near him, and to understand every thing that happens to him. For although Elisha, for example (2 Kings iv. 27), might make the confession, "The Lord has concealed the matter from me, has not revealed it to me," the application of this to Jesus is a very different thing. Simon is quite correct in supposing that if Jesus be *such* a prophet as the people take him to be, and as he himself gives out that he is, something else might be expected from him.‡ But the bluntly assumed axiom of the Pharisee is fundamentally false (an axiom which, if true, must keep God and man eternally separated), "that a holy man can have no contact with sinners." Why then has the Saviour had so much intercourse with the Pharisees? It is also fundamentally false that this woman is "a sinner,"

* The article ἐν τῇ πόλει refers only to the preceding τὴν οἰκίαν: in the same city where was the house of this certain Pharisee, and, *therefore*, she was well known to him as a notorious character. Meyer, without any reason, supposes the city to have been Capernaum; Wieseler, Nain, etc.

† We do not, however, see why (according to Braune) the ointment should be the "wages of iniquity."

* P. D. Burk, in his excellent and suggestive treatise on this narrative; the over drawn character of many of its remarks we have no disposition to find fault with.

† Which idea pleases us better than the usual one, that she anointed the feet as a mark of her deep reverence. With this woman there is no such thing as ceremony; every thing comes naturally from her heart as the events emerge.

‡ It is not at all probable that Simon had previously believed in the prophetical character of Christ, and that he was now perplexed about him. This idea is quite inconsistent with his very uncourteous conduct from the commencement, as afterwards described.

and, on the other hand, that he who has invited Jesus to his house is no sinner! Finally, how cold and unfeeling is his language, when the word "touch" is all he has to say for the weeping, kissing, anointing of the woman; her *loving*, as the Lord afterwards rightly calls it.* O Simon, wert thou not a poor *sinner*, Jesus would not have come to thy table; had not this woman been a *penitent* sinner, she would not have sought him in thy house. Oh that thou knewest what a *Saviour* he is; how he knows thee and her—her repentance, thy pride! But all this Simon shall soon learn. The Lord suddenly arrests his attention, and gives him an opportunity of having something said to him by the "prophet." A very simple parable leads him—with lightning conviction, but with forbearing kindness—to the main point which his thoughts had left out of view. He must reply: he judges correctly; but he does not know that he has judged himself. Then comes the interpretation of the parable, opening his eyes, and setting him and the woman, in three clear contrasts, before the company at table, as before God. The parable certainly puts the Pharisee to open shame; yet the lesson of instruction turning back again to the parable in ver. 47 is expressed forbearingly and graciously; instead of *nothing*, a "*little*" is left to the Pharisee, while to the sinner her "*much forgiveness*" is indirectly expressed in her "*much love.*"

Verse 40. Even from the beginning the design of the Saviour in entering upon the conversation is not merely to bless the poor Pharisee with the knowledge of salvation in the forgiveness of sins, but to protect the woman from the censure which was about to break out against her. His first word closely borders upon the humble modesty of the guest, as if he intended to say—"May I, Simon my host, speak a word to thee?" But his holy dignity does not permit him to express himself literally in these terms; for he is. and in every company he must ever be, the Prophet who has something to *speak* to the world. and —more than a prophet—to speak it in his own name. In the first place. to *thee* (not as yet to the woman, she may go on quietly weeping, and kissing, and anointing!)—in reply to thy present thoughts, which I read in thy countenance; to thee, thou *Simon*, thou man, whom I know and address by name, knowing well what kind of man thou art generally and at this present moment. *I—to thee—something* to say; this arrests his attention, prepares, and impresses him: *What* thinkest thou I have to say to thee? Canst thou not observe what I *have* for thee?† The man thus impressed could not but yield assent to the *Master*, in a brief enforced expression, which shall prevent him from afterwards complaining of the severe lesson.

Verses 41—43. And what a lesson of the perfect Teacher, giving, without lengthened preaching and discourse, in most pointed, brief, impressive touches, all the instruction which the case required. In the form of a convivial parable, which a Rabbi invited to an entertainment was always at liberty to give without any breach of politeness, he represents the sins of men before God by a common popular figure, that of a debt to be paid. "*Two debtors*"—this is the first expression: that is, thou and this woman; that is, the man who despises his fellow-sinner, and that fellow-sinner himself. Thou sayest in thy heart, "*She is a sinner*:" I have to say to thee, "Ye are *both* sinners before God," in this respect essentially alike; ye are both insolvent; and bankruptcy is the same, whether of much or little. But, although in the deepest sense of the truth every one without distinction is guilty of much in the presence of the Supreme Judge, and yet the proud man and the hypocrite even more guilty than other sinners, still the Lord, in the exercise of tender forbearance, condescends, at the beginning, to the Pharisee's way of viewing the subject; which, when looked at externally, and at first sight, has in it apparent truth. Conceiving thyself in company with this woman *in the presence of God* (a great step this from one's own thoughts about himself), art thou not conscious that thou art not perfectly holy; knowest thou not *some* sins, however little they may be, which the grace of God has *forgiven* thee? Then you are alike, with every admitted difference. He *forgave* them both (ἐχαρίσατο, comp. Col. ii. 13)—this is the great point, the whole process between God and man; in which every pair of individuals stand by each other's side on a footing of equality. Oh with what kindness does he anticipate and allure the Pharisee, whose sin is already really forgiven, according to 2 Cor. v. 19! And what *consolation* does he provide for the listening woman! *Say* (an εἰπέ for his εἰπέ); I will not merely teach thee, thine own knowledge shall decide the simple case: Which now will *love* him more? That is, which will be *bound to do so*, by the new obligation arising from the remission of the debt? which will be so *disposed* and *able* from natural gratitude, and so really *love* him more? finally (and this is the last point), which will be *allowed* to love him more?* Will not the creditor receive the larger gratitude from the man to whom he has remitted the larger sum? This would have been amply enough if Simon had had open ears—"the *touching* of this woman is an expression of her most sincere gratitude; it is her much *love* for the forgiveness of her many sins: and should it be repelled by God, or the prophet of his

* Alford says finely: "Touching—this is all that the Pharisee fixes on: his offence is merely technical and ceremonial."

† This, rightly applied as coming from the mouth of the Lord, would, at the present day, be a powerful text, and enough for any man: *I—to thee—something—to say! Shall I say it? Or canst thou not, wilt thou not, say it to thyself?*

* Bolten reads here with strange absurdity: Which would be most full of adulation?

grace?" Simon perhaps observed something, but certainly nothing clearly; otherwise he would have been silent from shame, or would have said, "Master, thou art in the right, I have been wanting." On the other hand he replies promptly, with stately confidence, as if this parable had nothing to do with him, "I judge" (ὑπολαμβάνω, compare Acts ii. 15) —it appears to me that the case is very simple and the affair very natural; the more of forgiveness there is, so much the more is there of love and gratitude.* Upon this the Lord speaks kindly, "Thou hast now judged correctly, more correctly than before; but even now, alas! more correctly than thou yet knowest; thou hast judged thyself, for thou art the man with the *little* sin and *little* love."

Verses 44–46. If it had not been necessary, the Lord would certainly not have proceeded fully to expose and put to shame the Pharisee. But nothing else will suffice: and Simon probably did not lay even this to heart. He now *turned to the woman*, although speaking to Simon; he casts a look of benediction upon the penitent and loving woman, still without speaking a word, in order that she might slowly arrive at the full enjoyment of his grace. Now he praises and brings into notice the despised creature in the house which only her regard for Jesus made her dare to enter. *Seest* thou this woman? now with right eyes, as heretofore with false? Look upon her; thou hast, properly speaking, not seen her yet —look upon her in the light of the parable, and of thine own correct reply: see, she is truly no longer a great sinner, but one who loveth much; *i. e.*, a great saint, in contrast with thee, in thy coldness and pride. The sight of a penitent sinner should bring the proud saint to confession. Whether the Saviour had become aquainted with the life and character of the woman on a former occasion, or whether he now saw all in the Spirit, we know not certainly, there is at least no reason for assuming this on every such occasion as this. In the present instance, it appears that he drew the inference from the great love of the woman, in the same way in which he directed Simon to draw it. "I came *into thy house!*" Possessing, as he did, the dignity of the Son of God, he reckons this favor done to his host as a favor from God, for which he ought to have manifested more gratitude, for which he should have bestowed a little more honor upon his holy guest. But what a poor counterpart does his conduct in this respect form to the expressions of love which had been witnessed on the part of the woman! Three contrasts in succession show this in the clearest light of truth. "Thou hast not remembered even that most common time-honored usage of hospitality, the washing of the feet of the man who hath travelled to thy house* (an act of hospitality shown by Laban even to the servants of Abraham); this woman hath performed this duty for me with her *tears*, her tears of penitence, the noblest of all kinds of water—a duty which thou neglectedst, and for her performance of which thou shouldst have given her thanks. Thou hast cautiously abstained from giving me a *kiss*,† that the world might not regard thee as too intimate a friend, or as a disciple; but this woman from the beginning‡ till now hath *not ceased* to kiss my feet." The very obtrusiveness of love is praised, not blamed. "Some one has sarcastically said—If my servant were to come and fall upon my neck and say, Oh, how I have loved thee, Master! I should teach him a very different lesson. He thus threw mockery upon the love of man to God, and even upon God himself, who has commanded such love from man. But praised be God, who condescends to our lowliness from infinite majesty" (Burk). The Lord Jesus receives the expressions of love and honor with equa. dignity and humility: he would have suffered himself to be kissed even by the false Simon, as he does not withdraw his feet from the tears of a woman who was a sinner. He is so humble in his majesty, and so majestic in his humility, that—shall we say like a *child*, or like a *sovereign*—he complains before a whole company of men, who were watching his words, that certain marks of respect had been

* Others (whom Braune follows) understand a wavering, not fully outspoken reply: I consider—*i. e.*, probably, yes, it might be so. But ὑπολαμβάνειν (like διαλαμβάνειν), *to assume, to hold*, never denotes uncertainty, but rather, and more frequently, a fixed, firmly held judgment. Thus Acts ii. 15, it is "As ye decide," or answer (vers. 12, 13); as ye explain the appearance.

* This is so very striking that many have endeavored, very erroneously, to read the words as a question: Hast thou not given me water? hast thou not given me a (ceremonial) kiss? Others suppose that the custom could not have been a general, constant one, as Simon would scarcely have intended to be absolutely uncourteous. But, on the other hand, it is manifest that it is only the most common respect and not any thing special for his own person that the Lord desired.

† Although we do not read of it any where except in the case of Judas, it is improbable that *no one* (as Bengel supposes) had ever given Jesus the customary "kiss of reverence, of greeting, and of farewell," according to the classification of Rabbinical writers at a later period. The Lord on this occasion graciously invites men to do this; gives it to be understood that he expected it. The kiss of Judas was only in accordance with the general custom of the disciples. The Lord does not keep himself aloof from such expressions of affection, or from such salutations on the part of any. He does not even say to the hypocritical Pharisee, "Thou hast no right to this."

‡ The reading εἰσῆλθεν is to be preferred to εἰσῆλθον. Still even this is not to be taken literally; it merely means, "from the beginning." *She came hither*—this was not to be forgotten in her praise. Further we cannot altogether conclude, with Alford, from the ἀφ' ἧς εἰσῆλθον, that the woman had entered along with Jesus, accompanying him and under his protection; for, ver. 37, ἐπιγνοῦσα ὅτι ἀνάκειται points this way only by a forced construction.

culpably withheld from him: and every one must be made to feel that he does this not for his own sake, but for the sake of men. He is not afraid to speak of these things explicitly and strongly, when the conduct of the woman furnishes him with the points of contrast: her tears remind him of the omission of the washing of his feet; her kisses of the kiss withheld; finally, her ointment very naturally of the oil with which the host ought to have honored the head of his guest. But this Simon probably meant no more in his invitation than to gratify his curiosity in regard to this alleged prophet, to examine him closely with a view of ascertaining whether he were really a prophet: it can scarcely be supposed (for of this the history gives no hint) that he intended to make a suitable acknowledgment for some favor received. He keeps himself, however, very discreetly on his guard; not only avoiding every extravagance of feeling (for there is nothing in his heart to flow over), but carrying his reserve rather too far. A striking picture of these cold, stiff "worshippers of God"—who gave at the most a half reverence* to their Creator and good Father, or even it may be the "Redeemer"—he supports Jesus before the world, and yet will not underlie the suspicion of any particular love for him. This the Lord Jesus lays open to him: for in his mind to love or to hate *himself* was to love or to hate *the Father*. The design of the Lord is not to recommend such people to show at least a little more dissimulation; in this respect he has been frequently misunderstood. He takes the man as he is inside and out; and rather turns his censure of him into comparative praise, that he had acted so as to show himself to be what he really was. It was obvious that the Lord might have censured him in more severe terms, and might have put him to yet deeper shame: let it be observed, in particular, that not one word is said of the sin of harsh judgment against the woman. He confines himself as tenderly as possible to the manifest relation between the two sinners, the one of whom is inclined unrighteously to condemn the great love of the other.

Verse 47. This word is to be understood only in strict connection with the *parable*, the application of which it now conclusively introduces. It is neither more nor less than a convincing inference from the great love of the woman, as seen before their eyes, to the already past forgiveness of her many sins—an inference quite legitimate according to the foregoing premises. "Her sins, which are *many* (the five hundred pence), are *forgiven her;* so that thou mayest no longer reproach her with them, or desire that I should not permit myself to be touched by her as a wicked sinner. *Whence* do we know this, good Simon? Canst thou not know it as well as I, without any such special knowledge of the heart as belongs to a prophet? Thou hast already conceded to me the main point; and, as *thou seest*, she loveth much." Let us be on our guard, however, against the Popish perversion of the way of salvation, which has laid eager hold of this saying; let us take care not to approach that perversion by any strange exposition of "reception love," or something of this kind, to be pre-supposed in faith, in order to the forgiveness of sins. Here, alas! many students of Scripture have gone astray. Neander speaks strangely of the faith of the woman being sound because it proceeded from love, which is a perversion of language; he speaks also of a concealed fire of love present in her heart, even in her state of depravity, and only choked and depressed by the power of her sin. Olshausen had led the way with the strange exegesis of a receptive activity of mind, an analogous fountain of receptive love in the root of the innermost life, in order to her being able to believe in forgiveness: to this, however, the πολύ, "much," does not very well correspond. According to Lange, the Lord was pleased to call *the ardent desire* of the woman *love*, by means of which the forgiveness had been imparted; in this way, moreover, satisfying the Pharisee's sense of right (by a kind of *meritum congrui et condigni?*). Steinmeyer preaches in the same way about a love of ardent desire, longing for forgiveness, as having been present in this special case; and to this he would limit the application of the saying.* We must express our astonishment that such men could be so far prejudiced as to entertain such varied interpretations of a text which is in itself an exceedingly clear one. For, nothing is more certain, according to the whole connection as it lies before us, than the inferential force of the ὅτι, "for," in the passage;† nothing is more simple than the "*argumentum non a causa sed ab effectu*," which the Lord here makes use of, as when one says (to speak with Braune), "the sun is risen (it must have risen), *for* it is broad day." How can the aorist ἠγάπησε, "loved," occasion any difficulty? It merely sums up into one the particulars which had been described (vers. 44–46) in pure preterites. "Her much love and thy coldness and heartlessness have both a good reason." The expositor who would place the love before the forgiveness contradicts the parable (in which ἀγαπήσει is the *consequence*); and moreover destroys the contrast, which in this case would run, But who loves little shall be forgiven lit

* I once saw, in an advertisement of a watering-place, that a church for the worship of God was to be found in its neighborhood "for those who should feel any necessity to show their reverence to the Creator."

* See in opposition to this an admirable review in Tholuck's *Litt. Anzeiger*, 1848, p. 196.

† Glassius, *Phil. Sacra*, ed. Dathe, p. 535, does not introduce this passage for כִּי, γάρ or ὅτι, but among others, John viii. 44, x. 26; 1 Cor. x. 5; 1 John iii. 14. At least the last is a most perfect parallel to the passage before us. Lücke's remark on it is: Brotherly love is a *sign*, a *proof*, of living faith.

tle. Von Gerlaeh's language, speaking of this perverted exposition, is not less true than strong: "An unworthy disfiguring of the beautiful story, in the very spirit of Simon." What in our case, who have nothing to pay, may precede forgiveness, cannot at the most be more than an understanding and a receiving of the love of God, on the part of a heart susceptible thereof; but this is by no means the full meaning of the word ἀγαπᾶν, *love*. The Lord says —what we have before our eyes in 1 Tim. i. 13–15—The more sin in past time, the more rich is the grace in forgiveness, with faith and love. The mockery of the world runs, Young strumpets, old beadwomen; but the truth of God is, Great sinners, great saints. "This," as Roos says, "is the great paradox, the wonderful secret of the abounding riches of grace, which out of the greatest guilt can prepare for itself the greatest glory." The *major* for the Lord's syllogism had been already granted in the parable by Simon—The more forgiveness, the more love. The Lord has given an ocular demonstration of the *minor* with his question, "Seest thou what this woman hath done? Is there not there a πολὺ ἠγάπησε (she loved much)? Canst thou not see it as I show it to thee?" The *conclusion* is expressed: "οὗ χάριν λέγω σοι, *wherefore I say unto thee*, from this I conclude that her hitherto many sins have been forgiven—and this was what I had specially to say to thee (ver. 40)."* We may still further observe how the Lord now half revokes and corrects the συγκατάβασις or condescension of the kindly begun parable, as if Simon had *sinned* only a little. He does not say, "But to whom *the* little, *his own* little, αἱ ὀλίγαι αὐτοῦ, have been forgiven," but merely, "to whom ὀλίγον ἀφίεται, little has been *forgiven*;" *i. e.*, the man who has received little forgiveness of *the many* sins (which he as well as the other, like every man, has), has merely derived loss from this imaginary advantage; he remains, alas! a man with little gratitude, and with little love, in contrast to those great saints who were once great sinners. Still, however, even this word is characterized by great forbearance and patience, for Simon's conscience might have answered: O Lord, thou sayest not enough, nothing has been forgiven to me, therefore I love thee not at all.† Still the Lord does not go so far as this; he supposes the poor man to have received an ὀλίγον or *little* of forgiveness, and therefore of love springing from it; and his design is by this word kindly to allure and touch such souls even while rebuking them. And he designs us to understand that there is a measure of truth in this supposition. Whoever *imagines* that he has been guilty of *little* sin, and cannot from deficiency in self-knowledge place himself on a level with vile *sinners*, yet may, through that rich grace which takes hold of souls at every point of access, receive the *forgiveness* even of this little; and thus there will come a *little* love into his proud heart. Blessed will he be if he then take a close survey of the much love of others, and be thereby induced with deep shame to sink deeper into self, and receive for himself also forgiveness of many sins. The remark of the *Berlenburg Bible* is well meant: "Even he who needs little forgiveness, should on that account love the more, out of gratitude to God for having hindered and protected him from sinning, just as a man does a greater act of kindness who keeps another free from hurt, than one who heals the wounds which he has received." But this is not to the point; for Jesus is not speaking of what ought to be, but what is: further, God does not reckon the little or the much of sin according to outward conduct; and whoever thanks God for preservation must at the same time acknowledge that all the many sins which have not been committed in overt act were really in him. We have to notice finally two important points. The one relates to the person of the Lord Jesus: mark how, in the case before us, he takes, with majestic simplicity, and as if it were self-understood, the place of God forgiving sins and receiving love in return; making the manifestations of love to his own person the measure of men's spiritual posture before God. The other relates to great sinners; who, after their conversion, feel inclined to do penance, and make confession, before the whole world, and glory in the compassion which they have experienced. To them it is here said, Only love much, this is the best confession and penance which you can offer. Only anoint the Saviour's feet in those of his brethren, that thus all who understand the matter may observe how much has been forgiven you. But as to others who do not understand it, and who would turn like swine upon you and rend you, spare them the special catalogue of your sins: auricular confession is due exclusively to the one High Priest.

Verses 48–50. Now *finally*, after the poor host had received the full honor (to him specially necessary) of the conversation held with himself, we have the long reserved word for the woman who was a sinner, who had already overheard much of a consolatory and commendatory character. Jesus had in the presence of all her despisers extolled and boasted of the great love of this deeply contrite woman, because she was able to bear this without injury; but he now goes, in his words to her-

*Λέγω σοι is hence by no means to be separated, like a parenthesis, from οὗ χάριν, and the latter phrase to be connected with ἀφέωνται. Hofmann has briefly protested against this view; and we rejoice to find him holding fast the only correct interpretation. Quite as false is the subtile expedient on which Grotius prides himself so much, which connects the οὗ χάριν with ὅτι as its αἰτιολογικόν, and brings out this sense: Therefore, for this end, that she might thus love, has she been pardoned by God; shall I then reject this love?

† For we are not to suppose of this altogether heartless man, as Von Gerlach does, that an inward sense of guilt, and an impression of the wisdom of "the prophet," brought him, even for a little, near Jesus.

self, into the very foundation of the matter, and that too, with equal publicity, in the presence of the whole party. He *assures* her formally and solemnly of her *forgiveness*;* and adds in conclusion a decisive statement in regard to its *foundation* and *consequence*. It is no longer "thy many sins," but σοῦ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, *thy sins* (the αἱ reduces at the last both to a complete level; and the emphatically preceding σοῦ excludes by a gentle contrast Simon, but at the same time allures him with the promise, "*I have* the same full comfort of forgiveness for all thy sins to address also to thee"). Thus again he speaks boldly, more so than a prophet, as he does at Matt. ix. 2, to the man sick of the palsy; and is not afraid of the objection of ver. 49. (That, however, on this occasion does not assume such a severe form as it did then, viz., of a charge of blasphemy against God.) In order, however, that all who hear the word may know the right road and the right end, he gives, in conclusion, the usual, simple, blessing upon *faith* unto *peace*. This concluding word here receives an expreseive, all-embracing significance. In the first place, *faith*, the intermediate idea between forgiveness and love, has not yet been introduced; and by it, therefore, an answer is given to the question, "How is it that the one has been *forgiven*, and the other has not?" At the same time the misconception is removed, that love could be the prevenient reason for which forgiveness is received.† *Faith* in this case is pointed out as the internal principle on account of which God justifies, as the Lord here does this woman; *love*, on the other hand, as the outward expression and proof to others of the grace that has been given, as the Lord has previously shown. Further, the Lord says, in the mildest condescension of the simple Giver: Thy hand has given it to thee, because it has received it from me. Still further, there lies here an allusion, which supplies the want of any previous notice on this subject, to the faith of the woman that was a sinner, before she saw Jesus and heard the word of comfort from his lips—the faith by which she heard his call from afar and thus came seeking him. She had already found favor with God in her repentance; her sins had been forgiven, and therefore she loved much. And we here learn that the sealing *assurance* of forgiveness is a different thing from the first forgiveness which had been enjoyed in penitent faith; although, again, every penitent wishes and seeks a special absolution, and shall assuredly receive it in the word, as this woman received it directly from the lips of Christ. Still more, by thus giving prominence to faith, the Saviour directs the comforted woman to the future of the new life: Go on believing, and thus as all thy past sin has been forgiven (the language hitherto used had referred exclusively to this), so all thine in-dwelling corruption shall be taken away. Thou art *delivered*, thou hast been *helped:* the Lord says this to her exactly as he had said it to the sick whom he healed, as, for example, chap. viii. 48. Thou art *healed;* and thou shalt be healed, if thou continuest and makest progress in faith. In the eye of *justice*, the sinner was at first a debtor; now, before full grace, she is merely an invalid. Therefore *go* in the use of thy new health and strength; *continue not, in the enjoyment of sweet consolation*, thus remaining in *my* presence, and hanging upon me. And this was needful, "for she would have forgotten to go home." Therefore, by this plain word, she who had just been comforted is directed to leave that presence which she had felt to be so pleasant, and to betake herself to her ordinary life, that she might by a new walk from henceforth continue to confess and to love him. Thus she departs not only in peace, but truly εἰς εἰρήνην, *to peace*, as to the happy termination of the way, the beginning of which is peace—a termination, always near, yet for the first time fully reached only at the end. Finally, the Lord here attracts Simon and all who were present (in opposition to doubting questions and angry feelings, vers. 49 and 13), to believe in himself, in order to their peace. But he approached the believing sinner, and gave himself to her in these four symbolical stages: he first silently received her approach; then he turned upon her the light of his countenance next he addressed specially to her the word of assurance; and last of all he sent her again into the world in the peace of faith

DISOWNING THE ZEAL OF ELIAS; OF WHAT SPIRIT YE SHOULD BE OF, CHILDREN.

(Luke ix. 55, 56.)

The Lord enters upon his last journey to Jerusalem, firmly resolved to meet the sufferings that await him there, through which he has to pass on his road to glory; and in the consciousness that the time is now very near

* We cannot understand (the "*many* sins" previously mentioned, in particular, render it impossible for us to do so) that this could have been said to Mary of Bethany, "in a reference entirely unknown to us," as Schleiermacher supposes.

† Compare Sander, *Das Pabstthum* (Elberf. 1845), p. 48, where, after affirming the correct view, in entire harmony with the interpretation given above, he quotes the words of Melancthon: "Christ interprets himself, when he adds, Thy faith hath saved thee."

when he must die at Jerusalem, and thus return unto the Father.* He takes the road through Samaria (chap. xvii. 11), a route generally avoided by travellers to the feasts; and in a spirit of kindness sends before him open-hearted messengers to bespeak for him a lodging, or to ask as a favor entertainment from some well-disposed people,† avoiding, as he was wont to do, places of public resort. But the Samaritans (mentioned here by Luke for the first time) are not on this occasion so well-disposed as the inhabitants of Sychar had been; they refuse to receive him. They feel agrieved that he should turn aside to them on his very journey to Jerusalem. It was natural that at the seasons of the feasts, and in connection with the journeys to the feasts, the rivalry between Jerusalem and Gerizim should assume its bitterest form. When James and John, who perhaps were the messengers themselves or formed part of their number, perceived or discovered the refusal of the hated and despised Samaritans to give a night's resting place to the Lord—whom they had so recently seen glorified before their eyes—they gave way to anger and zeal; their intentions were good, and their faith was strong, yet their conduct was in violation of love, and they were actuated by the returning, persistent pride, of the "We," which had recently been convicted in them, vers. 49, 50. They feel themselves insulted, with their Master; having come down from the Mount, they have Elias still in their mind, who punished, and that too in Samaria, the contempt shown to God in his person, by fire from heaven; they suppose that, as the disciples of Jesus, they are on a footing with Elias, that they may imitate him in the vigor of his zeal —a matter in which we are all most readily inclined to imitate the saints. All this is a very natural connection of thought. Further, inasmuch as they feel that it would not be seemly for them to say, "Call thou down fire from heaven," they do not know very well what to do, but imagine it would better become themselves to do it. Meanwhile they naturally ask first, Lord, wilt thou that we say so? Singular mixture of daring faith, which does not doubt that the event will happen at their bidding; of simple presumption, which scarcely doubts for one moment that he will say "Yes" to their question; of a certain loving zeal for his insulted person, which alone actuated them as they thought; and, with all, in the concealed ground of a self-deceiving heart, of an impure pride, in the subtle working of which it was in reality more their own rejection than the rejection of the Lord that affected them. "They will not receive thee—most strange impiety!" they might think that they meant; but their heart meant, "They have rejected *us:* shall we then not be angry, and punish them? may we not for once do more than thou hast commanded us?" (ver. 5). Thus they forgot entirely the meekness of their Master, and his love for the poor souls of erring men.

The faithful and wise Master has immediately at hand a reply and a lesson prepared in most striking words—a reply and a lesson available in all similar cases, and for the sake of which alone Luke has recorded the occurrence. It is inconceivable that even the first *word* of the reply should be a spurious addition. Many old *Codices*, however (and even the fathers), actually leave out every thing after καὶ εἶπεν, "and he said;" but it is hard to say for what reason, since some *reply* of Jesus must be conceived of at the time, and is necessary also in the Evangelical record of the occurrence. This mere brief abrupt ἐπετίμησεν, "rebuked" (he threatened them as he did the unclean spirit, ver. 42!), Luke could not possibly have written; although that word of itself says a great deal, and certainly contains this, that he was more angry at their unseasonable application of Scripture, covering much pride and selfishness, than he was at the poor Samaritans. It partakes, according to his kindly manner which considers every thing and pays regard to every thing, of the nature of a decided and zealous *rejection* of their offensive zeal: Far be it from me and from you to seek or to say any such thing! The *lesson* which must reply to this example, drawn in to justify them—*as Elias did*—must take a wider range. "Elias then, and ye now —what a difference! Do ye not yet understand this? What was quite right in him, is a sin in you. Do ye, as my disciples, still know so little? Do ye not know from my whole doctrine, actions, and life, that another spirit altogether than that which inflamed any Old Testament prophet is in me; and consequently of what kind of spirit (the disciples, children, possessors of what kind of spirit) ye *are*, as my servants and messengers, or ought to be?" That πνεῦμα, *spirit*, does not here signify a certain state of mind and feeling, thus and

* Although this journey is a protracted one (see Luke xiii. 22, 33, xvii. 11, xviii. 31, 35, xix. 11, 28), and the Evangelist interweaves much that does not belong to it—because, in a certain sense, the whole previous life of our Lord had been a journey to meet death—the above is the correct sense of chap. ix. 51; compare xiii. 33. The expression ἀνάλημψις (on which Wieseler in particular has expended much subtility) can, in New Testament usage (Mark xvi. 19; Acts i. 2, ii. 22; 1 Tim. iii. 6, etc.: it is used of Elias, 2 Kings ii. 10; 1 Macc. ii. 59, and the apocryphal ἀνάλημψις Μωσέως), only mean his *being taken up* from earth to the Father; but assuredly the passage through suffering is included (hence αἱ ἡμέραι), and the whole refers back to ver. 31. The remark of Von Gerlach is quite correct: "In this expression, death, resurrection, and ascension, are included, all in one." Christ goes forward to this ἔξοδος, not so much externally, by the shortest road, as internally, firmly resolved to meet it: πρόσωπον ἐστήριξε, not merely as in 2 Kings xii. 17; Jer. xxi. 10; Ezek. iv. 3, xxviii. 21, but in the sense of Isa. l. 6, 7.

† This is all that lies in the text. There is not the least occasion to connect with these messengers the sending out of the Seventy, as Neander does.

thus constituted, is certain, because the word no where properly means this. As little may we understand the expression to mean (indeed, the one sense flows out of the other): Ye do not know or reflect, ye are for the moment wholly unconscious, whether it be your own and an evil spirit, or the Holy Spirit, that impels you! For the φρόνημα or "mind" of the flesh never means in the New Testament "a spirit of one's own," though we now make use of this inexact expression.* The οἵου, "what," before πνεύματος, "spirit," refers manifestly to the "spirit of Elias," Luke i. 17, and expresses by one pregnant and instructive word the great difference between the Old and the New Testament economy, exactly in the sense of Rom. viii. 15. What Elias did was certainly not done in sinful wrath or in self-will; still with me there has come a new time, and with it a new spirit. The spirit of *servants* was then altogether the right one, and it justified a burning zeal for the glory of the mighty *Lord;* but the spirit of the children of God introduces in gentleness the love of the Father as it appeared in the humble, patient *Son of Man.* A certain theology cannot, and will not, apprehend this difference of the economies of God; but the difference is well-grounded, and rests truly on most real unity. For example, we are told by De Wette that "the Old Testament stands on low ground; it contains in it views, aims, and ideas, which in part do not reach forward to those of the New Testament, and in part run counter to them." He is unquestionably right in what he says about "not reaching forward." But to what he says of "running counter" we have to reply, it is either not the Old Covenant as such which contains within it such ideas (as, for example, self-righteousness and the righteousness of works, views which ought not really to be imputed to the law as their producing cause), or we make false points of opposition, where we have merely the unity of development by different steps. Finally, however, this patient government of the world exists only in the middle portion of this world's history; the same severity which was prefigured in the judgments poured out on Canaan, Sodom, and the world before the flood, must again be revealed at the end of time in an inconceivably more terrible form. The burning and punishing severity of God in the Old Testament is as really seated in his being as are the long-suffering and patience which first became conspicuous in Christ, and had never at any former period been unrevealed. All the temporal judgments of the first economy are types of the last and eternal judgment—to which the second economy points in language of more terrible import than had hitherto been used—and they are still continued even in their typical character; the vengeance, for example, inflicted upon the Canaanites is repeated in the history of nations till the end of time. Unless we expound the New Testament in an effeminate and one-sided manner, and unless we discard altogether the Apocalypse, the top-stone of both Testaments, in which, in a manner sufficiently striking, when it announces the wrath even of the Lamb, the Old Testament judgments in all their severity return (see, for example, chap. ii. 27; vi. 9 10; xi. 17, 18; xiv. 10; xvi. 5, 6; xviii. 6, 20: xix. 1–4)—we cannot fail to discern the unity that pervades the whole Scriptures. Exactly so is it with the *legal zeal* of the saints of God under the old covenant; then God demanded and practiced righteousness in the punishment and destruction of his enemies. Impurity might, indeed, mingle with it; as, in the present day, carnal effeminacy and idleness may be mixed up with Christian love and patience. But in itself it was right and holy, like the wrath and zeal of their God, who desired at that time to reveal these his essential attributes. When the spirit which they had, called upon them thus to act and judge, it would only be a misapprehension of this spirit to find in it any thing false or human. Therefore the Lord in the passage before us by no means blames the deed of Elias in blaming the intended deed of his disciples. His saying, asserting the difference as well as the unity, is, ye know not of *what spirit* ye now are. Diversified is the Spirit; yet it is the one spirit received from God. Wrath is as truly in God as love is; although in the grace of reconciliation, love prevails over wrath, and during the existing period of the Gospel stays its progress. The spirit of the fear of God is the very beginning of the spirit of adoption; the severe zeal of the law is, according to the relation of the man to God, and the stage of divine revelation, quite as pure and holy as is pitying and interceding love. Elias was on the Mount with Christ, and John the Baptist threatened men with unquenchable fire, before Christ brought down from heaven upon the sinful people instead of this fire the fire of the Holy Ghost.

The words following from ὁ γάρ, "for he," which are still more frequently wanting, might possibly be an explanatory gloss added to the "few yet very significant words" of the Saviour; but, if so, the gloss is assuredly one which flows very naturally from the Spirit of Christ, and is as perfectly in its place as if the Lord had really spoken it on this occasion. We cannot, therefore, decide quite as confidently as Olshausen does: "It is at all events a spurious addition;" for the addition, at all events very old (Clem. Alex. has it), sounds into our deepest soul like a word of the Lord, like an expression beautifully corresponding to the utterances which are recorded at John iii. 17, xii. 47. Even Schleiermacher would not agree with Griesbach in rejecting this gracious saying; and we venture to receive it as genuine. It corresponds entirely to the preceding clause, or rather it completely supplements it; it brings in what was really

* The idea is quite a wrong one, that our Lord directs attention away from the erroneously used *letter* of the Old Testament to its right *spirit.*

wanting, a decided allusion made for the first time to the person of the compassionate Son of Man, from whom goes forth the new spirit which does not act as Elias did; it gives the striking expression for the delivering, preserving, and redeeming *love* which was wanting to the disciples of the Lord in the present zeal of their faith. "Do ye not yet know for what *I have come?*" They had been driving too rapidly onward. Let fire fall from heaven and consume them! How opposite to this the tender compassion of the words which correspond to this, *The souls of men!* "Do ye not know what these words mean? What is each soul worth before God? Know ye that I am not Elias? I have come to *deliver, to preserve*, not to destroy, the souls of men." An old reading (the Vulgate also) gives merely ψυχάς, "lives." We prefer the full expression ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων, "men's lives;" it is the fit counterpart of υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; "Son of Man," and says more than either the mere ἀνθρώπους, "men," or the mere ψυχάς, "lives." It alludes to bodily life only in connection with the proper salvation of the soul: the Son of Man desires to let men live that he may give them *life*. Thus was Samaria spared for future salvation (of which the Lord gives here an indirect prophecy); and this same John must in due time pray down upon these Samaritans, in *apostolic* might, the gracious gift of the Holy Ghost.

A THIRD WORD TO A FOLLOWER; LOOKING BACK WHILE AT THE PLOUGH.

(LUKE IX. 62.)

We refer our readers to p. 138 for our views as to the relation of time between Matthew and Luke. Both Evangelists relate harmoniously the utterances addressed to the man who volunteered, and to the man who was called, to follow the Lord. Although the "And he said unto another" of ver. 59, in Luke, may be understood of the addition of a parallel saying brought from an earlier period, we cannot translate ver. 57 with Ebrard: And it happened among other things, *when, on one occasion, they were in the way.* This could be admitted only if ver. 52 and ver. 56 had not preceded; for though an Evangelist, especially Luke, may be supposed to collect and unite different narratives, still he *unites* truly into one whole for the reading Church, which, under the name of Theophilus, the guiding Spirit sets before his mind; and we cannot determine to draw a thick line between particular portions as if they were *disjointed* fragments. Hence, therefore, πορευομένων, "as they went," is truly connected with ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς ἑτέραν κώμην, "they went to another village," and the definite article ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, "in the way," denotes the way in which they then were; the Spirit of inspiration did not allow Luke to write what would not have been true. The καὶ προσελθών, "and—came," Matt. viii. 18, 19, is equally definite in the connection in which it there occurs (*this is not the case* again with the ἕτερος δὲ εἶπε of ver. 21); and there is no other way of explaining the facts except by assuming that according to the definite words of Matthew and Luke, the *first* of these examples really occurred a *second time.* Many suppose it suits better a later period; we dissent from this, as the outward poverty of the Son of Man needed to be pointed out rather at the beginning, and must have been well known at the end of his course. But, if the Lord in consequence of having received a repetition of such an offer (and it is probable such offers may have been repeated more than twice), found it necessary to repeat his former reply (and that he should do so is in perfect accordance with his practice, frequently occurring in the Gospels, of going back upon the past), the reply would in this case cease to be unsuitable for a later period. The second follower, and also the first, probably belong to this period. By this we mean not that they came forward in such close succession as they appear in the record (for the sacred writers are not so strictly exact in their histories as this), but that the events occurred generally, about the same time; for, the command to preach the Gospel appears to stand in connection with the mission of the Seventy, which took place immediately after.

Enough that Luke and also Matthew (who is still more complete), show us that the Searcher of hearts employed different methods, according to the different tempers of the individuals with whom he had to do. The first man desires to follow him, but there is something wanting at heart; he is therefore discouraged from his purpose. The second is called by him, and is ready, but in a critical moment he is irresolute; he is therefore drawn and urged onward. The third stands undecided, occupying a middle place between the two; he is neither discouraged nor held fast, but directed by a testing word to decide for himself: the Lord therefore addresses him not directly, but in a general statement. He requests, before following the Lord, that he may obtain permission ἀποτάξασθαι τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, *i. e.*, not "to bring into order *what* is in his house" (understanding the reference to be to things), or any thing like "to arrange certain relations, some private matters, and still to have the charge of the house which he was about to leave." For, in Luke, ἀποτάσσεσθαι signifies to *take leave*, or, what is con-

nected with it, to give the *last* commission; see Acts xviii. 18, 21, and Luke xiv. 13, in a figurative sense. There are thus *persons* in his house; not exactly a father to be buried, but living relatives, inmates of the family, friends, from whom he will not and cannot be separated without taking leave. We doubt whether the man "desired to give a festive entertainment to the inmates of his house on taking leave, and to act like those senseless people who would rejoice with the world before taking leave of it and becoming pious; or like the children of folly who must first indulge in excesses before they bend the knee to the cross and turn their thoughts to the passion of the Lord." We find nothing so bad in the ἀποτάξασθαι, which rather implies a firm determination to forsake all. Still, this leave-taking might easily give rise to a protracted stay at home, which might end in not taking leave at all. The Lord seriously warns him to consider this, neither forbidding him nor permitting him to do as he had desired. It has been said that the Lord makes use of this proverbial saying about the *plough*, because on the man's request there immediately occurred to his mind the similar request of Elisha, 1 Kings xix. 19, whom Elijah found and called when at the *plough*. It may be so; although the circumstances alluded to are the reverse of those in the present instance. Elisha was called away from the plough, this man was called to another plough. But though the Lord took occasion from this history to use this proverb, yet he must have had some reason to compare the call to the kingdom of God with the call to the plough: the figure must have a meaning and truth in itself. We certainly are not wrong if we view it generally in connection with laboring in the great *harvest* (chap. x. 2); and further suppose that the Lord here speaks of ploughmen instead of sowers (whose department certainly belongs to the great husbandry of God as well as that of the other), because he desires to direct attention to the earnestness and anxiety which should characterize the careful labor peculiar to the first period, when the foundations are to be laid. It is the intention of the Lord to say to this man: In the kingdom of God there is not mere pleasure and refreshment, not only easy and quiet work; but, above all things, and at every sowing time, a vigorous laboring at the plough—confessedly a work of the severest kind. There is labor within ourselves, labor on others; ever and anon the labor of repentance and self-denial, something new to plough, that there may be no sowing among thorns (Jer. iv. 3); it is ever necessary to break up the fallow ground of the world before we can plant any thing that is good. For this work, there is needed a strong arm and foot, and also, immediately and especially, undivided attention, and there must be no such thing as looking back; for whoever looks back from the plough will make no straight furrows.* The "*looking* back" here alluded to, is not altogether such a looking backwards as that of Lot's wife, who looked back in absolute unbelief; and still less is it the turning round and the *going* back of 2 Pet. ii. 22. Both of these, however, may, and must proceed from it, unless we cease from the habit of looking backwards, from that attachment to what is behind us which throws all our work into confusion, and arrests all our progress. Besides—and this is the *immediate* sense of these far-reaching words—whoever at the *beginning* puts forth his hand, yet does not bring the *fixed regard* to the plough which he has laid hold of (but looks round upon his village and his flock), is not fit for the work. Thus we have a repetition of the warning, given at a later period—Now in the middle of the great work, and after the full vigor of the first zeal is over, although thou withdraw not thy hand, yet if thou look back only sometimes, thou wilt soon make wretched, crooked work; thou wilt stand still altogether, yea, thou wilt stand at the plough as if thou wert working, while not working at all—not cutting into thine own heart, and therefore not into the heart of any other man. In the end it will come to this, that thou wilt throw away thy plough and return to thine own dear house, and sit down at thy former table. All this is not only designed for those special laborers in the harvest, whose office it is to make known the kingdom of God; the conclusion εὐθετὸς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, "fit for the kingdom of God," is intended generally to declare that with such looking back from the labor assigned to each, whatever that may be, no man can himself come into the kingdom of God, or remain therein.

THE MISSION OF THE SEVENTY.

(Luke x. 2–16.)

That the instructions given to the Seventy were probably the same as those which the Twelve received (at least in regard to their first journey), and were also conveyed in the same, or in similar words, is intimated by Luke himself, inasmuch as for this very purpose he brings into notice, on the former of these occasions, only such instructions as were common to it with the second (chap. ix. 2–5). If, how-

* Reference has been made to Hesiod, *Works*, ii. 60, where a similar expression is found: εὐθείην ἀῦλακ' ἐλαύνοι, μηκέτι παπταίνων μεθ' ὁμήλικας, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ ἔργῳ θυμὸν ἔχων. This is more to the point than the Pythagorean saying: εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἀπερχόμενος μὴ ἐπιστρέφου.

ever, we compare Luke x. with the far-stretching prophetic instructions given to the apostles in Matthew x., it becomes evident that the language used *there* refers to a permanent office for a future mission (the present being only a small typical one), yea, to a certain continuation of the office through successors for all time; but that here every thing is limited to the present temporary mission of these Seventy. Hence merely the first section of Matt. x. 1–15 is repeated, the exposition of which, as already given by us, we do not intend here to repeat. Still, a single observation may be made. Between the two missions which Luke has related in immediate succession, there lies probably a year, and that year the final one, in which the opposition was gathering strength. Consequently in these second instructions we find, very naturally for the immediate present, that our Lord has special regard to the *rejection* of his message. This is seen, at the beginning, in the resumption of the "lambs among the wolves," applicable also to the first journey (see at Matthew x. 16); next in the greater haste (see 4); in the stronger representations of the threatened judgments (vers. 11–15); and, finally (ver. 16 which again is parallel with the conclusion in Matthew x. 40–42), in the *contempt* spoken of at the close. That the prohibition "not to go" into the streets of the Gentiles, or the cities of the Samaritans, is now *wanting*, admits of easy explanation from the altered circumstances; we naturally look back upon chap. ix. 52, according to which the Lord himself wished to go among the Samaritans. Still further, it is obvious from chap. x. 1 that the Seventy were not to go to the heathen: as this mission was a preliminary, temporary one, there was no need for such an expressly given commandment. Compare what we have said on this subject in p. 169.

In other respects the progress and substance are very much the same as what we set forth in p. 168, as characterizing the first section expounded there. In the foreground we have, also on this occasion (ver. 2), the *necessity* which exists in the great harvest (as in Matt. ix. 37, 38) as the reason for this repeated mission (ver. 3)—a mission which, though it might be attended with equal danger, yet could not now be omitted; the "whence" and the "whither" of which are self-evident (Matt. vers. 5–8). Then the same negative *preparation* for the journey (ver. 4): they were to have no other protection against the danger to which, in the simplicity of their faith and fidelity they were to be exposed, than the taking nothing with them, and making urgent haste. The intimation as to how *they were to act* runs the same. At the *beginning*, when the determination of consequences is a matter with which they have nothing to do, general courtesy and kindness of manner, vers. 5, 6. In their *progress*, an unobtrusive discharge of duty (vers. 7–9), while they should receive the merited and promised hire without choice and change, and also without care. Finally, for the *termination* of their labors (on this occasion generally unfavorable) the same testimony of freedom from guilt and participtiion, after they should have fulfilled their duty (vers. 10, 11); with also (as at Matt. ver. 15) a glance at the judgment upon unbelief, repeated (vers. 12–15) in a stronger form from Matt. xi. 21–24. To this there is appended very suitably the general ratification of these and of all, even when they are despised, whom the Lord sends forth (ver. 16).

In ver. 1 the μετὰ ταῦτα, "after these things," (which according to Schleiermacher should only mean *besides*, *moreover*), points back to what immediately precedes, and the ἑτέρους, "other," only to the twelve, chap. ix. 1.* The mission of the Seventy falls quite suitably into a late period, viz., the one pointed out in chap. ix. 51 as that when he resolved to go up to Jerusalem for the last time; it is a gracious effort made for the last time in opposition to the hostility of his enemies; a most perfect prelude and preparation for the last journey of our Lord himself; a concluding testimony that the preaching of the approach of the kingdom of God was assuredly not a matter confined to a corner.† Even the expression ἀνέδειξε, "appointed," selected by Luke (compare Acts i. 24) points to this; for, with the idea of choice, it contains also that of a public manifestation, in the present instance before the whole world. The *number Seventy*, standing in connection with the number twelve (compare Exod. xv. 27), corresponds to the Seventy Elders (Exod. xxiv. 1, 4; Num. xi. 16), and indicates as it were from afar an anti-Sanhedrim of the new kingdom; in that case the round number 70 may stand for 72. The idea which has been frequently entertained that the *Seventy* refer to the seventy nations of the world (Gen. x.; Deut. xxxii. 8; Gen xlvi. 27), according to the Rabbinical reckoning, and the *Twelve* to the twelve tribes of the circumcision, is false,‡ for the apostles were rather destined for all nations, and the Seventy were not certainly sent to the Gentiles. Lange has recently affirmed, in favor of this idea, that Luke "lays these Seventy disciples for the nations in the scales over against the twelve apostles of Israel." We find, however, no trace in Scripture, or in history, of the

* Not, as Schleiermacher thought, to the "messengers" of ch. ix. 52; for the Sevent, were not sent merely to provide accommodation.

† So also it was to the Seventy themselves a preliminary exercise of their faith, and of the confession of it.

‡ Our recent expositors find it very hard to shake off this supposition. Richter's *Hausbibel* starts with it as an uncontested axiom; Antfeld announces it without scruple in his sermon; even Neander did not decide against it; Hilgenfeld in his *Clementines*, however, protests, to our surprise, against the "axiom of modern criticism, that the *Seventy* owed their origin to Paul's universalism, and that the number points to the number of the nations of the earth."

Seventy being intended for the Gentiles, and the Twelve for Israel; we cannot bring the former into accordance with Luke x. 1, nor the latter into accordance with Rev. xxi. 14,* and certainly not with Matt. xxviii. 19.

Verses 3, 4. We have already remarked that the dangers incident to the second period, accompanied also the first mission. The substitution of the ἄρνες, "lambs," for πρόβατα, "sheep" (compare Isa. lxv. 25, Sept.), appears not to have been accidental, inasmuch as this is the only passage of the whole New Testament in which the word occurs. It is intended to denote on this occasion the *simplicity* of the disciples along with their defencelessness (Matt. as *doves*), the simplicity of the *faith in the call* (*I, your shepherd, send you*), and the abiding *faithfulness* to the only work assigned to them, that, viz., of proclaiming and bringing peace. This proclamation of peace on the part of the messengers and children of God is something better than all human courtesy. On this occasion *the greeting in the streets* is prohibited on account of the great haste; for these proverbial expressions, comp. 2 Kings iv. 29. If, however, we ask here what is the spiritual meaning of these words in a wider application, the reply is, that *purse*, and *scrip*, and *shoes*, denote all unnecessary helps which disturb the simplicity of faith in the Sender; and that the greetings, on the other hand, and according to circumstances, denote all unnecessary explanations in word or deed, which prevent dispatch in the discharge of duty. It may further be supposed, that allusion is made to all false courting of the favor of men or spending of their strength in mere words; but this is not exclusively referred to. The expression κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν, whether we translate it "in the streets" or "in the way," forms in both references a contrast to the *houses* and the *hearts* (children of peace in the house), which the Gospel seeks. Every salutation other than the message of peace is an unnecessary impediment, foreign to the object of the commission of the messengers of peace, and interrupting their onward progress.

Verses 5—11. Every thing here is nearly, yet not altogether, the same at in Matthew's Gospel. It should be the duty of the Seventy to pay less attention to selection and inquiry, than the Twelve on a former occasion were instructed to do. Meeting a doubtful position with overflowing kindness, they pray for peace to every man—without inquiring, "Shall we find here the children of peace?" No doubt, this important difference was well grounded in the circumstances of the case. Further, in this instance they are expressly told merely to heal the sick; it is left to their own faith to determine whether they are to consider the demoniacs as comprehended among the sick. The peace of the kingdom of heaven they were not to proclaim in the streets, but preach it in the houses, and to the hearts of the people; and they should solemnly denounce judgments upon the city in which not one house shall receive them—For this purpose they *should come out*. (The second ἐφ' ὑμᾶς in ver. 11 is spurious.)

Verses 12—16. What the Lord had said on a former occasion (Matt. xi. 21–24), is here repeated at a very appropriate place: I say to you it will remain thus. The Lord remembers, very naturally, on many a later occasion, his own words, which he had uttered when his Spirit was specially moved; yea, they are not his own words (as he himself after the manner of men distinguishes), but the testimony of the Father, uttered by his lips, and therefore of sufficient importance to be recalled again and again. We may now look forward and observe how, after the *return* of the Seventy, he re-called the *consolation* from Matt. xi. 25–27. Thus two repetitions from the words spoken on the message of John, come together here at the close: first, the woe then denounced upon unbelief, and afterwards the joy at that time experienced over the faith of the children of Wisdom, then present. The concluding sentence, ver. 16, addressed to the Seventy, is designedly framed in the very same terms as that which had been addressed to the Twelve, Matt. x. 40; for it belongs to all to whom the Lord has in any way said, "I send you," in so far as this sending extends. And though they may be as weak as the Seventy are here, no man may *despise* their message; for the Lord who has sent them will let it be known that he judges the despisers of his servants.

* Even in Matt. xix. 28 it is manifest, as we there expounded, that it is only the people of God in general, as seen in the type of the twelve tribes, that is meant. Paul belongs to this number of twelve: the reasons for which we gave, though there with too little positiveness, in our *Reden der Apostel*, i. 18–20. According to Münter (*Sinnbilder der alten Christen*), there are at most only twelve apostles, inclusive of Paul; Matthias not being included as one. But if Paul belongs to the twelve, there is no opposition between the Twelve and the Seventy for the heathen.

RETURN OF THE SEVENTY; FALSE AND TRUE JOY OF THE DISCIPLES OF THE LORD.

LUKE x. 18–24.

In order to draw a contrast full of meaning, Luke, omitting the intervening narrative (compare chap. ix. 6–10), immediately anticipates the return of the messengers of the kingdom, who, though generally despised, are nevertheless full of joy. With what strict fidelity do the purely historical Gospel narratives every where reveal the weakness of all the companions of him who alone is mighty! the imperfection of the human nature, not yet sanctified by the Spirit, even of those believers whom he kindly acknowledges as his own and presents to all Israel as messengers representing himself! The *preaching* of the Seventy had certainly to a great extent been despised; whether or not they had ventured to shake off the dust of their feet as they had been commanded, they had been in cities in which they might have done this—in many a Chorazin and Bethsaida which must have reminded them of the terrible *woe* of the Lord. Still they returned with *joy;* but what was the source of their joy? It was not because people had every where listened with pleasure to their preaching; because they had found so many children of peace in the cities of Israel; because so many had repented and were rejoicing in the near approach of the kingdom: alas! this was not the report they gave to their Master! But—Even the devils are subject *to us* in thy name! We have been proved, we have shown our power, and have obtained honor! The Lord beholds the return of that indestructible *we* of his disciples which he had taken so much pains, alas! in vain, to subdue. The apostles, chap. ix 40, could not cast out one devil, although the Lord had given *them* power over all devils, chap. ix. 1; the Seventy, moreover, had expressly received power only over diseases, chap. x. 9. So much the greater is the almost childlike joy (Neander finds only "childishness" here) of these lesser men over the fact that they had succeeded even in casting out devils. Although this had happened only to some of them here and there, yet each one, as he makes his report, takes the credit to himself; and the proud expression runs, *The devils are subject;* while they almost forget and do not bring sufficiently forward the name of the Lord, placing it after their own *to us*. What a striking and faithful picture of a state of mind and feeling, alas! not rare even at the present day—of the *improper joy* of the servants at manifestations of power which have been effected through the name of the Lord, and which they have turned to their own glory.

The Lord, as was to be expected, directs to the true joy those who had returned to him with this false joy. The discourse given by Luke is strictly connected as far as the 24th verse; and the second part of it consists of instructive sayings looking back upon the past and repeated from what had been said on former occasions. In the first part, vers. 18–20 (to the middle of the verse), the Lord *discountenances* the false joy over the subjection of the spirits, the concluding sentences corresponding to the saying of the disciples. In the second, he *points out* the better, the only *sure* joy, the joy because of their own blessedness through and with Jesus their Master. In the first part, and before any thing else is said, the subjection of the devils is declared to be not to *them*, but to the name of the *Lord;* in order, by the voice of warning, to discountenance the false joy which would appropriate this to itself, and which might by stealthy pride again seize the power which had been only granted, and forfeit true blessedness. "It is because Satan has himself already fallen, and has met with a still deeper overthrow since my coming into the world, that he and all his host have obeyed my name in your lips. But it is from me that you have received power over him."

Verse 18. The words of the Lord are full of majesty, and at the same time full of condescension. They start from the expression, used by the disciples but not sufficiently emphasized by them, "through *thy* name" "Most assuredly for how were it possible otherwise; why do *you* see in this so much cause for amazement and rejoicing?" "The victory of good over evil was a certainty to Christ as it were by intuition"—is the remark of a well-meaning expositor; but this is only partially true, and weakens considerably the real force of the passage. Not the evil element (τὸ πονηρόν) is what the Lord here refers to; for, in the esoteric teaching which he gives his disciples, he again expressly mentions Satan as a *person*, working in the possessed and vanquished in them. And, moreover, not only "as it were by intuition" does he know that Satan is fallen and is falling; but his expression ἐθεώρουν—I *saw*—is to be taken in its full deep meaning. To interpret the words "fall from heaven" as designating Satan's coming down to earth in order to resist and to destroy—his augmenting and preparing his forces against the kingdom of God—is not only contrary to the whole biblical *usus loquendi*, but evidently incompatible with the context, according to which the only possible meaning is, It is natural and necessary, that he must fall before you and below you (πεσόντα occurring thus exactly as a parallel to ὑποτάσσεται). "*From heaven*" standing in the middle refers both to the lightning and the falling; but especially to the latter (as is evident from its being πεσόντα

and not πεσοῦσαν). The figure of lightning, used as it is in connection with ἐθεώρουν, "I saw," points to the sure certainty of the beholding (comp. Matt. xxiv. 27), and also to the quick decisive suddenness of what was beheld; but, inasmuch as it is immediately connected by ὡς, "as," with Σατᾶναν, "Satan," it contains at the same time a hidden reference to the bright character of an angel of light possessed by the fallen spirit when he was yet in heaven. And herein we find also the first answer to the question: *When* was it that the Lord saw Satan fall from heaven? Of course, then, first, when Satan first fell from heaven, before the creation of the earth and world; when the eternal Son in the bosom of the Father (as important, in this connection, observe ver. 22) was witness of this great and awful fall. The addition, From heaven *to earth* is purposely not made; for what we now call earth became what it is through this apostacy of Lucifer. *This* is the primary fundamental force of the expression ἐθεώρουν, "I saw;" as is evident from the simple wording of the whole sentence, which cannot be interpreted otherwise so as to retain its full literal truth; evident, moreover, from the unmistakable allusion to Isaiah xiv. 12 (where the king of Babylon is represented as a type of the original proud one who fell before him, compare ibid. 13–15, and Ezek. xxviii. 12–16, a still more distinct passage), forming in this connection a parallel to the words concerning the downfall of Capernaum, spoken before the sending of the disciples; evident, finally, from the warning, which is doubtless in the background: He fell by *pride*—be ye therefore humble.* They who think that the Lord is here speaking *merely* of a fall of Satan effected since the commencement of Christ's prophetic career, or of a new weakening and defeat of the enemy resulting from the mission of the Seventy—are greatly mistaken, and overlook altogether the decisive words ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, "from heaven."† We do not, however, limit the words of the Lord to the first beginning of the fall in the strict sense of the word; but pre-suppose that the Lord condenses into this great prophetic word, which looks both to the past and the future, the progression and consummation of this fall. For Satan's fall and loss of power is a process of long duration, passing through many gradations. His judgment recurs continually in an increasingly perfect demonstration, until the end comes; as is manifest from the remarkable passage, Rev. xii. 7–12 (which we cannot interpret here, but which in like manner speaks of what is still future by the type of what belongs to the past). That the old enemy suffered a new defeat by the few feeble exorcisms of the Seventy disciples, and that the Lord had beheld this victory, is the least important element, and scarcely referred to in the passage even implicitly. It is more suitable, not leaving these individual facts out of our consideration, to view the words in connection with the then near casting out of the Prince of the World by the death of Christ (John xii. 31)—this had already commenced even then, for the devils left those who were possessed through the power of his person and name. To sum up all: In this short comprehensive word the Son says—"The whole long course of the enemy's fall, from beginning to end, is before me as one downfall, decided and certain, even at this present moment."

Verse 19. The second thought follows very naturally. "And even as I am with clear and full consciousness the Lord and Conquerer of Satan; so likewise all who are mine have power over him, though this power proceeds altogether from me as my gift. I did not give you this power expressly when I gave you your commission; but, since your faith, which as such I do not despise, but on the contrary reward, has gained this additional strength, *behold I give it* now unto you, and in future to all who believe in my name." The Lord enlarges the narrow conception of only *one* kind of power, as exerted by the δαιμόνια,

* This thought so obviously suggests itself, that Erasmus unhesitatingly inserts it into his paraphrase: "Proposuit ipsis exemplum Luciferi, qui ob superbiam a tanta felicitate subito dejectum esset—insignis erat illius dignitas in cœlis, et tamen ob animi tumorem subito dejectus est a summis ad ima."

† It is altogether against the simple natural meaning of the words to refer them only to a "significant *vision*," in which "the *final* violent downfall of Satan was represented" (Von Gerlach). Even Neander, though he rejects and quite correctly, every kind of "beholding in the form of a vision" as applied to Christ, yet finds here only a beholding in the Spirit, a seeing by a glance which anticipates the development of the *future*; nor does he recognize that Satan appears here as one fallen long ago and therefore also judged. We rejoice to meet with the correct view in Hofmann's *Schriftbeweis*, i. 391, who adds an earnest protest against the supposed foreseeing of a future fall, urging emphatically the Imperfect used in the text (not ἐθεώρησα or θεωρῶ but ἐθεώρουν). [The tense employed should have been the Aorist ἐθεώρησα, had the one great act of apostacy been chiefly referred to; on the other hand, the Perfect τεθεώρηκα would have been more proper, had the reference been exclusively to the events just past.—Am. Ed.] Yes, the Lord speaks here as a "witness of what happened to Satan in the primal beginning"—speaks in the "recollection of a fact, of which he was witnesss, when he was God with God." *This* fall was an event of a moment, and different from the slowly progressing defeat of the power retained by Satan. Some see in our passage, by a mystical interpretation, the casting out of Satan, up to that time tolerated in heaven, but, since the coming of Christ in the flesh, cast out thence (as most recently Voss in his *Satanalogy*, *Lutherische Zeitsch.* 1851, which contains much that is deep mixed with what is fantastic). We make no remark upon this view; it may rest *per se* on a good foundation, but we do not see it in this word of Christ.

"devils," upon the possessed; he speaks of *all* the power (at the same time all power of the enemy's hosts, δύναμιν, חַיִל) of the enemy—a power which pervades, to a greater extent than the Seventy could or we can conceive, all nature and all creation upon earth, which is at present our habitation under heaven. The genus "*all the power*" is most significantly explained and exemplified by its two most striking species, *serpents* and *scorpions;* and this again is an allusion to Psalm xci. 13 (as is manifest from the expressions πατεῖν ἐπάνω), in which passage our commentary on the Psalms also points out the concealed reference to the powers of the kingdom of darkness. The passage in Deut. viii. 15 is likewise remarkable, in connection with which the Jews have a legend that all the creeping things of the wilderness had to lie under the feet of God's people that they might walk over them. Compare the promise given by the Lord, before his ascension, to all believers, Mark xvi. 18; where the serpents are mentioned first in the list of poisonous and hurtful elements. If we were at home in the Scriptures, reading them aright with understanding, and if we were at home in nature, reading it aright in the light of revelation, we should learn from Moses what is the significant nature of serpents, and whence their present characteristics originate. And not only they, but every thing which has affinity to them, and to that death which by sin entered the *world*—all the base vermin and creeping things of the insect world which were not originally created—belong to this category; hence the *scorpions* are significantly added. "It seems as if Christ classified all hurtful powers under the domain of Satan"—is Pfenninger's diffident remark on this passage; we do not hesitate to leave out the modest "it seems." Serpents and scorpions are the striking representatives of all that is θανάσιμον, *deadly*, in the animal world; parallel to the thorns and thistles of the cursed ground, in the vegetable world (comp. Ezek. ii. 6). Hence, the Lord refers concisely to all the hostile elements of nature, in which is the power of the enemy and the murderer. But this again, though the primary meaning is not excluded, is only an outward image of *all* evil power, specially spiritual, of all cunning, of all malicious, spiteful enmity: of all the perils which threaten us, though to a great extent we are in the midst of them without knowing it; and to which those who are not armed by Christ, fall victims, whereas they who are furnished out of his armory are *inviolable*, so long as they walk in faith.* But the most fatal violence or cunning is indeed that to which the Seventy were at this time exposed, in the midst of their joy of victory—the temptation of pride. Satan would willingly see his δαιμόνια driven out and ὄφεις trampled under foot, if he thereby could find an entrance, as in the case of Judas, into the heart of the deceived victors. For he *who, in heaven, was as lightning*, became darkness when he fell, and changed to a creeping, malicious, spiteful *serpent* (which still retains something of the rapid lightning, and deceptive outward splendor). In the first saying the Lord pointed out that pride of the formerly glorious angel through which he fell—in this he shows the wickedness of the enemy who, with cunning malice, is seeking to regain by stealthy deceit his former power.

Verse 20. "That this enemy must be obedient to *you* arises altogether and exclusively from the power of *my name;* for it must needs be, that you bruise all his serpents by the name of him who bruises the head of the old first serpent. But do not *rejoice* overmuch on account of this. Rather rejoice that your souls are rescued out of his power, and have obtained that salvation and heavenly blessedness which he forfeited for himself, and which he envies and hates in you. For it is *not* such a matter of course that *your names* should be accepted in heaven!" This, as was pointed out above, forms the transition to the second part, in which the order of ideas is the converse of that in the first. Our Lord begins by pointing out the only true object of great joy (the names in heaven, the persons of redeemed sinners written in the book of life); after this comes the encouraging *confirmation* of this salvation, exhorting to perseverance. This we heard in the thanksgiving to the *Father* for vouchsafing his revelation to babes, that is, to *humble* souls, as the contrast teaches us; in the testimony that this revelation is only through the *Son;* and in the pronouncing all *blessed*, who now hear and see aright the Son of Man—a benediction which implies that all are exhorted to continue to see, and hear, and learn aright.

Satan is cast out of heaven, he exercises now upon earth his pernicious power, destroying both body and soul; but they who by humble faith in him who has come to overcome Satan walk secure and unhurt, will be raised *to heaven* from earth's distress and struggles. The names of the apostates that depart from God are written in the earth, for the bottomless pit, Jer. xvii. 13; but the names of the redeemed are written in the book of life, which contains the names of the citizens of heaven. This expression, which occurs throughout the whole Old and New Testaments, indicates the divine foreseeing and merciful foreordaining of the inheritance of the saints and blessed believers, though not in the sense of an unchangeable predestination. In the very first instance in which the mention of a book written by God occurs, we read of a blotting out of this book, which is therefore viewed as a possibility: Exod. xxxii. 32, 33. Consult also Psa. lxix. 29, compared with Isa. iv. 3, and Dan. xii. 1; and, in the New Testament, the passages Phil. iv. 3; Rev. iii. 5, xiii. 8, xx. 12, and (quite in accordance with this saying of the Lord) Heb. xii. 23. Hence it is possible for the Christian

*"This is not so much a symbolical representation, as a concrete specimen of all that is hurtful" (Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, i. 392).

to know in faith, and to rejoice in knowing, that his name is written in heaven, even as it is possible to have the assurance of adoption and the inheritance promised. But we are at the same time to regard the fact itself as the chief, the most important thing; and to walk in humility, watching against Satan's wiles and malice, that our names may be found in heaven even unto the end—fearing lest we ourselves fall *from heaven*, in the same way in which Satan fell. We are to give always all the honor to the name of the Lord, but seek the honor of our own name only in heaven before him; not rejoicing complacently in any thing else. The Lord changes the expression of the disciples, "the devils are subject unto us," into "that *the spirits* are subject unto you." Certainly he does not intend to say the same thing, though using a different term; but instructively enlarges the meaning, as we see above in ver. 19. There he placed in the foreground the hurtful and antagonistic elements in outward nature; here he glances into the whole depth of the spiritual world, where the πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας, "spiritual [beings of] wickedness" (Eph. vi. 12) are subject to the believer, thus furnishing the most perfect exposition of his former meaning. No possession of spiritual gifts, to the ascendancy of which even the great and acute *spirits* of the world submit—no victories and triumphs over the strongest κοσμοκράτορες, or world-rulers, not even the fact that a Göthe or Hegel, with all his genius and the whole host who offer him their worship, cannot prevail against the Christian, but must in some cases admit his superiority in Christ—all this can confer no real blessedness upon the Christian. In order that his name be really and remain written in heaven, something more is necessary than that it have authority on earth, be mentioned in books, be recorded in every short compendium of Church history as the name of a man who did great things and made a great epoch. What is necessary, above all other things, is the humility and simple-mindedness of *babes;* the simplicity which, notwithstanding the performance of great things, remains little, and, undisturbed by earthly activities, constantly looks to heaven.

Verses 21, 22. Now, ask yourself whether these words do not stand here in a connection as deep and internal as that in which we found them to stand in Matt. xi. 25–27—in both instances with the equally distinct assurance that the Lord spoke them *at that time, in that very hour.* It is not other than a licentious liberty which pseudo-criticism takes when it expunges either of the two reports. It would, indeed, be incomprehensible, on the supposition of a real inspiration of the Evangelists, that the Spirit of the Lord should have permitted them to give duplicates of such sublime sayings, with formulas so distinct and deceptive. Here again we notice in diversity, unity. It is natural that *the rejoicing* of Jesus does not occur in the account of Matthew, where ἀποκριθείς, "answered," points out a different connection. In his account the words are mere words of *consolation;* words of submission to the decree of the Father; the comfort with which the Son soothes and calms his soul before the Father when the anger of judgment was kindled in him. But in Luke there is expressed in them, in recollection of the solemn moment when that great saying was first given to him, a real joy, increased by seeing that the little band of his disciples and messengers, whom he can endow with power against Satan, is increasing; and that thus the saying was ever fulfilling itself more abundantly.* The Lord himself rejoices over his babes, notwithstanding all their weakness, against which he has just furnished them with the proper remedy; thus showing them by his own example, *how* and on account of what they *ought to rejoice.* The connection between these two verses and the preceding section is indeed deep and internal. We are not to look on the conquered devil, of whose lamentable fall the Lord himself does not think triumphantly, nor on other spirits subject to us, with a joy, the character of which is doubtful and, strictly speaking, not without an impure element. But we are to look up to the eternal *Father*, before whom the wise and the prudent are confounded, with a joy which, forgetful of itself, loses itself in his praise: in vain triumphing there lurks the truly pernicious self-praise. But we cannot know and see the Father, except in the revelation of the Son; consequently, to see the Son with the open eyes of faith, is alone and must ever be the true cause and object of joy.

Verses 23, 24. The glory of the Lord remains hidden from the wise and prudent; for they have eyes and see not, because the god of this world has blinded their minds through proud unbelief, so that he cannot see the glory of the true God in the person of the only begotten of the Father (2 Cor. iv. 4). But blessed are they who have eyes to see. There is here an almost verbal repetition of what is found Matt. xiii. 16, 17, doubtless in its right place.† It contains here a new truth peculiarly appropriate for the seventy disciples—that he is able to say it to them, as he said it before to the twelve, this is the progress in the joy of the Lord. But his word of rejoicing is likewise, finally, an exhortation to the disciples. They are said to be blessed, not merely on account of seeing what is to be seen in him, but also because they should *listen* in future, and learn without wearying from the only Master what he reveals to us of the Father.

* It is a symptom of the healthy and well-ordered state of the soul of Christ, that on the same occasions he used the same words and had the same feelings in his soul. Inasmuch as with him nothing depended on high spirits and low spirits, but he always thought, spoke, and acted according to the truth.—Roos, *Die Lehre Jesu Christi* (new Edit.), p. 337.

† Here it says prophets and *kings*, in order to magnify the dignity of those, to whom the revelation of the Son in the flesh is vouchsafed.

Let us take this to our hearts; and with all Christ's babes, over whom he rejoices (is not this more than royal honor?), constantly and humbly look and listen to him the only Master. This is better and more blessed than to endeavor to penetrate like him into the depths of falling Satan, sooner or in any other way than he intends to reveal it to his babes.

WHAT SHALL I DO TO INHERIT ETERNAL LIFE? THE COMPASSIONATE SAMARITAN.

(Luke x. 26–37.)

How eagerly would the critics seize on this passage, and pronounce the question of a certain lawyer to be identical with the narrative contained in Matt. xix. 16, only differently reported—if Luke had not himself subsequently narrated that second incident (xviii. 18)! This once more shows us that many things could naturally, and would necessarily, occur more than once in the life of Jesus. It is clear, that by the expression *καὶ ἰδού*, "and behold," the Evangelist does not intend to introduce the *standing up* (that is, rising with the hostile intention of tempting, disguising pride under a semblance of humility), and the question of this *νομικός* or "lawyer" (comp. our remarks on Matt. xxii. 37) as succeeding immediately ver. 24.* Yet it is not without significance and truth, that the Gospel for the 13th Sunday after Trinity does not commence with the question of the lawyer, but includes the two preceding verses; thus pointing from the very outset to the grace which has appeared in Christ, which enables us to keep the law; and thereby leading us to the right understanding of the passage. This of itself refutes the strange paradox of Harms (*Past. Theol.* i. 69), which, though doubtless written with a good intention, is very incautious—that "it is difficult to find in the Gospel of the good Samaritan a *Christian* theme for a sermon!" Is it not possible for the Christian preacher to obviate the foolish misconception that the narrative refers only to the general philanthropy of moralists? Does not the very introduction, which precedes it, prescribe this to him, even though he should not add a deeper exposition himself? But the introduction is not necessary for this purpose. Our believing preachers are almost as one-sided as the mere moralist, when they rapidly pass by the merciful Samaritan, who, it is true, has often been brought forward; and dwell on the seeing eyes and hearing ears (vers. 23, 24). Dräseke is superior to both, and shows the union and connection of the two parts: "after the blessing is added the condition." It is legitimate to connect in preaching things thus placed side by side in Scripture, and to treat the real, dogmatic connection independently of the historical. And thus when preachers represent the lawyer as if he had heard the words of vers. 23, 24, and as thinking or saying, "Now, let us see and hear, what new and great things thou canst tell us about the way to life eternal! Mere hearing and seeing cannot make us *blessed*, we must surely also proceed to doing, as we learn from God's word"* —they pronounce correct pulpit thoughts, which possess inward truth so far as *typical* history is concerned, although not founded specially on that particular *history*.

The truth in this remark is this, that the lawyer who was tempting Christ (*ἐκπειράζων*) spoke in a half ironical manner, and wished in his unbelief to try the Lord, what new answer he would give to the grand fundamental and central question. It is incorrect to say, or at least very uncertain, that he refers immediately to the preceding saying of Christ; nor must we forget that, with all the irony, there is also an element of earnestness, though unconscious, in the question, which bears in this way some resemblance to that of chap. xviii. 18. Indeed, if these *νομικοί* or "lawyers" had not, over and above all their questions about doing and performing works, a question troubling them in their inmost heart, "What lack I yet?" then they would not have even taken the trouble of asking. It is this element of earnestness on which the Lord in his mercy seizes as a point of connection; he answers with earnestness the earnestness which, notwithstanding all other elements mixed up with it, approaches him with the great and important question. He tempts the tempter, but on his part it is out of fervent love; taking him at his own word, and leading him to give himself an answer, which surprises, and, at the same time, judges him. Compare, on the meaning of the question, which was probably common in the catechetical teaching of that time, and on the false interpretation of it, our remarks on Matt. xix. The Old Testament, consisting of the two grand divisions, law and promise

* According to Ebrard, the verses 21–24 conclude, in the general plan of the Gospel, "the section concerning the *disciples*;" but this does not accord well with chap. xi. 1, xii. 1–12, 22, xvi. 1, xvii. 1–22, etc.; and surely the Evangelist did not write in accordance with such artificial outlines, introducing such formulas as: At that hour—he turned!

* Thus Luther, in the *Hauspostille*: "Surely this Jesus cannot preach any thing better and higher, than what Moses taught. Hence, not only they are blessed, who see and hear thee, but also they who hear and keep the Law of Moses," etc.

answered the question to this effect: Thou oughtest to do according to the commandments, but as thou, sinful man, art not able to do this, therefore, beside and above the law, eternal life is promised thee as an *inheritance*. Though this was clearly revealed, yet the masters in Israel did not understand it; and this master here establishes by his ποιήσας, "*do*," the same false casual connection between doing and inheriting, which the other expresses more openly and fully by the word ἵνα, "that."

Now let us see how the true Master gives the true *answer* to the question; which, though starting with a misconception concerning the doing, points to the truth concerning the inheriting, viz., *What shall I do to inherit life?* In the first place, Christ refers (as in Matt. xix.) in general to the revealed *law;* since he also knows of no other "doing" but the fulfilling of this law; he puts the question in the most general way (ver. 26), and, after receiving a correct answer, confirms the sum of the law or the fundamental commandment of love to God, and to our neighbor (ver. 28). Upon this, when the lawyer, who is somewhat disappointed and struck in his conscience, begins to add sophistical questions limiting the commandment in order to escape the condemnation, which, he vaguely sees, is a consequence of not doing, of omission, Christ adds a special explanation of the commandment of love to our neighbor, by which our love to God is to be tested and to become manifest, but which fallen man can attain only by regenerating grace from on high, which begets in him new love to God. Christ gives this exposition in a *parable*, of convincing force, which strikes down every self-justification of the disputer, who has not experienced this love. The parable itself, to which is added a practical application, describes in a most graphic manner *active* love to our neighbor; in order to prove to the lawyer, how destitute he was of such love, and to show in the distant background the merciful love of God, which must *first help us.*

A man in distress requiring help, whoever and whatever he may be—two men devoid of love, although priests and Levites, such as were at that time—a man of active love, although a Samaritan! This paints distinctly enough the chief point, which is of central importance; and hence the application may follow immediately, exhorting to such love of our neighbor, a love general and free from all sophistical limitations, and showing the questioner the necessity of a regeneration of his heart and character. The simple concluding question (ver. 36) forces him to acknowledge the duty of universal love; whereas the powerful injunction added ver. 37, embracing both beginning and end of the plan of salvation, demands the fulfillment, which, however, is possible only through divine grace—attainable even by a Samaritan, though he be without dogmatics.

Verses 26—28. The law tells you what you ought to *do;* why then dost thou, a νομικός, a *lawyer*, who art well acquainted with it, ask me? What is *written?* it is open to all; *thou* readest it thyself, and *ex officio* readest it in the hearing of others. The remarkably simple τί, *what?* of the first question does not render it necessary to enumerate in the answer the 613 commandments, given to Israel by Moses; nor even "*the* commandments" of the Decalogue (as in Matt. xix.); but indicates and pre-supposes, *that* there is a sum of the law, a fundamental commandment, containing a short answer to the short question. Significant is the difference between this τί and the subsequent πῶς, *how?* which cannot be dismissed with a remark in the style of Rosenmüller's *Scholia:* "Graecis interrogantibus saepe pro τί" (often used in questions for τί)! What is *written* requires to be *read aright;* hence the question—*How* readest thou that which is written for the use of all? *How*—with regard to others, as it is your office and duty to be a teacher, searching the truth; how, moreover, for your own heart? This rabbinical formula of quoting a text, "How readest thou?" has a deep and searching meaning when used by Christ! It is because what is written is not read with simplicity and humble submission, that the law, which is a schoolmaster to grace, is misunderstood and abused. The lawyer read correctly in this instance, so far as the letter was concerned; but he was unwilling to accept simply, and without artificial limitations, what is meant by "with *all the heart*" and by "*my neighbor.*" He does not repeat merely the first sentence concerning the love of God, the well-known שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל, "Hear, O Israel!" as it is written on the phylacteries, and was read out in the synagogues morning and evening—but he adds also correctly the second chief commandment concerning love to our neighbor (which was *not* written on the phylacteries), and thus gives the same sum of the law, which the Lord himself has declared to be the substance of law; comp. Matt. xxii. 37–40 (and our interpretation of that passage). It is possible that he had learned this in the school of *Jesus;* perhaps he arrived at it along with others by his own meditations. However this may be, the Lord commends his reply and says, "Thou hast answered *right;* thou well *knowest*, as I see, the law." Then after this is added, "But thou pronouncest thine own condemnation; as alas! thou dost *not* know." The man asked about doing, and yet he knew very well about doing; hence, he deserved, in the first place, to receive back his own word as an answer to his question—"Thou knowest the τοῦτο, *this*, which corresponds to your first τί, *what;* then cease to ask the question, and begin the *doing!* Thus *thou shalt live*, even as Moses and the prophets say (comp. our remarks on Matt. xix. 17, and add the passage there quoted from the Pentateuch, Neh. ix. 29; Ezek. xx. 11). God first answers man according to the question he puts; thus *tempting* him to good by the law (Exod. xx. 20), that he may be prepared for the word of mercy by repentance. He who does not begin with

earnest and honest dealings with the law, never can or will understand and enjoy the Gospel. Is the physician to say to him, who imagines himself to be in health, Come, friend, let me heal thee? If he says to the lame man, Walk and run! he is not deceiving or blinding him, for his object and intention is to help him to health. *Do* this and *live*, are inseparably connected, it is true, and Moses is corroborated and ratified by Christ; the only question is *how* it is possible for us poor sinners to attain to that doing, which gives life and is life—whether by our own impotent endeavors, or by the Fulfiller who has come to us (Matt. v. 17, 18).

Does the lawyer feel it to be right that the truth of the assertion, easy enough to pronounce with the lips, "I love God with all my heart," should be tested by his love to his neighbor; and that he himself is far from truly loving every neighbor? He does not know it clearly, he does not feel it with submissive conviction; but he must have felt something of an accusation directed against him, because he endeavors to justify himself. Yes, he must have perceived *something* at least in the earnest and doubtful tone in which Christ surely spoke the words: "*Do* this—if thou art able! Thou hast not met thy obligation, *thou hast not done it!*" But according to human depravity he resists the confession of repentance, which begins to move in his heart, by the cunning of his lips and by the refractoriness of his reason; seeking excuses and evasions in order that he may remain a just man, by giving a different exposition of the commandments. The lie, which is brought forward as a cover and cloak, and which lies at the root of his question, is very well expressed by Meyer: "With regard to love to God—I, strict observer of the ceremonial law, am not defective; and with regard to love to my neighbor, neighbor means Jew or good friend—hence, as we interpret the law, have I not kept it? Or dost thou wish to give another, a new interpretation? Canst thou think of referring it to him who hates me, whom I admit I hate in return—or to any stranger, in whom I feel no interest?" Indeed, the lawyer must have had a presentiment of such an explanation of the command; else he would not have fortified and defended himself against it by the question, which has the appearance of a wish for further information, but in reality shows his wounded sensibility and desire to resist. Καὶ τίς, *ecquis vero*, and *indeed who then* is my neighbor? This is a new question; dost thou know any thing concerning this different from our teaching?

O how blind is the poor man, and how hidden from his eyes the true meaning of the great words, uttered by his own lips, ver. 27! How ignorant is he of the true "*love*, which begins with God, passes over to the neighbor, and ends in ourselves!" (Dräseke). God, as all-sufficient to himself, does not stand in need of thee; but as the all-loving, who loves all his creatures as himself, he gives thee fellow-men instead of himself, that thou mayest show to them thy love! To love God *entirely* is to love our neighbor; to love our neighbor *with the heart* is to love God. Such is the key which the introduction furnishes to the understanding of the subsequent parable; in which the Lord leads us into the heart of real life by a sketch which we cannot too carefully examine. Besides the chief object of his teaching, the very smallest feature and detail is executed in the most striking and suggestive manner. The parable goes into real life—it is not abstract moralizing, which leaves the heart cold; it is not premature teaching of dogmatics, which cannot open the eyes of the self-righteous blind. What Christ teaches in this manner is (to refute Harms again) as full of genuine *Christian* character as is his new commandment of love; it accords manifestly with his first and last sayings (Matt. v. 43–48, and xxv. 34–40). But the Christian Pharisee cannot see his own heart (or the face of his birth, James i. 23) even in this clear mirror. They prove their transcendently wilful blindness, when, joining the general, fashionable, lamentable misconception, they take the good Samaritan as the Shibboleth of their insipid hypocrisy-morality, of their "doing" in which there is neither doing nor life—and besides of their pseudo-toleration, which puts aside faith.

The whole Gospel lesson which contains this parable, may be thoroughly explained by the three questions occurring in it. The second of these questions, most characteristic of the narrative, *Who is my neighbor?* does not require an answer; for the word of the law, which speaks about the neighbor, contains the answer in the addition *as thyself;* according to Matt. vii. 12. As *no one* is to do any evil to me, so I am to do evil to none; as *every one* is to love me, so I ought to love every one. Consequently the question proceeds from an evil heart, which is not willing to know; and it is as foolish and perverse as it would be to ask, And what is meant by the word *love?* What is implied by the "*whole heart?*" What can be meant by the expression "*as* myself;" of course *not* as much as myself, but always *after* and subordinate to my dear self? The preceding counterquestion of the Lord, *What is written in the law?* is intended not merely to refer us to the law, as if the Gospel was not necessary, but to lead us to a knowledge of our sins by the law. *How readest thou* the law? As a special pleader, looking for evasions and backdoors; or as a faithful subject in sincerity before God? If the latter, thou wilt likewise hear the promise; thou wilt read as a beggar reads the letter, in which he is acquitted of his debt; as the appointed heir reads the will. Finally, the first question at the head of the whole, "What *shall I do*, to *inherit* eternal life?" contains the answer in the very expressions of the question—"Receive the inheritance offered, take hold of eternal life by faith in God's mercy; then shalt thou *live* and *do!*" But, moreover, the second question, which follows naturally after the first, receives hereby its an-

swer; when the believer continues to ask—What am I to do now, while I am living upon earth, in order to inherit certainly and fully eternal life? the answer is—Thou must advance in *doing;* and prove and manifest thy life of faith by thy love. In this sense, doing is indeed the only and final test. (The fourth question: *Who has done this?* is, through the blindness of Christians of our days, in many ways not willing to see it—its own answer: *This man hath done it,* even should he be, or be called, a *Samaritan,* or any thing else as regards his religion and dogmatics! Call not such a one an unbeliever, though thou canst not see his faith! If his love is genuine love—this remains always the necessary supposition—he must have also faith before God, even true faith, which lives in works and brings forth life.)

Verse 30. A *certain man;* some one or other—the very first word gives the complete answer, and shows who is our neighbor; while it is intended to call forth our sympathy, "*alas! poor man!*" There is no mention made of nation, tribe, rank, character, or the like—as men we are related and owe love to one another. The Israelite smote his *neighbor,* Exod. ii. 13; and afterwards every man borrowed of his Egyptian *neighbor,* Exod. xi. 2. The stranger, that dwelleth with you, shall be with you as one born among you; and thou shalt love him as thyself, for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt, Lev. xviii. 34.* The parable *may* have been a true story, as the names Jerusalem and Jericho seem to suggest. (Similarly Lazarus, chap. xvi. 20.) The road between the two places was indeed infested by robbers, and notoriously dangerous; however, there is no reason to suppose with Jerome that the wilderness Adummim was so called from this circumstance (or מַעֲלֵה אֲדֻמִּים, the bloody road), because the height had this name even in the time of Joshua (Josh. xv. 7, xviii. 17). Samaritans did not travel here frequently; hence, as ver. 33 is meant as a contrast, the certain man is probably a Jew; this follows as a matter of course, as he is said to *come down from Jerusalem.* At least such must have been the most natural supposition for the priest and Levite who afterwards passed; though we cannot (as Lange does) assert this positively. Others have said, though with much less reason, that he was probably a heathen, for the priests would not have passed by a Jew—thus mistaking the very pith of the narrative! But what he was is quite indifferent, and therefore remains unmentioned; nothing was to be seen in the man stripped of his raiment but a *man* lying in his blood. Thieves and murderers (comp. our remarks on **Matt.** xxi. 13)—alas! such men, who *do* such things to men, exist upon earth; they were in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, even as now in and around Rome. Out of the heart proceed hatred and *murder,* Matt. xv. 19: another most important hint at the very outset. The murderers were *also* doers according to their craft: καὶ ἐκδύσαντες αὐτόν, they stripped him; and because he probably defended himself a little, they struck him in anger, as if this in him had been injustice, and wounded him in sheer wanton cruelty. (Ἐπιθέντες not exactly *adding yet this,* but simply as in Acts xvi. 23.) Thus they departed and left him, ἡμιθανῆ, that is in the act of dying, who would surely have died had no help come; they do not even show him the robber's mercy of shortening his anguish. If the pious hearer of this narrative is disposed to bless himself inwardly at this stage, and say in his heart, "O, wicked sinners! neither such things, nor any thing in the least resembling them, have I ever committed; I have never transgressed the commandment in trespassing against the body and life of a human being"—behold two other and very different men appear on the stage, to shake somewhat this high opinion of himself. For, in Christ's catechism, to do no harm or injury to our neighbor includes the offering of help and assistance in all distress.*

Verses 31, 32. It is probable that many priests and Levites travelled between Jerusalem and Jericho, the city of priests,† on account of the weekly service, which was taken by them in turns; but, that a priest passed just in the moment, when it was still possible to save the dying man, was κατὰ συγκυρίαν, by a coincidence, as we commonly say. When the Lord uses this expression (it is his pleasure to make use of all words of human language, so far as they may be reduced to a pure meaning)—he means vividly to represent that this external event proceeded not from a directly expressed intention of God or of men. The miserable man was not brought before the door of the priest. Here, holy man, is a work of compassion and mercy; take him and nurse him! Not only he who is thus brought to me, or who himself appeals and cries to me for help (this poor man could not do so, but his lying on the road cried the louder to every human heart), has a claim on my active love: the occasions and calls for active love appear often to be accidental; but God directs it so, and will require it of me, if my heart did not recognize in faith and love his leading and his hand in the coincidence. If the miserable man had been still able to see at that moment, he would have entertained some hope. But the priest, who had performed his temple servi-,

* Hence do *not oppress* the Jews at present, ver. 33. But do not make them, before they are truly emancipated by Christ, judges in Christendom, any more than the Israelites did the Ammonites and Moabites. This against the "good Samaritan-toleration" of the Rhenish *Landtag.* (Some readers will know what this note of the first edition referred to.)

* [Alluding to Luther's exposition of the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill!" (*Kleiner Katechismus.*)—Tr.]

† Sepp, iii. 272, cites passages proving that it was the honor of that city to harbor many priests and Levites.

and who was in no hurry (for it says κατέβαινεν, "came down,") sees indeed the naked wounded man, but does not *do* according to Isaiah lviii. 7. If thou meet even an ox or an ass going astray, if thou see the ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, thou art not to forbear to help him—thus Moses commanded, Exod. xxiii. 4; Deut. xxii. 1–4. How much better is a *man* than ox or an ass? But the priest, who would perhaps have kept those commandments literally, forbears to help his own flesh; because he does not regard his neighbor, as the same Moses commanded him to regard him, as himself, but thought only of his *own* flesh. He does not care to know whether it is a stranger or enemy, or perhaps even a friend or brother; he is satisfied with the first glance. "This is a dangerous place!" is his first thought; the second follows soon, "God be praised that it did not happen to me!" Not so bad a thought, indeed, if he had only continued, "And what if it *had* happened to me and somebody was to go past as I am doing! Let me help him, as I in such a case ought to be helped." But he passed by. Did he "calculate in his loveless mind, that the sufferer was possibly not his neighbor?" It is not likely that he followed out such a long train of *reasoning;* for excuses always belong to to the latter date of theorizing. Practice in the present has quite other motives. "It is required, it is seen, by nobody"—God is nobody in the eyes of this priest—all their works they do for to be seen of men (Matt. xxiii. 5). If it would have made an *eclat* he would have done it; not as a work of mercy, but as an abomination of hypocrisy. If a thought of compassion stirs in his heart, he finds counter-considerations enough to stifle it. "He is too far gone, help is too late! What can I, single-handed, do with him?" (Indeed the priestly robe might have lost somewhat of its beauty and purity!) "What I ought to do is to make haste, lest I also fall a victim to these robbers"—and thus he passes by, and tells people afterwards, "I saw on my way a poor man lying on the ground; alas I *could* not help him, I thanked God for my escape, lifted up a fervent intercession for his poor soul, prayed and hoped that some one would come after me on the frequented road and help him!" That other one came, indeed, but he thought, "If the first one did not help, he who is a priest, why should I do it, who am only a Levite, of whom it cannot be expected with even as much right as of my superior?" He was not only at the place, but came near;* possibly felt a little more compassion than the former; but he also only looked on him and *passed by* on the other side.† A human being on the brink of eternity—what a sight for these two, whose duty it was to bring help even to the soul, and hence also first to the body! But *Priest* and *Levite* had become like the robbers; by their omitting to offer help, they completed as much as was in them the work of murder; if a third one had not passed by chance they would have sent the half-dead man into perfect death. Such were the men in Israel, who passed over the love of God and mercy to their neighbor (Luke xi. 42; Matt. xxiii. 23); and thus forsook the fear of the Almighty (Job vi. 14). Would you also be such a one in such a case? This is the question which Christ here presents to him, who questioned first. Thou hast the words of the commandment in thy mouth, and art seeking in thy sophistical thoughts to find out who is thy neighbor; but when he lies before thee on thy path, thou art neither able nor willing to find him! It is not knowledge, not dignity of any kind, not external worship, but only love, which is *doing;* and to omit the doing of good is doing evil—and herein alas! many become like evil doers. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Λευίτης, "In *like manner* also a Levite"—the one gives the example to the other in doing, or rather not doing! Such are they who teach the law and minister in the sanctuary; and what if they, who preach the *Gospel*, and talk sentimentally about the good Samaritan, act in the same manner? All they whom you passed by here upon earth will lie in your way there, before the throne of the Judge.

Verses 33–35. The active love of the Samaritan forms a significant contrast in every respect. The priest knows the sacred letter; he comes from the sanctuary and—has no heart! The Samaritan travels in affairs of business or something of that sort, but it does not fill up his soul. His *love*, which he finds at once time and inclination to follow out, is described by few but most powerful strokes, and forms a complete speaking picture. Moved with pity as to the past, help for the present, considerate care for the future. If any one had witnessed it, he would have said, They surely are *brothers!* and, in truth, the Samaritan saw in the *man*, without asking who he was, his brother. How glad the half-dead man must have been, that then—a *Samaritan*, perhaps despised by him at other times, recognized in him a neighbor and fellow-man! It was good for James and John to hear this narrative (comp. ix. 54). If the history had not actually taken place, it must yet have been a possible event; it was *possible* that even a Samaritan, even a heathen, would act thus, and put to shame thereby the Jews. The Lord, however, purposely did not choose a heathen; partly not to offend his hearers

*Ἐλθών seems to be the right reading, and denotes progression; perhaps it contains also the delicate feature, that the Levite, more accustomed to external service than the Priest, examines more closely than the latter.

†Ἀντιπαρέρχομαι means, like ἀντιπάρειμι, in the first place, *ex adverso prætereo;* hence Grotius understands it in contradistinction to καταβαίνειν *contrario itinere* to Jerusalem. Others say: Turning away to the *other side*, in order not to see him any longer or better. But in both cases we have ἀντιπαρῆλθεν; hence the intensified compound means *passed by.*

too much, partly to castigate the national hatred against the Samaritans, who were, after all, partakers of the law of Moses and the hope of the Messiah. The Samaritan *journeyed*, whether from or to Jerusalem, or only across the road, is not told; because the emphasis lies on the circumstance that he came *there* in the course of a journey of urgent necessity.* *He had compassion on him;* though similar feelings may have stirred in the hearts of the priest and Levite, yet it is only in his case that this feeling is thought worthy of mention; natural spontaneous compassion is of no avail, it increases the guilt if it prompts us to go out of the sight of misery. True sympathy ripens into act and help; this man forgets danger, business, every thing, and thinks only of the wretched man before his eyes. The robbers, he thinks, may not come again; the short delay—short, for he helps without delay—can easily be made up afterwards. "Where can I get in this wilderness physician or medicine?" This question does not trouble him much. According to the custom of the country (Gen. xxviii. 18), he carries oil and wine with him. Oil especially is good for healing wounds (comp. Isaiah i. 6).† In general, we ought to think that the most essential necessaries for works of love are easily obtainable, wherever there is the earnest will. Without hypersensitive disgust he binds up the wounds and molifies them. Soon the poor fainting man is so far restored that he could set him on his own beast (τὸ ἴδιον κτῆνος, on which he rode, sacrificing his own comfort to that of his neighbor); thus he leads him into the next πανδοχεῖον (this is the only sure instance of public inns occurring in the New Testament, comp. the Talmudic בונדק formed after this Greek work, and בינדקי from πανδοχεύς). The inference to be drawn from this is not that the poor man was a heathen, because these inns were chiefly intended for such strangers, who did not meet with hospitality in Jewish houses; but, evidently, that he did not expect or wish to demand from any of his friends to receive his charge. There was no other house, where he would have been received, except the public inn, where every one is admitted for money. *There he took care of him*—out of love, not for the sake of reward, only for the sweet reward of love; one cannot tell who of the two had greater *joy*. *Now*, dear reader, be as sentimental as thou wilt; but only *in* doing and not without it. The next day he must continue his journey; so we must suppose, and thus this feature of the picture shows the boundary lines of different duties: it was not required of him to delay his journey altogether; for he had *done* what he *could*. Where there is no other friend or not even a host, we commit the completion of the work to the Lord as the Supreme Helper and Healer. But in this case there was a host, and he said to him—*Take care of him;* even as it is said of himself before, he took care of him. Thus he gave him first an example, before he asks it of him; not as people, who *only* throw open their purse, saying, I will pay him who helps here. And at the same time he does not demand of the host to continue the work of love freely and for nothing; he lays no burden on the shoulder of another, because he had preceded with a good example: but pays in advance two *denarii*, ample wages for two days' labor (Matt. xx. 2), though the host would probably not be occupied the whole day in tending the sick man. And, moreover, love makes him so prudent and wise, that, though possessed of such strong love himself, he pre-supposes nothing in the other but self-interest, specially in a host, who only calculates, *How much?* and who is introduced here as a man receiving pay for works of mercy, thus completing the picture of contrasting heartlessness. The Samaritan anticipates every possible scruple and objection that the expenses required by tending the sick might exceed the money given; and, lest any thing should be withheld from the poor sick man, he promises—and after what he had done the host could depend on his word—"and whatsoever thou spendest more *I* will repay thee, as if it was for myself, when I come again." Thus we ought, and thus we may exercise love, if we have a willing love; it is perfectly compatible to *go on on one's own* journey and yet not *pass by* the needy.

Verse 36. *These three*—viz., three *men*—thus the Lord comprehends without difference under this name the holy magnates of Israel and the Samaritan, as opposed to the fourth *man*, fallen among thieves (whom he leaves to themselves and the judgment awaiting them). And now he puts a counter-question as an answer to ver. 29; but very significantly the converse of that "who?" not, Who of them thought the poor man his neighbor? but, *Who was neighbor unto him?* Thus we are to put the question, in order to arrive always at the answer: Am I this man's neighbor? that is, ought he to help me, if I were in his place and he in mine? "Neighbor" designates a reciprocal relation; for it is said "as thyself," Matt. vii. 12. The egotistic motto, "I am my nearest neighbor," is to be interpreted in the following manner: "Put thyself in the place of the other, and see whether thou wouldst like to be thy own neighbor—exchange places with him, in order to love him as thyself!" Thus we may obtain in every case the rule of love from our very self-love; and thus the question of ver. 26 may be put likewise. "What is written in thy own heart and conscience? who else is thy neighbor, but he, whose neighbor thou art, that is, every one?"

Verse 37. The lawyer, put to shame, finds

* Braune thinks that he was coming from Jerusalem, where he had again experienced how the Jews despised the Samaritans. This is, however, only a secondary thought.

† Oil relieves pain, wine stops bleeding. Wetstein cites a passage from Galen, in which oil and wine are mentioned as remedies in the case of wounds.

it impossible in his annoyance to say expressly, *The Samaritan.* But this makes his answer the more striking and to the point. *He that showed mercy on him.* That is, he whose compassion ripened into deed and truth; who did not merely feel a compassion which he got rid of by an inward act of a positively evil character; who did not merely talk of his feeling of pity (ah! there lay a poor wretched man on the road; how it went to my heart that I had to pass him and was not able to help him!)—no, but who *showed* mercy. Without works there is no truth of love (1 John iii. 18); but without love of the heart no truth of works. If the robbers had seized the Samaritan before he was able to accomplish his design, his work would have been accomplished in the sight of God—and if the priest and Levite had given help on account of approaching spectators, it would have had no value. Dives may pay for the tending and nursing of fifty Lazaruses, or himself lick his sores *a la Xavier*, and "have his reward." Whereas if poor Lazarus sighed in his heart—"If thou, proud Dives, wast lying before my door, I would surely not leave thee lying there"—his will is accounted to him as if he had performed it. But if thou art willing in thy heart, then go and do καὶ σύ, also thou likewise, as now and then a Samaritan did; not as the passers by, who had time and opportunity (Gal. vi. 10), but no heart. Thus the questioner, by his first question, What shall I *do?* himself prepared the last answer now given him, *Do!* The Lord says ὁμοίως, as he used the same word in ver. 32. In the former case (ver. 32) there were two, in the present only one; the first *likewise*, alas! is of more frequent occurrence than the latter. "*Go!*" There lies in this word something repelling; as if he had said, "Go away from me; I have shown you now that you knew well enough the answer to the question which you put to tempt me; learn a lesson from this, and know yourself differently from what you do now, and then come, to seek my mercy for your sinful heart." This is implied in the word for the lawyer. But for *us*, who know the Lord's mercy, it implies more. "*Go!*" Whither? Every where on our path of life; wherever our journey leads us, our neighbors throng upon us to demand our love; so that there is no need to go far to find them. Especially they who are wounded in their soul, who are dying spiritually; for truly to help *man* means more than to help and nurse the bodily life. Whatever rescues in this way, deserves to be called asylum; whoever shows such compassion, shows that true and real and perfect full mercy, of which many a "sister of charity" knows only the proselytizing caricature.

But he alone *knows* this who has himself experienced the mercy of *him* who appears, as we said in the beginning, though only in the background of the whole parable, as the true compassionate Helper. As certainly as Dives and Lazarus are types of other persons (this will be shown subsequently) the good Samaritan is figurative of him who shows mercy to fainting and dying man. Oil and wine and wounds were intended to remind us of Isa. i. 5, 6, and the whole description of Ezek. xvi. 6, and similar passages. It is true that an attempt to interpret allegorically the individual details—as, for example, the difference between oil and wine, the beast, the inn, the host, the two pence—may easily degenerate into trifling; but spiritual Christians of all times have not been able to resist seeing in the whole parable a picture of man lying in sin and misery, whom neither law nor Levitical institutions can help, and to whom the mercy of Christ comes—whom they angrily called a Samaritan. Luther and Melancthon cannot refrain from such a view; the former goes even into details, contrary to his usual principle. Only let us not argue falsely against this mystical import of the parable, which is dimly though really contained in its depths. This has been done with great warmth by Heinrich Müller (*Erquickstunden*, ed. Nusswurm, No. 214), who says that from such a view it would follow, that Adam was only weakened, but did not become altogether dead, by the fall;* that the law of Moses was to be blamed as not being willing to help; that Christ was justly called a Samaritan; that the lawyer could, if he liked, have done likewise, that is, could have been a Saviour and Redeemer of the world! Indeed, such ὑπόνοια (occultism) is never amenable to so very rigid a criticism; but when we say, *Active mercy to him, who would be lost without it!* we have stated the simple *tertium comparationis.* The Lord could scarcely do otherwise than wrap up in the truth required for the occasion, and which in its first aspect is repelling, also the whole and full truth. *Thou shalt—love!* This perfect antithesis of the law, which as law cannot help us from death, becomes in Christ vitalizing truth, giving life to the faint spark of life. For, the only way in which it can be imagined that the word "thou *shalt* love" can produce an effect in him who is without love, is when I love him first in such a manner that he is ashamed, overpowered, and awakened to return my love. Now this is what the Lord does to us; and, *after* having done this, he gives his disciples the new commandment, "Go and do to others as I have done to thee!"†

---

* Luther also says, "Wir zappeln noch ein wenig," "we still trip a little;" and Calvin (as Richter remarks on this passage) uses the expression *semimortuus.* And this is just as true as the "altogether νεκρός;" each in its own place. Calvin speaks of a revival of the *semimortui*, not only in connection with Isaiah lvii. 16, but in his *Institutes;* referring to our parable he says of the natural man, *semivivus.*

† Valerius Herberger treats the whole Gospel of the thirteenth Sunday after Trinity, as follows: "The *outer court*—Who are most blessed? they who see and hear Jesus. The sanctuary—Which are the holiest works? to do God's commandments without ἐθελοθρησκεία. Finally, the *Holy of holies*, our Friend and merciful Redeemer, who helps us to such works, and covers all our deficiencies."

MARTHA AND MARY—ONE THING IS NEEDFUL.

(Luke x. 41, 42.)

The simple reader of the Gospel will naturally suppose that the two sisters mentioned here are the sisters of Bethany, and not, as even Bengel was inclined to suppose in his *Harmony of the Gospels*, another pair of sisters who had accidentally the same names. Besides this, a closer investigation of John xi. and xii. discovers the same differences of character in the two sisters; and this short account of Luke harmonizes exactly in all its suppositions and deductions with the narrative of John. That the certain village, where Martha received on that occasion the Lord in her house, must have been *Bethany*, follows necessarily from John xi. 1—thus excluding the supposition (which occurs in a work as late as that of Greswell), that the sisters had another domicile in Galilee. But the opinion that the short incident narrated by Luke belongs to that stay of Christ at Bethany which is mentioned in John xi., seems to me perfectly untenable; partly, because in that case Luke would necessarily say something about Lazarus; partly, and this is of greater importance, because the whole scene, described here as a calm visit, does not correspond to the state of things which afterwards arose in consequence of the death and resurrection of Lazarus. But how are we to account for our Lord's being ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι—that is, *in the journey* which Luke is now speaking of—so suddenly in the neighborhood of Jerusalem in Bethany, and then far away again in Samaria and Galilee? We know that Luke does not narrate details in strict succession; in his so-called journey-narrative he inserts sometimes also other events. He has thus inserted here this affecting and important occurrence, which may have happened, if not at the very close, yet at some other time when the Lord at the end of a journey to a feast had entered the house at Bethany.* And *why* here? Certainly on account of some real dogmatic connection; with the intention of giving a pendant and contrast to the question, "What shall I do," which had found its answer in the story of the Samaritan. Thus much seems certain to exegesis; but what is the intended meaning of the parallel must be decided by the individual perception and taste. For our part, we see something significant in the general contrast between the self-exalting lawyer and the reverent women; but do not regard the narrative, "as an actual exemplification of heart-felt love to God and hidden life in him," corresponding to the doctrine concerning this highest duty, as given in ver. 27 (because the centre of the preceding Gospel-lesson is not *this* word in the mouth of the νομικός, but the "*doing*" in the parable of Jesus). We would rather regard it as the intention of the Evangelist to guard by this deep contrast, in its juxtaposition with the preceding parable, *against the misconception which even to this day clings to people's view of the good Samaritan.* Have not many believers, who wish to follow Christ's admonition, and offer to him the loving service of many works of charity, lost themselves, on the other side, in a Christian πολυπραγμοσύνη, in an unquiet, self-troubled spirit which prevents the calm reception of grace? And is not the in most fundamental thought of the word directed to busy Martha—a warning against such a tendency? *Do!* was the word of the Lord in the parable; but now he says, *Rest!* Do not forget the "Seeing and Hearing" in thy much doing.

Martha, perhaps a widowed, at all events the older sister, to whom the house belonged, received him into her house, and felt great joy in being the hostess of such a guest. But her sister Mary did what was *better;* she also (καί—in this word Luke at once sketches the whole situation) sate at Jesus' feet, to listen to his words, and to rejoice in her guest; thus truly and wholly receiving him who had not merely come into their house, but had also come to bring the bread of life to their *heart.* Opposed to this quiet παρακαθίζειν is the περιεσπᾶτο of Martha; the thought-scattering, busy going about to serve the highly honored guest with as many things as possible. Περὶ πολλὴν διακονίαν, "with much serving;" the article τήν is left out purposely, for she did not wish to be busy about things that were not necessary. But in the midst of her work, which she began with good intention, she feels an indistinct presentiment that her sister was enjoying more than herself the presence of Jesus (that she had the better part). But instead of turning from this feeling to a knowledge of her own fault, she envies and unjustly blames her sister. Martha also would prefer sitting at the feet of Jesus; but she counteracts this deep impulse of the Holy Spirit by her own spirit, which has chosen meritorious works in preparing and offering many things, and is unwilling to desist. She has a vague feeling of what would be right; but the opposition in her heart against this feeling only heightens her zeal, which breaks forth most artlessly in her words, of which every one lays bare the inward work-

* Much may be said in favor of Lange's supposition, according to which this quiet visit of the Lord to Bethany took place about the second Passover Feast. [The author here is but pursuing his habitual depreciation of Luke's historical accuracy, which in point of fact exceeds that of Matthew. There is no reason for disturbing the order of the Evangelist in the chronological position of this incident.—Am. Ed.]

ings of her soul. Because she herself had no quiet and repose, Mary likewise must have none; what she herself has chosen must be the right, and Mary must be very wrong. So she takes at least so much time as to leave her work, and interrupt the Lord and her sister. *Lord*—so she begins reverently, but soon becomes uncourteous, and afterwards actually rude to her great guest. *Dost thou not care?* (*οὐ μέλει σοι*, as Mark iv. 38, the strongest emotion of distress)—thus she would ungraciously draw Jesus himself into her trouble and restlessness; pre-supposing in him an interest in the many good things with which she intends to show him hospitality. "That my *sister*, whose duty it doubtless is to assist me, *hath left me alone to serve?*—to serve *thee?*" What proud boasting is there in this *κατέλιπε*, viz., that she had begun and had performed the greater share of the work; she confesses that her sister assisted her in the beginning, but blames her in the injurious assertion that she is not doing any thing at present, and that herself *alone* fulfilled the incumbent duties. Was then the Lord to be left sitting *alone* waiting their preparations, as if he had come only for the sake of their food? Martha cannot call away her sister quietly, for Jesus was speaking to her; therefore she must interrupt him in order to set Mary at liberty. She does this boldly; speaks, in his very presence, as if it was then a culpable waste of time to listen to him; nay, she even corrects the Lord's want of the proper *μέλει* or "care," and dictates to him what he ought to say. *Bid her, therefore* (instead of speaking to her these words of edification, by which thou keepest her unseasonably from her work), speak to her that she help me with my preparations! Are we doing injustice to Martha by this interpretation? Her intention was good, but she was as confused and disturbed as we describe it—and all this is a consequence of the unquiet of a soul which has much to do only about him and his cause.

Martha, Martha! By this reiterated call he awakens and alarms her out of her busy confusion; and then addresses her in words so incomparably deep and penetrating that they have been inexhaustibly efficacious for all such souls as hers in every age—containing that truth which is able to save them from their error. "Without *need* thou causest thyself trouble and care for *many things;* on this occasion for more than is required." The *μεριμνᾶν* or "carefulness" is the first and inward fault; it necessarily produces the external *τυρβάζεσθαι* or "being troubled," the restless hurrying hither and thither. "I see that thou art losing all collectedness and calmness of thought in the zeal which scatters itself over *πολλά*, "many things;" thou art thus spoiling thy good work, and losing the blessing of my visit." (Comp. Jes. Sirach xi. 9–11 in the original.) The Lord then adds *ἑνὸς δέ ἐστι χρεία*, "but *one thing* is needful;" and *ex vi oppositi* it cannot be denied that, in the first place, the *ἕν* or "one thing" forms a contrast to *πολλοῖς* or "many things" which are not necessary, and that it implies, therefore, a kind declining of the *πολλὴ διακονία*, "much serving;" quite in the sense of the old gloss, which, however, is wrong in not going beyond this first meaning: *ὀλίγων* or *ὀλίγων ἢ ἑνός* (*few things*, or *few things or one thing*). Good Michaelis (it is necessary that there should be such exegetes, in order to counteract the hastily spiritualizing and vague interpreters) is in the right, with his "single simple dish which the Lord finds sufficient;" as he is in the case of the temple-tribute and that of Cæsar. Even Basil, in one of his homilies, understands the word of the Lord as parabolically taken from the emblem of food. Bengel remarks correctly, "Unum (*ἕν*, not *τὸ ἕν*) ad necessitatem victus, sine apparatu distrahente. Si referas ad frugalitatem hospitii, uberior, non modo non tenuior fit doctrina totius periochae" (one thing for the needful food, without a distracting apparatus. By referring it to frugality of hospitality, the doctrine of the whole passage becomes richer rather than jejune). We also think that the sublime saying is torn from the root—out of which it grows, according to that condescending wisdom of the Lord which transfigures the external into a direct symbol of the internal—that the whole is divested of the familiar character and touching delicacy which contrasts so forcibly with Martha's impetuosity—if we do *not* see in the Lord's words this *primary* meaning, "Why are so *many things* necessary, good Martha, to welcome me into your house?" Thus Martha most probably understood the words at first, till she heard what followed. For the sentence, "One thing is needful," stands *between two* sentences, the first of which proceeds from the many dishes, whereas the second evidently *passes over to the spiritual application*, and the middle sentence forms thus the medium of comparison, being applicable in both senses. That the Lord gave *merely* "a true, but at the same time, courteous answer, according to most delicate politeness," viz., that he was satisfied with few things, and even with one thing; and that Luke wrote down under the influence of the Holy Spirit such a saying—can only be imagined by Michaelis and such commentators; and a Paulus may picture it out complacently.* Meyer's† answer is not so much witty as natural and sensible: "If this be the only and true meaning, then to be consistent we must understand in the subsequent sentence (altogether overlooked by Michaelis) that Mary had chosen the best dish." *Ἡ ἀγαθὴ μέρις*, "that good part" (*now* the article is used and is significant), does not mean the better occupation, but indeed the true *food* which is *need-*

* Nachtigall (in Henke's *Magazine*, vi. 2, 355) supplied *ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου: One* person is sufficient, you will be able to prepare the repast yourself!

† Who has honored the interpretation of Michaelis by a special refutation (*Blatter*, etc., iii. 383).

ful; for this expression stands likewise in connection with the image suggested by the occasion. But the Lord appeals hereby parabolically and suddenly to the heart; and because Mary is willing to receive of him, he says, "This is the food necessary for all human beings, also for *thee*, O Martha—*which I give* (John vi. 27). Did I come into thy house to be ministered unto or to minister?" (Matt. xx. 28). At this stage the expression πολλά and ἕν are seen in their real meaning, contained implicitly in the parabolic use; and Heb. xiii. 9 may be compared as an illustration of the whole. Observe, moreover, that the Lord does not reject the πολλά, for he accepts willingly that love which manifests itself in many things. Often many things pertaining to outward διακονία are required by the Lord, and it is praiseworthy to be dilligent and careful in such labors (Rom. xvi. 6, 12)—but, notwithstanding, this thing, which is needful, always is and remains the one thing; what is superfluous belongs to the too "many things;" and what is of chief importance, what is blamed and reproved here is not the much labor and service, but the μεριμνᾶν καὶ τυρβάζεσθαι.* Finally, as the *Berlenburg Bible* beautifully expresses it, "whenever spiritual things and temporal things are compared, temporal things cease altogether to be necessary." "That the soul be quiet and calm before me, and listen to me, and receive from me that which gives and increases such quietness of spirit—this is the one thing, the good part; Mary, in sitting here at my feet, hath chosen this; thou hast not done so, at least not at present, but hast neglected it and deprived thyself of it!" Thus the Lord, sheltering Mary, gives back the accusation to the accuser, and deservedly; and in conclusion, summing up all, opposes the strange desire expressed by Martha that her sister should be sent to join her, by the comprehensive word, "and this shall not be taken away from her." "Neither at present, as you would have it, nor at any other future time; neither from her, nor from any other who has *chosen* it; it shall not be taken from any, so long as they keep it and hold it fast." Whereas, the Martha-portion is a part "that can be taken away from us in a thousand ways, by poverty, sickness, old age, weakness, and who can enumerate them all?"† Nay more, in the end all who delight in working, and are happy in doing many things, must enter into quietness, though it be not congenial to them! It is also a correct remark, that μερίδα, "part," and ἐξελέξατο, "hath chosen," are placed together, denoting the communicated grace of God and the free appropriating act of faith. Likewise notice the great love and kindness of the Lord in offering himself, and being so willing *to be chosen* (for spiritual communion with him, receiving from him, who gives himself to us, is in reality that One Thing, which the One and only Jesus brings us); and observe that he blames only from pure love those who to their own loss move round about and near him, instead of seeking, laying hold of, and enjoying *himself.*

This may suffice as direct exposition. But in this case the reader may expect a fuller consideration and practical application of a word which in the course of centuries has proved of such importance to so many souls; and which has been so much quoted, justly or unjustly, for consolation and for blame. *Who is meant by Martha, and who by Mary?* The warning which is addressed to Martha has been sometimes also applied to the natural man, who, in the restlessness of earthly pursuits and worldly-mindedness, in the multiplicity of creature concerns, has much trouble and unnecessary turmoil, instead of seeking and finding the one thing needful, the salvation of his soul in believing and humbly following the Saviour Jesus Christ. This first application (to which the beautiful hymn of Schröder confines itself)* is by no means to be altogether rejected; for this application is indeed implied in the "one thing." But this is merely on the surface of the word, something which is indeed *pre-supposed* in it; this application, however, does not penetrate into the peculiar and real meaning of the passage. Martha and Mary are *both* disciples and followers of Jesus; and although it is not in the original of Luke's Gospel, yet the translation† has rightly interpreted, "Martha was cumbered about much serving *him.*" Jesus loved also Martha, as one of his believers (John xi. 5); for to take trouble about and in connection with him is much better and more valuable than all the restless activity, or all the apparently peaceful slothfulness, of the children of this world. But it is not enough to be cumbered about much serving him; *among Christians themselves* Mary is distinguished from Martha.

Here also let us begin with the external. Like Martha are all those souls who, though they have come to know and love Christ, and even wish to *have* him, yet do not take the right way of obtaining the good part. Busy with a zeal in which self-righteousness insinuates itself or is even predominant, they wish to *receive* Christ according to their own manner; that is, to prepare themselves many things for him, thus serving Christ chiefly according to the manner of their former conversation—their soul is wanting in that calmness without which it is impossible to obtain the full enjoyment and blessing which our Redeemer brings us. They get books, learned or devotional; they seek out works and services of

* Lange says truly, If you find the thing *needful*, and live for it, you have found thereby and live for the *one* thing. The converse holds equally true, and is the primary meaning, of the verse: The one central point is the only thing needful.

† Tholuck, in one of the three *sermons* edited by Brachmann, of Bielefeld.

* [Beginning: "Eins ist Noth, ach Herr dies Eine."—Tr.]

† [Luther's Tr.]

many kinds; they try to obtain it by spiritual exercises, in communion and fellowships here and there. This also is one of the ways, and, alas! a necessary beginning for many, who, as we usually say, are sincere in their desire. But it is to such that Tersteegen says, in the spirit of these words of Christ: "Do not bind thyself so much to forms and outward methods. We must not always be *seeking* God, we must also *find* him. So long as we are still seeking, there is much running and working: he who has found him enjoys and works quietly!" So long as they do not give up the πολλά of their running and working, their own seeking will stand in the way of their finding; so long as they are busy *round about him*, they cannot come to rest *with and in him* —a rest which many a Mary enjoys, who, with deeper wisdom, chose from the outset the better part, and which is obtained by many a weary Martha, who, meekly receiving the exhortation of the Lord, joins Mary and sits at his feet (as, *perhaps*, was the case of Martha of Bethany). Thus, many a Separatist is still seeking with trouble and labor what the hidden flock is enjoying in that "Babylon" which he so much despises; many a one, running impetuously, finds fault with the quiet people of God, the meek ones of the earth; and yet they are in advance of himself, enjoying in a childlike heart that "one thing," receiving Jesus not only into the house of their outer life, walk, and works, but also into the home of their heart.

But we proceed to ask: Are we not all to be *active;* are we not to work both as regards ourselves and others; especially are we not to abound in works of mercy; that is, to serve the Lord Jesus, feed the Lord Jesus in feeding our neighbor who is his brother? Or, are some at liberty to sit down inactively with Mary in order to enjoy, while others are appointed to be Marthas, offering that service in many things which is likewise required?* It has been the opinion of some that both sisters had *equal rights* beside each other, as persons who had received *different callings*. So preached Dräseke, in the year 1824 (in after years he would not have expressed himself thus): "Each loves in a different way; but each loves aright, that is, according to her best understanding and capacity. The Saviour is pleased with both. Both desire, both possess, the one thing needful. Both desire, both possess, him. He might have likewise added the converse, and said to Mary, 'Honor the busy housemother. Martha also has her good part. She serves me out of love; even as thou, out of love, sittest at my feet, listening to my words.' Jesus recognizes among his disciples every natural peculiarity and gift." Justly was this sermon criticized at the time in Schwartz's *Jahrbücher*. Yet there is *some* truth in the preacher's remark, as will be shown subsequently; although taken in this definite form it is exegetically altogether false. The Saviour does *not* approve both, does *not* attribute to Martha likewise the good part. She would have freed herself from the blame—which refers not merely to her calling Mary away, but to her own conduct itself—only if, understanding the reproof of the Lord and humbly accepting it, she had left that one thing which she had prepared for her guest's refreshment, and had sat down at that table and feast which he had come to bring to her.

Who then is Martha whom the Lord blames? Such active, working, and laboring Christians as form a species between the self-righteous outside the pale of believers and the true disciples; in their active interest for the kingdom of God, using and urging all manner of organizations, machinery, and agencies—that is if they engage in all this with unquiet care and restlessness. Every Martha, whom God has called to be busy about many things, should, as Tersteegen says, do her work *calmly and quietly;* in order that the husbandman that laboreth be first partaker and *enjoyer* of the fruits, 2 Tim. ii. 6. *Every* Mary should have, not only the good part, but also her portion of active work; for—"Quietism is not of itself Mary's spirit" (Richter). Paul working more than all the other apostles, sits also and at the same time at Christ's feet; contemplative John is not inactive, but an energetic apostle; "Christ, who constantly demands of us to be active in the kingdom of God, would not have approved an exclusively contemplative life" (Neander). From which it is clear that Martha and Mary should go hand in hand as true sisters; but so that Mary's spirit is the foundation common to both. "If understood aright, Martha had cause indeed to ask Mary's assistance, in order, namely, that her labor and works be sanctified" (*Berl. Bib.*).

Alas! it is here that we are so deficient. The new man is not able to continue always in the spirit of Mary. In our active works, even in our studying and learning, in our conflicts, and in our very prayers, the temptation insinuates itself to fall into the restlessness of the old man, and to substitute self-made things for gifts bestowed from God. How are we to put an end to this constant conflict *between Mary and Martha?* Some propose as a remedy to distribute the two elements into *different seasons*. Thus, for example, it is said by them, when Christ came to Bethany to bless them, it was a Lord's-day for their house, and it was wrong to deprive themselves of this privilege by household cares and troubles. In like manner, Sabbath-days and work-days, Mary-hours and Martha-hours, alternate in our lives. "The Lord's words to Mary have this purport: Know the right point of time; and do not devote that which is set apart for learning the

* As the man who came to the abbot Sylvanus on Mount Sinai, boasting that he differed from the brethren who worked, "Mary had chosen the good part." He sat in his cell with his book, and was not called to dinner. The answer of the abbot puts, according to the then prevailing incorrect interpretation, Martha as representing work—"Every Mary must have a Martha." (See in the *Altvater-Buch.*)

divine word to earthly pursuits. I have come to teach you what is needful for you, and, instead of listening, you are troubled about the *meal!*" (Chrysostom). This is not without its truth on account of our infirmity; but it does not detect the real sting of Christ's words, whose blame of Martha does not refer merely to the time chosen by her for her work. We are not to remain in a state of soul, constantly ebbing and flowing from Sabbath rest to the unquiet of works. Is it right, then, to say—Martha without, Mary within? The beautiful Moravian hymn on the subject is spoiled by the introduction of the common-place phrase that Martha is only the *body*, Mary the *spirit*. No, this can never lead to any thing good: the spirit must be in a living vigorous body; the outward hand and the inward heart must not be separated in our doing. In short, strictly speaking, all Christians should have not the Martha-spirit (which is blamed, and must ever be blamed), but the Mary-spirit, and it alone in their heart of hearts; and even, though this be difficult, in the midst of Martha-work, and under all our obligations to being cumbered about "many things." Heinrich Müller (in his *Erquickstunden*) is anxious to rescue Martha, and therefore says: "Mary is faith clinging to Jesus, but active Martha is love." But by the erroneous title given to his essay, "*Always* at rest, and *never* at rest," he has himself shown that his exegesis is at fault, and has attached an incorrect meaning to the word *at rest*. Not her active work, but her restless unquiet mind, is what the Lord blames in Martha; *love* also must always be calm and at rest; for only that love is genuine, through which *faith* is active. And, therefore, always and to the very end, it is Mary who surrenders herself from her inmost heart to Christ, loses herself, so to speak, in humble, undisturbed, child-like simplicity in him, depends on him for all and receives all from him. She alone chooses, possesses, and retains that good part which is lost by Martha as soon as *she* begins her unquiet labor. But how difficult is it to be Mary! And into what depths of our spiritual life does this one word of our Lord reach!

If the severity of the word fills us with fear, let us descend from this culminating *point* of the meaning of the passage to find consolation in a secondary application, which has also its truth for us poor men in our actual state of frailty. It is evident that there was such a difference in character and natural disposition between the two sisters; that Martha could never become altogether like Mary. Consequently our Lord did not demand this of her, and would have accepted kindly the many offerings of her hospitality. But what the Lord reproves in the first instance, is her demanding that Mary should become like her; and her thinking that her way was the *only* right and true way of serving him. Apart from this the Lord loves her; and leads her, accommodating himself to her way, to choose at length thoroughly and entirely the good part, which, after all, she had not altogether lost, since she loved Jesus. Love is speaking, ruling, and deciding the conflict in Bethany; but it is the love and truth of the Lord, condemning the Martha-spirit, and yet not rejecting Martha. Mary never thinks of reproaching her sister, except it were absolutely necessary. She leaves it to the Lord. Ye, who are brothers and sisters before him, prescribe not to the Lord what he is to say to such as differ from you! He does not require our dictation, but will say what is right in his own wisdom; what he says to *thee*, hear and accept; and in hearing and accepting it thou becomest a Mary—even though he had before called thee, *Martha! Martha!*

THE LORD TEACHES US TO PRAY, WHAT AND HOW—THE HEAVENLY FRIEND AND FATHER.

(Luke xi. 2–13 [Matt. vi. 9–13, vii. 7–11].)

In a certain place—in a village—on his journey; such expressions show that Luke pays more regard in this whole section to a material (real) connection than to that of chronology or of any other kind. It does not fall properly within the task of the present work to investigate the plan and order of this Gospel, of which we gave a specimen in the preceding narrative. Jesus himself had been *praying;* and, moreover, as is evident from the whole connection of the terms (ἐγένετο, ἐν τόπῳ, ὡς ἐπαύσατο), in the hearing of his disciples—one of whom has the courage to give utterance to a desire, which was doubtless shared by others (comp. p. 86). "What *words* of prayer flow from the lips of our divine Master, when he begins—so that it is necessary to wait till he *ceases!* We also ought, and we indeed would *pray* much and often, as he frequently exhorts us to do, but we are poor in words. Oh that we, his disciples, also had from our Master one or more *forms of prayer*, put by him into our mouth, even as John taught his disciples!" Such is manifestly the meaning simply expressed by them: *Lord teach us to pray.* And this request, as it really corresponds to a general want felt by all his disciples, is mercifully granted by him. The present mouth-piece of the future Church does indeed attach too much importance to the outward word, as if in this way he could be taught to pray (a most important part of teaching,

which had been neither forgotten nor neglected by the Great Teacher)—but when the Spirit was given, then the Church felt what is written in Rom. viii. 26. We require not only to be taught *what* to pray, or the subject-matter and contents of prayer, such as would be acceptable to God, and in conformity to his will, which want is supplied by the form of prayer and promise given; but much more the καθὸ δεῖ, "as we ought," in addition to the τί, "what," the manner pleasing to God—the true understanding, and right disposition of prayer. For this reason, the Lord answers the request of his disciples, as usual, above what they could ask or think; and gives them not merely the former, but adds also the latter, warning, as was absolutely necessary, against abuse and misconception. We need not suppose that the disciple who asks the Lord had not heard the Sermon on the Mount; to how many things had the disciples listened, without either understanding it according to their Master's intention, or keeping it in their mind and applying it. But the Lord, who, according to Luke (and partly also as we saw according to Matthew), *repeated*, specially in the latter days of his prophetic career, many things taught by him on former occasions—and, as was natural, particularly from the Sermon of the Mount, that short compendium of his doctrine, delivered at the outset of his teaching—refers here with purpose and great significance to his former words, and illustrates and develops them only by a newly added parable.*

He teaches his disciples to pray *after this manner*. First, he tells them *what* they are to say, because they are in want, and whenever they are in want, of words;† that is, he tells them both what they may and ought to pray, and what are the best and simplest expressions for such petitions. Thus he repeats what he had given before; and appoints it on this occasion as a *standing form of prayer*.‡ But what is even the Lord's Prayer as uttered by the lips, if the heart does not *pray* it really, confidently, and with all assurance, *even as* dear children speak to their Father? Therefore the Lord proceeds to teach us, as much as this can be taught by words explaining words, the chief condition to be observed in using the formula: *believing* perseverance on the ground of the divine *promise*, that he gives to him that asks much more certainly and willingly than any man, friend, or father. This is the second repetition from the Sermon on the Mount, vers. 9–13; which is preceded, however, by a new parable, and is applied and used as an exhortation to pray to the *heavenly* Father; thus giving new force and effect to the words of the prayer itself.

Verses 2—4. With regard to the omissions and abbreviations which we find in Luke as compared with Matthew, it is impossible to assume that every thing which is wanting in the MSS. was left out by the Lord himself on that occasion. In general we agree with Tholuck's remark: "As he had given the prayer as a model of a *short* prayer in contradistinction to the 'much speaking' reprehended before, it is unnatural to think that he inserted unnecessarily the three sentences, which are wanting in Luke, and that he afterwards thought a rectification necessary."*

However, we do not apply this to all the three, or rather four omitted sentences; but draw an essential distinction between the introduction and conclusion on the one side, and the complete enumeration of the sacred *seven petitions* on the other. A certain variation in the expressions (which does not consist in abbreviation, but in change of words; compare the fourth and fifth petitions) corresponds to the whole character of Christ's teaching; and is intended to prevent any false cleaving to the letter of the form. We can understand why he might have omitted in the beginning the words ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, "who art in heaven," or even the ἡμῶν, "our;" he wished from the outset to lay all the emphasis on our saying, with all our heart, "Father," as being the essential and deepest truth of this prayer, even as he concludes the whole section with this word (ver. 13). The reason why, in ver. 4, τὰς ἁμαρτίας, "our sins," is put instead of τὰ ὀφειλήματα, "our debts," was mentioned in our remarks on Matt. vi. (p. 91); here we must observe that, with delicate accuracy, the expression ἁμαρτία or "*sin*" is not used again in the second clause, treating of *man* trespassing against *man*. With regard to the *doxology* (concerning the genuineness of which compare our remarks on Matt.), the reason why it is omitted here is partly because, according to the ideas of that time, it belonged, as a matter of course, to a complete form of

* We cannot but regret that even orthodox preachers repeat from their pulpits the opinion advanced in theological science, that the request of the disciple was the occasion of the words spoken, Matt. vi. (for example, Steinmeyer, *Beiträge zum Schriftverständniss*, i. 119). [What more natural than such an opinion, since Luke expressly sanctions it?—Am. Ed.]

† But this is not to be stated, as Braune does, "He made them pray this glorious prayer after him." (Comp. i. 170.)

‡ Von Gerlach thinks this repetition improbable, "*because* in this case the prayer would have become a standing form for the disciples." We argue exactly in the converse way; Christ repeats the prayer, *because* he wishes to satisfy the right desire for a standing form. For, considering this want as felt by all saints, specially for their public services and fellowship, we must think that it was indeed Christ's object to give "a literal repetition of the prayer" for our sake. "If the apostolic Church did not use the Lord's prayer literally," Alford remarks, "*at what point of time* did this custom commence, which we find in every Liturgy known to us?" [There is certainly no trace of the use of this form in the New Testament, or in any writings of the apostolic age. The supposition of such a liturgical view of the prayer by the disciples is wholly gratuitous.—Am. Ed.]

* *Sermon on the Mount*, p. 379.

prayer; and partly because the *confidence* expressed in it is taught in the succeeding parable, which thus takes its place, and, as it were, calls it forth afresh from their memory. So far the whole is clear; but the *Lord* certainly did not omit in the repetition of the seven petitions any one; he did not take out any link of the perfect chain; hence, he did not leave out the third petition, which is a summary of all obedience, to be attained on the path of prayer, or the seventh, which is a summary of the redemption of the sanctified, and thus a condensation of the whole prayer.* However, they *are* omitted generally (and in the Vulgate); but are we to infer from this that "the reporter, whom Luke consulted," did not communicate the words of Christ completely? We do not think so. For in like manner as Luke knew well that Martha and Mary lived in Bethany, but did not *wish* purposely to mention it, so it is much more probable that, as a disciple of Christ, he knew the Lord's prayer in its complete form, when he wrote the Gospel; and it is impossible that he should have have had any reason or purpose for leaving out what is so essential. Nor was he a dependent copyist of what he found in any ἀπομνημόνευμα or memorandum, which he consulted; but the true and last authority and reporter in all these consultations was always the Holy Ghost. Hence we conclude that Luke wrote originally the seven petitions completely; and the reasons why the two petitions mentioned were omitted so generally, and at so early a date, may form a subject for the critics to exercise their ingenuity to their hearts' content. Such is our mature opinion. If any one knows better, let him bring forward his arguments; but they must be more satisfactory than any which have been adduced hitherto.

Verses 5, 6. A new commentary on the subsequent, "If ye then being *evil*—how much more *God*" See in the subsequent verses the clearest comment, if such be still required, on these parables which—in merciful condescension, and with a truthfulness which conceals nothing—represent the highest love of the heavenly Father even in that (evil) yielding of man to importunity of requests. Comp. chap. xviii. 2. "Who among you has a *friend* (not to speak of any nearer relationship) whom he thinks and believes to be such, and will not use him and request his aid in time of distress?" This is the first question, to which is added the second: "And do you think that this friend will keep his door shut in such a case against his importunity and much asking?" The Lord himself gives the answer, "Though he should not yield to the request out of friendship, yet he will do so, overcome by the urgent and importunate appeal to his friendship. Hence, what happiness—to *have* a friend!" This thought by itself is calculated to call forth in the disciples' heart the thought of prayer. "We have a friend and Father, a Hearer of prayer, a Redeemer, and deliverer from evil—in God in heaven! Are not men great unbelievers, who boast of this—and yet make so little or no use of it? To be willing to pray—this is of itself something; to be able to pray, to find true words of prayer, to find in one's heart to pray (2 Sam. vii. 27)—how difficult and hard is this! Are we so *suspicious* even towards fellow-men (who are yet evil)? The Lord in his wisdom describes a time of sudden and unexpected distress, which drives the one to ask, to the great inconvenience of him who is to give. About *midnight*, when the Orientals like to travel in the coolness of the night, a friend arrives late from his journey, and hungry; his friend and host has nothing in his house wherewith to refresh him, but he *has* his friend and neighbor, who must have something to help him, To him he goes; and, without many apologies, knocks loudly at the door, with the word φίλε: "*Thou art my friend*, and if thou dost not help me out of this present difficulty, I cannot believe that thou art my friend." He speaks as if the other must help him, without delay or hesitation; specially because he requests a favor not so much for himself as for one who is again his friend. Ἐπειδὴ φίλος παρεγένετο, "for a friend has come," probably without μοῦ, "my" (or with it, supposing it to be a genuine reading)—thus appeals to the community of friendship: "It is for a common friend, for my friends must necessarily be also thine! Therefore, come now and give me, though it be midnight, three loaves (the Jews baked flat loaves, probably each was sufficient for one person). For, I must offer him one; I must, as is customary, eat one with him, or, at least, break it; and I must also have a third, for propriety's sake, and in case he should be very hungry."

Verse 7. He *from within*—that is, in the warm comfortable repose of the first sound sleep, in which doubtless one likes least to be interrupted—refuses at first in an unfriendly manner, as happens not rarely among men. He gives him short reason for refusing the request so shortly worded; does not prefix a kind φίλε, "friend!" but instead of it, a cross and angry, "Trouble me not at midnight, thou intruder! The door is *already* shut (to unbolt the bars was not so easily or quickly done in those days); my little children are with me in bed; I certainly ought not to neglect them, or waken them, in order to help such impertinent night-disturbing friends; that, indeed, would be too much to ask of any one!" Παιδία, "children," cannot mean, as some understand it, servants and domestics: "they also are asleep, there is nobody in the house to get up on your account!" Also κοίτη does not mean chamber, but *bed*; "I have brought them to bed with all the necessary care and trouble, I do not wish to have any more κόπους, or pains, I am glad they are all asleep." In passing, the Lord thus throws a kind glance into the details of domestic life.* "In short, I *can-*

* Bengel, in his *Gnomon*, for once passes over the question in a superficial manner.

* Alford observes beautifully that the *mother* does

not get up again to go to thee; that is, of course, I do not wish to do it; here is the limit to our *friendship*." This, in general, and all the circumstantial features form a contrast to the Friend in heaven, who never gives such an answer (though it may at first seem so to unbelief). God does not sleep, he never shuts his door against us; he has no favorite children who divert his attention from us; he does not think it a trouble to hear and to grant, and though man sometimes is really *not able* to help, yet God is always both willing and able.

Verse 8 But even evil men, thus the Lord returns to the object of his teaching, are inclined and yield in the end (almost against their will), when continued perseverance in asking overcomes them. He pre-supposes that the man without continues his request with importunity, and does not allow himself to be refused; herein consists the ἀναιδεία or boldness which asks and urges, till the person asked is ashamed (2 Kings ii. 17, עַד־בּוֹשׁ). Though he was not willing to *give*—rising out of friendship; yet he will now *rise* and give on account of the importunity of the asker; and if he is once up, will give all that is necessary for his friend.

Thus it is between us and God, who is so well pleased with importunity of prayer, that he encourages us to it; and that importunity he evokes by at first refusing. But who is meant by the third person in the parable, the friend from the journey? Primarily, doubtless, my fellow-man; for, the parable indicates by this delicate feature that all our prayer is to be and may be likewise *intercession* for others, according to the desire of charity. It is in this manner that Chrysostom applies the parable: "If a weary friend, who is not able to find truth, comes to thee and asks thee questions, and thou hast no answer for his hungering soul, then, even though thou shouldst be satisfied with thy simple faith, search the Scriptures and pray to the Lord on his behalf." But yet since immediately afterwards, in vers. 9–13, reference is made to the wants of the person himself who is praying, it is clear that, according to the real and deeper significance of the *friend*, the friend for whom I am to pray is myself. In the parable it renders the request, so to say, more noble and worthy of being granted, that it refers not to the petitioner himself; that he gives trouble not on his own account; thus suggesting to the friend he importunes what he himself would do in a similar case for his friend. But with God such distinction is not necessary; he is pleased and satisfied that we should consider ourselves as the first and nearest subject of our prayers. Thus Meyer remarks very beautifully and correctly: "When the heart, which has been away on a journey, returns suddenly at midnight (in the time of greatest darkness and distress) home to us, that is, comes to itself and feels hunger, and we have nothing wherewith to satisfy it,* God requires of us *bold importunate faith*." True, if we were not poor sinners, who have forfeited all our rights, who have no claims to bring forward, but justly deserve to be rejected by God—then indeed there would be no mention of being ashamed or not ashamed to ask; and moreover let us bear in mind that Christ tells us to *pray*, not to put forward claims. Whenever we look on ourselves and our merit, we must feel ashamed, but whenever we look to God and his mercy in Christ, then we need not feel ashamed.

Thus, we also belong to the children *within*; and, resting on the sure ground of the divine promise we are not merely to ask, but to *knock* without ceasing, till the door is opened and the gift bestowed. The Son has thus commanded us in the Father's name (κἀγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν); and he who remains behind and is ashamed, after such a command—*he* is the bold and daring man with his unbelief and disobedience! God would blame us for this in truth and faithfulness; just as the friend might have said with partial truth, if the other had *not* come to him, "Why did you not apply to me in your difficulty? Did you doubt my friendship, or think that it lasted only during the day?"

Verses 9, 10. Thus asking helps in the end—frequently even in the case of men, who are evil—but always and certainly with our heavenly Father. This yielding of God to our importunity is not an anthropomorphism, as the learned people say; for in that case our praying also would be no reality. But it *is* a reality in the relation subsisting between a *living* God and his *free* creatures. "That a stone is inexorable, and that a free being is placable, are things which it is possible to prove or to refute by experience, thus putting an end to all philosophical counter-arguments; though, in spite, or rather to the rectification, of our Sophia, it is certainly always in favor of our *Philo*-sophia" (Pfenninger). Therefore our duty is to *give no rest* to the Lord, as all Scripture exhorts us and encourges us by innumerable examples. In the ninth verse already is contained, though not explicitly, "Thus ask *God* my Father and your Father!" and in the thirteenth verse the application is expressed distinctly. Hereby we are also taught that the Lord designed this parable to be applied in this manner; not indeed that we should go and without discrimination act upon it in our intercourse with friends, quoting this instance and saying that friends are to importune their friends. This parable, as all others, only takes what happens in real life and makes use of it, without praise or recommendation. It is possible that the man, to

not appear, in order to preserve the dignity of the parable; and points out that, in the parables which place the husband before us, the bride in a similar way does not appear.

* Comp. *Blätter für höhere Wahrheit*, v. 45–53, and the whole exposition of the passage, of which we have made use in our remarks.

whom the guest came at midnight, could have baked himself a few cakes instead of disturbing the other in his night's rest; at least this would have been more considerate. But if you go to the *right* door when you are in distress, you will learn not to annoy poor mortals by your loud knocking. However, we would not express it so strongly as Meyer does: "Christ rather wished to *castigate* a mode of conduct which is allowable in our spiritual relation to God, but not in our earthly relations to our fellow-men," as if Christ intended here to reprove the *inconsiderate* troubling and importuning of our friends and brethren, robbing them of their time and rest, not considering whether or not the friend has children with him to take care of, etc. No; importunity is represented here, in the first instance, as something praiseworthy; thus furnishing the point of comparison, viz., trust in our friend. But, at the same time, and as a secondary point, it is represented that he who is within has as much right to think his friend importunate and disturbing, as the other has to knock at the door. And this is the result: the more we seek God and knock at his door with earnest faith, the more we shall lose that impetuosity, which seeks only the help of man; the mere apt shall we be to bear in mind considerately and prudently, that a poor and sinful man *cannot* give and help, except God gives it to him for us.

Verses 11—13. *Father* is more than *friend;* and yet even an earthly *father*, among us who are evil, is infinitely less than than what the great God is willing to be, and really *is* to his children. This is the new connection in which the word (which we explained in our remarks on the Sermon on the Mount) appears in this passage. The thought is expressed with greater force in the additional illustration of the *egg*, which, compared with necessary food, is something superfluous, and is asked, perhaps playfully, in the full and hearty confidence of the child; and to which the scorpion (referring possibly to chap. x. 19), resembling the fish outwardly (not hidden in it), forms the strongest contrast. In the one case ἀγαθὰ (δόματα), "good things (gifts)"—here the Holy Spirit, as the gift of gifts, the best of all gifts, with very clear allusion to the proper object of our asking from God.* For God gives, while in the parable the man is represented only as lending. This is the gift of the true *bread*, on which man properly lives, most truly interpreted in the "give" of the fourth petition (ver. 3). If any feel inclined to play with the words of wisdom, they may imagine that here are the three breads of the three following petitions; although this is not to be called exegesis. Ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, "your heavenly Father;" this refers back to the preceding address, ver. 2, supplying what was there omitted;† and conveys to the hearts of the disciples the assurance, "Ye are not like the children; can ye not pray?" In the transition to what alone remains, as spiritual need, the limit is also pointed out where an apparent denial is the best answer to our prayers for earthly objects.

---

* We do not, however, by any means, understand that the scope and connection positively demand something definite, corresponding to the figure—the Holy Spirit as the food of the soul; and consequently that the indefinite expression ἀγαθά at Matt. vii. is a generalizing of the original expression, as Neander supposes. We rather find a prayer for the Holy Spirit to be in accordance with a later period, and not in harmony with the Sermon on the Mount.

† Here observe: When we address God he is ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, and, when he answers us, he is ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (Alford).

THE BENEDICTION PRONOUNCED UPON HIS MOTHER TRANSFERRED TO ALL.

(Luke xi. 28.)

We have already given our opinion upon the harmonistic relation of the entire section, ch. xi. 17–36, to Matt. xii. 25–45; expressing upon this latter passage our conviction that they record one and the same discourse, founded upon one and the same incident—whether the point of time, not definitely marked in either of the three Evangelists, be determined by Matthew or by Luke. Adhering, however, to our firm principle, we give the preference to Matthew's arrangement of our Lord's discourses; when, therefore, Luke interrupts, in vers. 27, 28, by an interjected word, the general discourse, the conclusion of which he had already given us before, we must necessarily assume that this apostrophe of the woman, and our Lord's answer, had occurred in the meantime. But, whether in the midst of the discourse itself (Matthew's *extract* gives us no appropriate point of connection for it) or at its close, parallel with what is related in Matt. xii. 46–50, Mark iii. 31–35, and what Luke himself has already recorded in ch. viii. 19–21—who shall determine? We manifestly see that the otherwise so well-informed Luke is indistinct in the chronology of these things generally. The ἐν τῷ λέγειν ταῦτα, "while he said these things," ver. 27, may refer to the immediately preceding words, and to that supposition we prefer to adhere; but they may also refer to the entire discourse, the order of which was different from that given by him.

It is remarkable that in close succession, or in direct connection, the Lord took a double occasion to decline for his mother any distinctive honor—once in respect to her own person, and once in respect to the woman who blessed her in the crowd. It is very natural that his answer should be on both occasions alike. It has been said that the well-meaning outcry of the woman "stands here very affectionately between the malicious blasphemy and the less malicious demand of a sign." It does, indeed, *so stand here*, but Matthew shows that this was not the historical sequence of the circumstance. And was the outcry *affectionate?* That would be the case only if it sprang from an earnest feeling and deep understanding; but we doubt this very much, and for our own part see in it, not indeed a wickedly intended, but still a most artlessly unintelligent, outcry of mere womanly feeling.* Thus it would be better to say—How serenely the Lord here stands betwixt malicious vituperation on the one hand, and unenlightened empty praise on the other! The woman's "devout attention" to the Lord's solemn discourse had apprehended no more than that this man can speak, and teach, and preach with most wonderful force and interest; and she gives this idle commendation, moreover, to his mere human personality, for she, like a true woman, pronounces the *mother* blessed who had borne and bred a son like this.* "O how must thy mother rejoice over thee—would that I were she!" What a mournful contrast to the entirely opposite feeling which, according to Mark iii. 20, 21, at this very time filled the mind of that mother of Jesus!

The Lord's answer hardly refers *to that*, but rather to the point, that his mother as such had no preeminent sanctity or blessedness; and it is the impulse of the Spirit which prompts him to take every occasion to rebuke prospectively that future Mariolatry, the innocent germ of which was heard in such an apostrophe as this woman's. By the μενοῦνγε, "yea, rather," standing first, he concedes all that is true and right—that to have borne him was indeed her honor; but at the same time he corrects the false distinction. Only *because* Mary had received the word of God with such entire and unhesitating faith, had she received that honor. "Blessed are they who rightly *hear the word of God;* and not as thou hearest it, O woman, who fallest so readily from the solemn matter spoken to the mother of him who speaks it!" In repudiating the praise, and repelling all consideration for his human person as such, he does not say—*My* word; but only testifies that he speaks the *word of God*, in the comprehensiveness of meaning which includes all that had ever been spoken in human ears, and all that would yet be revealed for man's salvation. "My mother," he will say, "is only on that account blessed, because she has heard, and treasured up in faith, the word spoken to herself;" see Luke i. 45; ii. 19, 51. The *keeping* God's word is partly the test of *true* hearing; partly its fruit and consequence, which must never be wanting; first, however, the "providence treasuring up of deep words" of God, which, though not fully understood then, will be better understood afterwards, as we see in the case of Mary herself; but then, also, the actual fruit-bearing after receiving the seed, the *doing* which must follow the hearing of the word, Luke viii. 15, 21. The entire saying is itself in its universal comprehensiveness given for the hearing, pondering, and keeping. What the conception and bringing forth of Jesus was,

* No "child-like devotion" of this "affectionate woman"—no such "expression of a simple love" as the Lord would *approve* (Braune).

* Not the *nurse* in addition, as Thiess inferred from the words.

in the case of Mary, the Lord shows in its spiritual and essential fulfilment in all who receive his word for the new birth of their souls, and in this sense become like his mother (Luke viii. 21). This apparently slight circumstance is a genuine type of what has, alas! been realised in after times; bearing in itself the germ of that which is typified. Instead of doing like Mary, and becoming like Mary, the Church turning away (in secret self-pleasing) from the word *of God* to the human Child who was brought forth, deifies the lowly one, and dishonors her lowliness by the unseemly and unbefitting *θεότοκος, Mother of God.* What is the preaching of the Reformation, as opposed to this, more than the word which the Lord here speaks? In their council of Trent they heard not that voice, but repelled it with anathema—for a *Maranatha* to themselves!

AN EARLIER WOE TO THE PHARISEES AND SCRIBES.

(Luke xi. 39–52 [Matt. xxiii. 2–39.])

That which the Lord uttered against the Scribes and Pharisees in his solemn final condemnation, had been prepared long before; for, while many of his longer discourses originated in the circumstances of the moment, many of them, on the other hand, were from time to time *collected* by himself, and by degrees prepared and reserved for final and most weighty utterance. We have here a remarkable testimony and example of this latter; the Lord speaks, in a narrower circle and in a more restricted manner, a great part of what was afterwards spoken in a more extended connection. These judgment-formulas were formed and shaped, as it were, within his soul; and an occasion from without calls them, in all their preliminary and prospective solemnity, readily to his lips. Thus it were better for us to say, that he now *anticipates* this impending farewell of these fools and blind, than that he *repeats* later what had earlier been spoken.

A Pharisee invited him to a meal,* and, undoubtedly, with a false heart, as at ch. xiv. 1, and vii. 36. They watch him invidiously, to see how he will demean and express himself; and with all the less restraint on that account, yea, with a deportment which was immediately offensive, like a challenge in their own house, he *εἰσελθὼν ἀνέπεσεν*, "went in and sat down to meat," without further ado, designedly omitting the Pharisaical washing (see on Matt. xv. 2). While the Pharisee wondered at such boldness, the Lord's searching answer would anticipate his thoughts before they found utterance.† As to the perfectly justified "divine dispensing with civilities," which the Lord exhibits, who is Lord, even while he is guest, Ebrard has well said, in reply to the unjustified censure of the critic—"I will warrant the worthy Strauss, that if the Lord were at *his* table in the present day, He would be just as *uncivil!*" Everything has its time, the cutting severity and the patient benignity; and the Lord knew full well what was on this occasion seasonable. There must, indeed, have been assembled around this *ἄριστον*, or "dinner," a company that held themselves select and purified; and the Lord only expressed to them in his word and act, what their secret guiltiness had already prepared for them in his heart.

The discourse divides itself into two parts, each of which embraces *three* woes, ordered thus in precise and solemn number, though not like the perfected seven of the later enumeration. The first portion is directed against the hypocrisy of the Pharisees; but as a *lawyer* (*νομικός* is, as ver. 53 shows, almost the same as the former, but indicating more definitely the office) expressly vindicates his own caste, the second is directed against the conduct of the lawyers particularly, in whom was especially concentrated the guilt of the general unbelief of the people, and its condemnation.* At the outset, *hypocrisy*, which cleanses the outside instead of the inward part, is, without a woe and half in irony, rebuked—the immediate occasion being found in the washings upon which the Pharisees laid such stress, but at the same time, making that the type of their own proper character and conduct, vers. 39–41. (Afterwards in Matt. xxiii. this is the middle one of the three subsequent and final woes.) The three woes, which are the first here, follow for the more definite description of the Pharisaic *spirit*—their petty externality in the fulfilment of the law instead of minding its essential substance; the

* And, indeed, *ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι*, which, without *ταῦτα*, appears to have reference to what had immediately preceded—"while He was engaged in this conversation;" but, as this can hardly be reconciled with harmonistic considerations, especially when the mass of matter connected together in Luke is taken into account, we may translate with Ebrard—When on one occasion He was thus speaking.

† Schleiermacher's useless refinement imagined that our Lord would have washed at a *δεῖπνον*, and that the Pharisee took it ill that his *ἄριστον* was not equally honored. These two words are not to be so rigorously distinguished; as we have already remarked.

* The man means to say—That touches *us* with them (a soft way of saying—particularly), for we furnish the Pharisees with their *theory*, which it is our office to sustain. Is all our glorious learning naught, or of evil? The Lord answers at first by merely placing them also on a level with the others; but then in ver. 52 follows the specific portion for these theorists.

proud lust of honor and rank connected with this; although under the covering of their hypocrisy nothing existed but spiritual death! (Afterwards in Matt. xxiii. 23, 27, this becomes the fifth and seventh woe, but the intermediate one here is there singled out in vers. 6, 7.) We see that the whole has its own connection and orderly procedure here, though a different one from that other; for, it is the wonderful nature of these pregnant utterances of the Lord that they may be strung on a variety of threads. Now, when the bold lawyer appropriated to himself what had been said, although the Lord had only named the Pharisees—a marvellously daring acknowledgment of a smitten conscience, which straightway complains that this charge inculpates us also—these lawyers receive their portion over and above, still heavier than the former, though not exempting them from the application of that likewise. We see that the *wisdom of God* in Jesus (ver. 49) finds it now reasonable and right to cast down the presumptuous wickedness of sinners with especial severity; in order to deprive them of every reason for thinking that he did not penetrate their hearts, or was afraid before them. And our critical prudence should also rest contented with that. The *Pharisees*, as such, had been previously described *in themselves*, according to their own spirit and character; the νομικοί, on the other hand, the *teachers* of others, receive their three woes on account of their *dealing with the people*. First we have, once more, the universal and comparatively gentle description—Laying burdens upon others, which themselves not even touched! ver. 46 (Matt. xxiii. 4). And, as this would instantly place them in humiliating comparison with the ancient prophets, therefore the holy and anointed messengers of God, vers. 47, 48, quickly pursue the topic, and with words which in Matt. xxiii. constitute the summing up of the seven woes into an eighth. Similarly, the charge against the generation, and its condemnation, follow in vers. 49–51, just as they follow there in vers. 34–36. But then, as these words are not a concluding and farewell discourse, it is quite natural (we might say, necessary) that the close here should turn back as we find it does—the third woe, ver. 52 (analogous to the first, ver. 46; there, however, concerning the law, but now also concerning the way of penitence and salvation in order to the εἰσέρχεσθαι or "entrance" into the kingdom of heaven), first describes in all its enormity the character of these lawyers, as being fatal to their own well-being, and ruinous to others. This *last* woe of our present discourse becomes afterwards in Matt. xxiii. the *first:* for the Lord seems to recall then his former words, and, beginning again what is in part the same discourse, commences at the point where he had ended before.

Verses 39–41. The νῦν, "*now*" at the beginning can scarcely be made to indicate, as many think, that this is a fragment of a longer discourse unskilfully extracted, the true commencement of which is not given: it is much more in keeping to regard it as a הִנֵּה, or "*Behold*," which makes an ironical allusion to what was then just occurring.* The Lord sets out from that which met his eyes at the repast, beginning at once—"I mark, indeed, that ye Pharisees are very zealous in washing *the outside*, whether of the cups and platters or the *hands* of your own persons; alas, that ye should forget the *inward part*, which is the main concern, the purification of the heart and life!" The connection of his words with the washing of hands, which here gives rise to all, makes it evident that τὸ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν, "*your* inward part," hastening as it does to its great object, refers to the individual persons of the Pharisees themselves, who deal with themselves as with their cups and platters (and even the singular here derives significance from this). (The τὰ ἐνόντα, afterwards has a quite different meaning; and τῷ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν instead of αὐτῶν can neither be explained by—"the contents of the vessels belonging to you," nor "the manner and way in which they are handled and used in the house.") The following verse is very commonly regarded as a question, ὁ ποιήσας, "he that made," being referred to God; so Meyer corrects the Luth. version—"Did not He that made that which is without, make that which is within also?" The inference drawn from this—Is not this also to be purified before Him who is the *Creator* of the soul or the inner man? seems to us to be very inapplicable here. We cannot see how the observation, which holds good of every possible thing, and of much that is different within and without, that the inward and outward part *originate from the same Creator*, should be supposed to lead to the conclusion—that therefore they necessarily belong together! Still less can we understand why just *here* the reference to the ποιήσας should be introduced as a reason, since He most certainly did not create the *unclean* inner man as such; and we think Luther's original text more conformable to the sense, although he uses a paraphrase which gives up the literal words. The significant parallel, Matt. xxiii. 26, which runs—*Cleanse* first that which is within, that the outside *may be clean also!* shows us that ποιεῖν here signifies *purgare*, a meaning which is very suitable and alone gives the sense in its simplicity. The lexicographers vindicate this use of the word, which is found also in later languages; deducing it from the placing any thing in a certain condition, making it what it should be, thus, according to circumstances, cleansing, putting right, etc. Wahl and Schöttgen cite, particularly, 2 Sam. xix. 24. Thus the clause is a simple statement, telling these *fools* the plain truth which they had altogether forgotten—that He who has done all to, or purified that which is without, has not *thereby* put to rights or made clean that which is within; but has that much harder work yet to

* This explanation pleases us, at least better than Lange's subtle interpretation, which goes at once too far—*Even now*, with all the wickedness of your inward parts, ye care so much about external purification!

do.* As it respects ver. 41, we can, again, scarcely understand why most expositors are so earnest in protesting against the supposition of an *ironical* meaning (Erasmus so understood it, and many afterwards, among whom we may mention Lightfoot and Kuinoel); for we find it impossible, as Schleiermacher also does, to understand it otherwise.† Is not the severity of scorn perfectly in harmony with the tone of the whole discourse, and does not this re-appear most decidedly in vers. 47, 48? Can we suppose that *here*, confronting these Pharisees, the Lord would positively lay down this clause concerning the meritoriousness of almsgiving, which, however correctly to be understood in itself, ever *presupposes* a right spirit of apprehension, or else is fatally abused? This would be the only explicit doctrine and exhortation in the whole discourse, which else contains nothing but condemnation—and this is reason enough, in fact, for understanding it otherwise. The Pharisees assuredly gave away alms enough, as we know, and might, consequently, have been altogether unable to understand the Lord. But, in fact, they understood him much better than his modern expositors; for, the giving alms of the contents of their platters,‡ and then saying "All is now pure, all is right!" *was just their way.* This the Lord can only be regarded as now reproving; it is impossible that he could be recommending it in earnest *to them*, for they would have mocked him with the answer—O Master, we *give*, indeed, diligently and plentifully enough! It would be like saying to the feasters at our modern free-mason and other feasts—Let the poor have a collection, and the matter is pure and sanctified! No, the Lord would here say to the Pharisees—Your custom to purify *robbery* by *almsgiving*, touches only that which is *outward*, as ye hypocrites well know! He expresses this scornfully in the Imperative (which should not be advanced as an argument against the ironical sense), and his well known application is—Do this as much as ye may, ye will not thereby avoid the woe! The καὶ ἰδού, "and behold" (corresponding with the νῦν at the beginning), speaks also for this view; as well as the καθαρὰ ὑμῖν ἐστι, "are clean *unto you*;" which indicates the condemned, facile mode of their cleansing *everything* in their conduct—*before your eyes;* with which, finally, as a final evidence, the following Ἀλλ' οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, "But woe unto you," comes into sharp contrast. This ἀλλά would have, indeed, no meaning, if the previous clause did not refer to a *false* justification on the part of the Pharisees. Neander says correctly—"You cannot with this mock piety satisfy the law of God, and escape His judgments; but *woe unto you!*" Therefore we have not here, as in Matt. xxiii. 23, express mention of their passing over the exhibition of the ἔλεος, or *mercy*, towards their neighbors.

Verse 49. The remainder of the discourse has been already explained upon Matt. xxiii., save that "the words of the wisdom of God" in this verse demand some comment. Hereafter the Lord places himself, at his public and solemn concluding discourse in the temple, openly before them thus—*Behold I send!* placing himself in the stead of the God who gave them prophets and preachers; but now, at the table of a Pharisee, such dignified *majesty* in his words would have been unsuitable: he therefore veils it, as it were, in the spirit which we have before exhibited as the significant distinction between the earlier and the later discourse. It scarcely needs proof that this entire sentence, which continues through vers. 50, 51, and closes with Λέγω ὑμῖν, "I say unto you," can be no quotation of any passage in Scripture—though this strange opinion had been advanced, and Morus speculates on a lost book with this title. The Lord refers, immediately and first, to the wisdom of God, who sends that wisdom which manifested itself in its messengers, and which was justified in its believing children against all unbelievers; and probably not without allusion to ch. vii. 35.* He then places this wisdom, which sendeth the genuine prophets and messengers from age to age with the simple truth, in marked contrast with the blind scribes who boast themselves in their useless and unused key of *knowledge.*† But, finally, it is very plain (as the parallel in Matt. xxiii., which must be retrospectively brought to explain this, shows) that he signifies himself in the undertone of this name; for not merely in him is the wisdom of *God* to be heard in a higher sense than in Solomon (ver. 31, in this chapter); but he is himself, as all true Scribes in Israel might understand, the only-begotten Son of God, the personal, hypostatical Wisdom, which *speaketh* in all the

* Alford wonders that I adopt this view, which gives "the most frigid sense imaginable;" but our taste here differs—the reference to the Creator seems to me indefinitely general and almost meaningless.

† Even Neander inclines to the ironical meaning: "But, on the other hand, where Christ employs this mode of teaching (giving a specific instead of a general precept), the peculiar *kind* of special injunction that he gives is always determined by the character of his hearers; and *almsgiving* would have been an inapt injunction to *Pharisees*, who, as we learn from the Sermon on the Mount, made great show and display thereof." "If the words were not spoken ironically, it must seem strange that Christ, whose design was to aim at the *disposition of the heart*, should have laid down anything so easily perverted into opus operatum." And in this we quite concur.

‡ Τὰ ἐνόντα (Vulg. *quod superest*) is obviously no more than ἐκ τῶν ἐνόντων; it requires no explanation, that all was not to be given. Morus adds—quantum fieri potest. We cannot understand how this ἐνόντα (as Neander thinks) should be applied, like ἔσωθεν previously (as contrasted with ἔξωθεν, ver. 39), to the inner being of the man.

* This view, even if we look no further, sufficiently explains the expression on our Lord's lips. With any transformation of the "citation" according to subsequent Christian phraseology (Twesten and Neander) we can have nothing to do.

† We have already shown, on Matt. xxiii. 13, that the knowledge is itself the key.

prophets and in all the bearers of Divine revelation—see Prov. i. 20; viii. 1, 12, 22–31. Thus does the Lord "utter his eternal dicta in the style of an ancient prophecy," as Von Gerlach says, holding fast the truth.* One might almost say that the Lord in his passing use of this expression would give the true key for understanding the *Book* of *Wisdom*, developed as it is from canonical elements, containing the purest gnosis of Israelitish faith, and stretching forth, as it does, in its principles, towards the New Testament revelation. But this we would only throw out in passing, and not for captious application.

THE DISCIPLES WARNED AGAINST HYPOCRISY, FEAR OF MAN, AND LITTLENESS OF FAITH.

(Luke xii. 1–12 [Matt. xvi. 6; x. 26–33; xii. 31, 32; x. 19, 20].)

All of these are sayings which were uttered, according to Matthew, on an earlier occasion, and in another connection, some of which also appear again in Luke's Gospel, as ch. viii. 17; xxi. 14, 15. The Evangelist here binds them together as a connected discourse spoken in immediate connection with the preceding. The people had in the meantime crowded together in unwonted numbers;† whether surrounding the Lord for his protection, as it were, against the excited and wrathful Scribes and Pharisees, ch. xi. 53, 54—or waiting without in eager anxiety for the breaking up of the repast—or, if that be preferred, accidentally gathered together. In the hearing of these the Lord now utters a discourse, strictly related to that immediately preceding, the condemnatory spirit of which it still retains. It is directed to *his disciples*, indeed, yet evidently with a view to its being heard and pondered by the people at large and the Pharisees. He goes on to teach these latter that he feared not to rebuke publicly before the people without, as he had rebuked secretly at their table, the *hypocrisy* which the light of his truth detected (and in which they had invited him and listened to his words); the poor deceived people, so far as they were disposed to come over to *his* discipleship, he warns against false masters; and, finally, he solaces his disciples' minds in the prospect of the enmity which might be excited against them, reminding them of most appropriate sayings which they had already heard, though they had not yet learned them fully—to wit, that they themselves were called to sustain the same testimony to the truth which he sustained, and with equal warfare and opposition of man. Only guard yourselves against hypocrisy, by contemplating the judgment which will finally make all things manifest, as also by keeping in mind the ever-increasing publicity which will speedily be given to the preaching of all truth! vers. 1–3. "As my followers, friends, and companions in the office of this testimony, fear not men, but *fear* that true enemy and murderer of souls (see on Matt. x. 28); *trusting* in your God and Father, who numbereth the hairs of your head!" vers. 4–7. "In order to the compensation in the judgment, the *confessing me* before men, and not denying, is the great essential; he who commits an offence against me may find forgiveness, but he who withstands and contradicts the Holy Ghost in His full testimony—ye know what I said once before to these Pharisees concerning that!" vers. 8–10. (See on Matt. xii. 31.) "Therefore do ye, in the time to come, in direct opposition to the sin *against* the Holy Ghost, place your absolute reliance upon the promised aid which ye shall receive *from* Him," vers. 11, 12.

Thus far the connection is clear. But when many, after the interruption, vers. 13–21, find in the paragraph of vers. 22–59 a continuation of the same connection—that is, of this present warning and instruction to the disciples, we must demur. For, the whole has in itself too general a meaning; nor will the recurrence of such correlative thoughts as we find in ver. 32, *Fear not!* ver. 56, *ye hypocrites!* ver. 51, *divisions*, dispose us to determine that the whole was but one discourse. Thus much, however, remains certain, that our Lord turns once more to his disciples again, while, in ver. 54, he appeals to the people at large, reproving their Pharisaic thoughts. For the rest, the section vers. 1–12 has for its *leading theme* hypocrisy and the fear of man. But ver. 15 begins a distinctive warning of another kind, making prominent the difference between *earthly* and *heavenly* thought; *care* for the body and this life, and seeking *treasure in heaven;* Christian *prudence* in regard to the future recompense.

The details have already been expounded. It appears to us certain that πρῶτον, "first," in ver. 1, belongs to προσέχετε, *Beware*, and not to λέγειν, *to say;* for this was not the first warning against the Pharisees and their leaven, and any distinction here between a first time now, and a second time to the disciples in ver. 22, seems quite inappropriate. But that sincerity might be called the first thing of all, and, consequently, that the warning against hypocrisy might be introduced with a πρῶτον προσέχετε, *first beware*, is abundantly clear. On vers. 2, 3,

* The allusion to 2 Chron. xxiv. 19, which Alford lays so much stress upon, seems to us forced and inapplicable, since the question is still about the *wisdom*.

† The καταπατεῖν, ver. 1, is hyperbolical; not intimating that they actually trode one upon another.

consult page 182 on the parallel passage, where there are some specific remarks on this of Luke; and on the speaking in *closets* compare 2 Kings vi. 12. Further, it is to be observed on ver. 4, that the Lord designedly says, in special confidence and with universal invitation—*you, my friends!* Ver. 10 is so strictly connected with vers. 8, 9, that it tends to mitigate the threatening against denial of himself, and limits the utmost severity of retribution to the final persistency in self-willed and inveterate sin. In vers. 11, 12, there is opposed to this the simple, unfearing, confident obedience under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost; intermediate thoughts may have been omitted, since the record only makes prominent the significant sayings as they recurred here on a specific occasion.

THE PEOPLE AND THE DISCIPLES WARNED AGAINST VARIOUS FOLLY: COVETOUSNESS, AND EARTHLINESS OF MIND; LACK OF WATCHFULNESS AND FIDELITY IN THE DISCIPLES; FOLLY OF THE PEOPLE IN NOT OBSERVING THE PRESENT DAY OF GRACE, AND THINKING OF THE COMING JUDGMENT.

(Luke xii. 14–59 [Matt. vi. 25–33, vi. 19–21, xxiv. 42–51, x. 34–36, xvi. 2, 3, v. 25, 26].)

After a specific parable, occasioned by an inopportune and foolish appeal, we have here various sayings which, with some few additions, had been either spoken earlier, or were subsequently repeated. Not that Luke or his "reporter" has inserted a portion of the Sermon on the Mount; nor that Matthew, in ch. xxiv. and in his Sermon, borrowed various sayings from this place. These parallels between the two Evangelists should simply impress upon our minds the conviction that our Lord ofttimes did what every diligent teacher of unapt scholars must constantly do—repeat in his condescending patience the words which only by incessant repetition could be eternally imprinted on the minds of those who heard them. We cannot see, for our own part, why this *could* not have been the case in "longer discourses, which correspond word for word"—for those longer discourses would, of course, be less likely to be understood, at one hearing, than the shorter proverbial sayings; and precisely *such*, therefore, we should expect to find repeated. The idea which lies at the root of all such critical suspicion is this, that the Lord must necessarily have been more solicitous about the originality of his own teaching than the benefit of those whom he taught.* This may be the case with us presumptuous mortals, but with respect to him let it be for ever rejected as utterly unworthy; and let every man reflect how, in his own experience, the most profoundly pondered thoughts adhere longest to the memory in the very words which expressed them first. All these difficulties will then vanish.

The man in the company, ver. 13, had been a foolish listener; and while our Lord had been speaking of matters infinitely momentous, and finally, concerning the Holy Spirit, *he* had been thinking of *his own*, and not the heavenly, inheritance. He now breaks out into an interruption concerning a strife between himself and another, touching matters of personal property. The man of God had shown himself so fearless and impartial in his contest with the Pharisees, that this injured person feels disposed to select him for an arbitrator between himself and his elder brother, who, being in possession and in administration, refused to give his younger brother his rightful portion.* Now this singular and inopportune appeal itself betrayed the improper zeal of his πλεονεξία, or "covetousness," in a matter which might indeed be just; the Lord therefore condemns—and this was his own only function—both the man in particular and the people in general, for the folly of such entire devotion to worldly good. When he turns in ver. 22 to the disciples again, he does not take up the interrupted thread of his former discourse where ver. 12 left it; but adheres to the subject which this interruption had introduced, though not without retaining some echoes of what he had before been saying. The fundamental idea, which binds all together down to ver. 59, lies in the Ἄφρον, *thou fool!* of ver. 20. The Lord rebukes the folly of the mind which fixes its thoughts upon the *earthly* instead of the heavenly, upon the present life instead of the future and its concomitant reckoning before God; warning the *people* as well as the *disciples* against it with profound earnestness. First comes the *people's* warning against covetousness, with a reference to being rich towards God, vers. 15–21. Then follows a warning to the *disciples*, arising out of the former, against heathenish worldly thought and care; a

* [The reasons assigned by those who maintain the non-repetition of our Lord's discourses are, rather: first, the improbability on the part of One who was so terse, varied, and fertile in his teachings; and secondly, the fact that *impromptu* speakers rarely repeat their remarks in the same form, much less in the same words.—Am. Ed.]

* Brauno thinks it probable that he wanted to share equally with his elder brother; but we see no reason for this.

warning which in their case would naturally lead to more specific inculcation of the heavenly spirituality of mind which became *their* character, and of that *watchfulness* and *fidelity* which was demanded of them in the dispensation and use of the *gifts of grace* intrusted to them, vers. 22–53. (How the concluding words from ver. 49 are connected with this, we shall see in the sequel.) Finally, our Lord returns to the *people*, and addresses to them a warning which adheres to the fundamental idea, cautioning them against the *folly* (learned of their misleaders, ver. 1) of abusing and neglecting the day of grace; of forgetting and putting from them the consideration of the judgment; and of failing to avert that condemnation which it was still in their power to avert, vers. 54–59. Thus, the whole discourse sets out from the wretched *folly* of *men* in thinking to fill the soul with great store of abundance; proceeding to the corresponding *folly* among his poor disciples, in neglecting the kingdom of God in their care for food and clothing; penetrating still deeper in the exhibition of that last folly of the *servants* in not preparing for their Lord's judgment; and turning back again to the most universal *ground-folly* underlying all, viz.: the *refusing to mark*, in spite of reason and conscience, what God is now offering to man's *soul* for its satisfaction, and what He will one day require of that soul. Disciples and people are thus interchangeably addressed; they are distinguished one from the other, and yet so fundamentally blended that each party shall hear only the same things said, according to its own specific point of view.

Verse 14. Assuredly it is not without reproving indignation that the ἄνθρωπε, *Man!* suddenly begins; yet not repelling him as a stranger who concerned him not, for he gives him much better than he asks. Its meaning is—"This appeal of thine is altogether *human* in its earthliness of spirit! Art thou bent upon going to law with thy brother about mammon—*in relation to that* I can help neither thee nor any other man, for to this end I did not come into the world, and have not been commissioned of my Father. Dost thou not yet know him better, whom thou namest διδάσκαλος, *Master?* I am not appointed by God or man to be a δικαστής in general (*judge* or arbiter, Acts vii. 27, 35), or a μεριστής, *divider*, in particular; my kingdom is not of this world, and I meddle not with any earthly judgment or temporal business, so that the enemies of the truth to which I bear witness can never say of me what was there said of Moses." (The form of the expression evidently points to that passage, [Exod. ii. 14,] which Stephen afterwards referred to.) While the Lord thus declines what did not befit his mission, he acknowledges, at the same time, by his κατέστησε, "made," the just prerogative of those who were *appointed* to that end. The word and the example of the Master is of perpetual obligation upon his servants too, warning them ever against injuring the efficiency of their spiritual function by mixing up with it things quite foreign to its character; for the rest, however, 1 Cor. vi. 1–6, is by no means here contradicted, for that which did not become our Lord in relation to "men" without, for whom he had matter of quite different judgment, does strictly and absolutely become *brethren* in relation one to another. *If* Peter and Andrew had not yet left all, but had been at contention about some portion of their possessions (which he might have permitted them still to retain), he would in such a case—unimaginable, however, in itself—have rebuked the contention, and have interposed between "his friends," instead of referring them to any court of human judicature. The ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, *over you*, must be strongly emphasized in strict connection with the ἄνθρωπε, *man*.

Verse 15. And he said *unto them;* that is, not simply to the two brethren (for who can tell if the other was present?), but to all the people. He includes all who were held by the same carnal mind as this one; and administering *his* office, involving a much more weighty condemnation, he warns them against covetousness; employing a popular parable, which, preceded by the most definite expression of his *teaching* (ver. 15), is followed by the most definite expression of his *warning* (ver. 21). But the instruction at the first stands only as the ground of a warning; while the concluding warning points also to a correlative promise. *Take heed* and beware (parallel with κρίνετε ἀφ' ἑαυτων afterwards, ver. 57) of *that* πλεονεξία, or covetousness, which, alas! adheres to and endangers all; that foolish lust of having much, and of having more—that evil spirit and disposition which reduces all your otherwise lawful vindication of your right and of your property, to mere unrighteousness! This is the beginning; and at the end we have reference to the *being rich in God*, without which no earthly possessions can save the soul from destruction. The *doctrine*, which gives the reason for the ὁρᾶτε, "take heed," in the ὅτι, "for," is by no means the utterance of an entirely new truth; it is no more than the simplest expression of a conviction entertained by all men everywhere, established both by external and internal experience; the misapprehension and perversion of which, therefore, can only be condemned as wilful blindness, and sinful folly. The concise expression of the German Bible—*Niemand lebt davon, dass er viele Güter hat!* (Nobody lives from having many good things), perfectly exhibits the obvious meaning, but does not correspond with the more profound order of the original words. That order has been found a difficulty (literally, *for not in the abounding to any one his life is from his possessions*); and some have adopted another reading,* while others have darkened the thought by a perverted construction. It appears to us inconceivable that ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, *from the things which he possesseth;* should belong to περισσεύειν, *abundance*, from which it is so far separated—partly on account of the strangeness of the con-

* That is, adopting αὐτῷ instead of αὐτοῦ; but this is not sufficiently established, so that we adhere to the usual reading as the more simple.

struction, and partly because of the Infinitive followed by ἐκ with its object; and therefore it is wrong to translate—His life doth not consist in this, that a man hath a superabundance *of* or *in* his goods. Schleiermacher's view (following the interpolation of Michaelis, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, "*but* of the possessions"): "Assuredly, a man must live of the goods or of the bread *which he now hath*, but the περισσεύειν, the having more than is absolutely necessary, is of no avail to him"—is equally incorrect as it regards the text, and very much more so as it regards the matter; indeed, it altogether distorts and ruins the profound doctrine taught. Most certainly our Lord, who uttered the great truth of Matt. iv. 4, could not have designed to teach anything so doubtful as that anything creaturely is necessary to a man, *whereof* his life must consist: what he here teaches is essentially the same as his word in the wilderness. But he proceeds from what is altogether evident, that man does not live of superfluity, and strengthens that assertion by further denying that a man's life consists in anything that he may have already; so that instead of the ἀλλά, *but*, which they would interpolate, "not even," would be more appropriately supplied. This alone seems to bring out the fulness of meaning: The life of a man does not depend upon his having abundance, upon (so that it might be said to come from) the good things which he already possesseth. Compare the warning of Ecclus. v. 1 (followed as it is by a saying which our Lord here refers to)—Set not thine heart upon thy χρήματα, or *property*, and say not, αὐτάρκη μοι ἐστι, "*it is sufficient* for me." The thorough understanding of the sentiment is developed in a triple progression. Let the *abundance* be first emphasized; and we are constrained to confess that the having superfluity is not the life, since the man cannot consume all that is in his barns. Then it must be noted, that we do not, properly speaking, live of that which *we have*, be it little or much;* thou dost not live one day longer, because thou hast bread for another day (vers. 19, 20), but rather thou must continue in life if thy bread is to be eaten by thee. Finally, let us seize the full truth which is intimated in ἡ ζωή—God alone gives and sustains man's *life* in every sense; as his lower, bodily life, so also the true life of his *soul*, its rest, its confidence, the satisfaction of its every need, now and for ever. That this is the essential undertone of our Lord's instruction, its exposition in the parable will most clearly show.

Verses 16, 17. A man, a rich man, to whom the περισσεύειν or *abundance* is not wanting, must miserably die, and perish in the sudden horror of night; his *foolish security* fails to assure his life; he *has* more than he can well take care of, but will hold fast all, and solace his soul in the thought of ample provision for the future. But how awfully is the case reversed! He *is* rich already, and is ever becoming richer; his great field (χώρα instead of χωρίον, a strictly classical distinction) has yielded largely in a year of blessing and fruitfulness. The Lord selects the most innocent method of acquiring riches, that which most obviously tended to lead the mind constantly to thankful acknowledgment of God; and thus makes this wretched harvest-joy all the more frightful, and all the more impressive a warning to every man. He thus designedly varies the expression of Ecclus. xi. 18, where an example is given of one who was πλουτῶν ἀπὸ προσοχῆς καὶ φιγγίας αὐτοῦ, rich by strenuous pains and parsimony. The fruits of the earth furnish also the most striking and apposite illustration of the truth which our Saviour enforces, since it is most obvious that the man cannot eat the whole himself. But this the fool in his infatuation does not mark; his τὶ ποιήσω, "*what shall I do?*" with its unhappy answer, is much worse than that of the worldling who was at least wise in his generation, Luke xvi. 3, 4. He does not say with an earnest meaning—What *should* I do? but—What *shall* I do? At best it was—What should, what can I do with it—to store it up in the most effectual manner for myself? Possibly his neighbor's land had not borne with equal plenteousness; certainly there were landless people enough around him who in their poverty would have eased him of his care for the superabundance, and would have well known where to bestow it. The law of Moses, too, reminded him of these by all its provisions for the poor in connection with the gleaning, the sabbath-year, and so forth. But it does not occur to this man that *his own belly* was too small for all his abundance; instead of that he only thinks of his insufficient barns; and the only aim of all his prudent craft is—to *collect together*, and bestow safely, *my* fruits, *all* which has been produced for *me* in my land! This is a man like a hamster.

Verses 18, 19. His riches now cause him much care and disquietude, before his soul can peacefully eat and drink and take content (Psa. xxxix. 6). As he knows only the pains of gathering, nothing of the joy of giving; as he is only troubled about the ποῦ, "where," and ἐκεῖ, "there," of a stately and secure place of heaping up; his abundant harvest only brings him much vain expense of time and money. Καθελῶ, *I will pull down!* This is the schemo of his prudence; and the great work begins with the *destruction* and pulling down of all his ἀποθῆκαι, or *barns* (not merely caves, therefore). If any one spoke to him about it, he would probably in hypocrisy and thanklessness *say* something about the "blessing of God;" but what *he said to himself* runs quite differently. He calls it τὰ γενήματά μου, *my fruits*, thinks only of the field and its produce instead of thinking on God; rests in the μοῦ (the Ger. trans. is quite correct—*mir* gewachsen, grown *unto me*) with-

* That ὑπάρχοντα is always *superfluous possession*, as Richter's *Hausbibel* says, we cannot admit; but in most passages plain evidence is found that it is the general idea for the property which a man has. But comp. ver. 33, and then, *e.g.*, Matt. xix. 21; Acts iv. 32; Luke xiv. 33, xix. 8; Heb. x. 34. The expression which most fully corresponds to it is *provision*, without direct reference to little or much: comp. τὰ παρόντα, Heb. xiii. 5.

out any thought of his neighbor. As Göthe says: "Im Frühling denkt gleich der steife Philister: Das ist für mich und meine Geschwister; Unser Herrgott is so gnädig heuer, Hätt' ich's doch schon in Fach und Scheuer!" (In the spring thinks too the sturdy Philistine: That is for me and my brethren; our Lord is so gracious this year, I have it well nigh in shock and barn.) Then will he say—These are *my goods!* Twice, in designed irony, ἀγαθά, *goods:* not merely as a general term like ἀποθῆκαι, *barns;* but this deeper word is used instead of χρήματα, ὑπάρχοντα, *property, possessions,* and the like, in order to intimate more expressly the unspeakable folly which takes no account of the true ἀγαθόν, or *good. And then,* when the building is done? Now shall his soul find rest: ἀναπαύου, *take thine ease,* points to leisure and repose—φάγε, πίε, *eat, drink,* to ample enjoyment, not without *luxury*—εὐφραίνου, *be merry,* finally, not simply to content and merriment again, but to abiding repose in false *confidence,* as Luther has it—Be of good cheer, there is no more need! The ease he might have much more easily obtained before; and, whether rich or not rich, might have eaten and drunken. If we go on to ask him, once and again—*and then?* When the years have all revolved, and time with thee is ended?—*what follows?* So far onwards he *will* not carry his thought, and the foolish colloquy with his own soul dispels and banishes all such reflections. "Soul, thou *hast*"—is it really and truly *having?* Much *goods*—true goods indeed?—*Laid up*—actually insured against robbery, fire, and what else? For many *years*—but hast thou a store of years, too, laid up in thy barns? His folly was fourfold: he forgot the Giver; appropriated all to himself; counted these things the food of his *soul;* and thought not of the daily possibility of death. Thus did his soul repose in mammon, as if that was the security of his life! But his poor soul is not at rest, and is not full of confidence; hence he must exhort and encourage it. The Lord makes evident reference in these piercing sayings to Ecclus. xi. 17–19* (see in the Greek), which entire passage lays the foundation of this parable. Such people think of their souls in the spirit of Wisd. ii. 1–9, indeed scarcely going so far; but they shall to their terror find out what the soul of a man really is and must ever be.

Verse 20. *God* said—how impressively is this contrasted with his words just before spoken to himself! And *unto him!* which was either a forewarning presentiment of coming death, or may only mean—God said unto him by the fact, *God's decree was*—Thou must die! Both harmonise together; for the reference to *this night* (instead of the many years) intimates the former, while the ἀπαιτοῦσιν, "shall be required" (literally, *they demand*), brings death into the immediate present. That which God says, *is done!* "O thou *fool,* who didst forget both Me and thyself, with all the wisdom of thy thrifty plans!" Comp. Psa. xlix. 11 and Jer. xvii. 11. Thy soul is *required*—not by a gracious summons; but God, the Lord and Judge of thy life, plucks it from thee, and hurries it away. (Job xxvii. 8, יִשָּׂא which does not stand there for יִשְׂאֵל.) But God sendeth to that end His messengers, ἀπαιτοῦσιν being, in a passage so significant, scarcely to be taken impersonally (comp. ver. 48)—*they,* whom thou, O fool, also wert ignorant of, My ministers appointed to that end; see Job xxxiii. 22. We are taught again in Luke xvi. 22 that angels have to do with the dying of mortals. They require thy soul *of thee,* that soul which thou didst shut up in thy barns, which thou didst think happy, and which, belonging to Me and not to thee, thou hast corrupted and ruined! Thou art responsible to Me for it; comp. once more, the expression of Wisd. xv. 8, τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπαιτηθεὶς χρέος, "when his life which was lent him shall be demanded." The curtain falls upon that other "life" which awaits such a soul; and the discourse returns to the goods and possessions, in all their insufficiency to help—"which thou hast *provided;* provided, indeed, and collected together, but not for thyself, even as thy fruits did not grow for thee. *Whose* shall they be, in opposition to all the *I,* and the *my,* and the *having,* of *thy* vain words?"

Verse 21. Most highly emphatic is the fearful reference to eternity in—*So is it!* expressed by a simple οὕτως. The following words resolve themselves into a twofold contrast. The mere θησαυρίζειν or *treasuring* implies a labor and a care which after all leaves the gathered goods in the barn *out of myself;* πλουτεῖν, *being rich,* on the contrary, is an actual condition and possession of good; and the ordinary phrase πλούσιος, *rich,* used to designate this man in the beginning is now corrected—he was not in a true sense πλουτῶν, or wealthy. He who is truly rich, has his life from and in that which he possesses—and what kind of possession is that? The δόσις κυρίου or *gift of God* which remaineth with the godly, according to the profound parallel which Ecclus. xi. 17 once more affords. A man, however, can *possess* his God, strictly speaking, only when God possesses the soul which belongs to Himself, surrounds it, pervades it, and takes it into His own fulness; hence it is very significantly said πλουτῶν εἰς θεόν. "rich *toward* God;" not to be merely translated by *erga,* or as if the gathering *for* God were spoken of. The true πλουτῶν or *rich* man, believes, lives, loves, loses, and prays himself *into his God,* and thus he most superabundingly finds himself again; but he who heaps up treasures ἑαυτῷ, "for himself," obtains nothing whatever for *himself;* and more than that, loses himself and his soul to his rigid creditor. Thus *die* and perish many in the midst of their great possessions, instead of deriving from them life! Observe how profoundly the second contrast, between ἑαυτῷ and εἰς θεόν, brings out the difference between the real and the specious riches. And, finally, we should carry our thoughts beyond the *external* application of the parable, which remains in itself a

* So that this passage is convincing proof that he sometimes alluded to the Apocrypha.

similitude, and understand it of the self-seeking appropriation and heaping up of wise spiritual goods, stores of knowledge, virtue, and godliness (in which even the experiences of regeneration may again wither away). This truth, however, only hovers over our Lord's words, to be discerned by our thoughtful pondering; it was scarcely intended to be taught in the present connection, and will be further enforced at chap. xvi. 19.

Verses 22–30. How appositely does the Lord now repeat to his disciples this section of the Sermon on the Mount! He perfectly well knew what he had then said, but the *μαθηταί* or *disciples* who now surrounded him (never the Twelve merely, or any fixed and permanent circle), had probably not heard it from his lips —and wherefore should we hesitate to think that he would trouble himself to repeat it in their hearing? The great contrast—the *heaping up treasures*, and not being *rich in God*—leads by immediate transition to the exhortation, "Take heed, ye my disciples; *ye* should be rich in God, and not heap up treasures; that is, *ye cannot serve God and Mammon!*" Thus was Matt. vi. 24, brought to remembrance; but as most of our Lord's disciples were *poor* and not rich, here follows, as there, the warning against anxious *care* about the sustentation of life, and the clothing of the body. For it is the self-same heathenish worldly spirit which is both in covetousness and in care; it presents in both cases the same contrast with a believing contentment in what the Lord gives now, and will continue to give. Μὴ *μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν*, "Take no thought for your life"—here at first the lower meaning of *ψυχή* and *ζωή*, *soul* and *life*, is taken up; but it does not therefore follow that in the previous parable *only* this meaning was intended. This time the *ravens* are mentioned, ver. 24; not so much as being birds of prey, useless and despised of men, but because of the proverbial use to which they had been put—God caring for their forsaken young (Job xxxviii. 41; Psa. cxlvii. 9). We have already noted that *ἡλικία*, vers. 25, 26, can refer only to the *length of life*; and this is confirmed here by the reference to the fool who was compelled to depart the self-same night. Τὰ *λοιπά*, "the rest," indicates everything besides this *ἐλάχιστον*, "least;" if it is not in our power to retain the spirit when God taketh it away (Eccles. viii. 8), even for a a span of time, assuredly it is not in our power to provide for the entire *necessity of life*, in its clothing and nourishment (*τὰ πάντα*, Acts xvii. 25), which is to be understood as necessarily to be provided by Him who gave the life itself. (See on p. 103, our comment on the *μετεωρίζεσθε*, which here responds to the *ἀναπαύου* of ver. 19.) Even the heathen can recognize it as a naturally evident truth, that man doth not live of that which is in his hand, and that the life is more than meat; but the believing appeal to the Father who knoweth and who supplieth their need, and their seeking His kingdom, gives a new and higher assurance and ground of argument to the *children of God*.

Verses 31, 32. These consequently receive, from this point onwards, directions as to the disposition of mind which becomes *them*; in contradistinction to the covetousness and care against which the Lord had warned them. That disposition is *heavenly-mindedness*, which fixes the eye and the heart only upon the kingdom of God, the gift of the Father (vers. 31–34)—*watchfulness* as the true *prudence* and care, to preserve this inheritance and gift (vers. 35–40) —consequently *fidelity* in the dispensation of the intrusted possessions of grace (increasing by being dispersed), which forms the final and perfect contrast with the *συνάγειν τὰ ἀγαθὰ εἰς ἀποθήκας*, *bestowing goods in barns* (vers. 42–48), persisting in unwearied *warfare* with the world (vers. 49–53). Down to ver. 34 we have still repetitions of the Sermon; although altering the connection of the words as they are found there, and adding a sentence, ver. 32, which so aptly completes the meaning of ver. 31, that we could not avoid observing, in p. 105, that probably Matthew had omitted it there. It is, at any rate, a retrospective allusion to ver. 4. Will He whose merciful good pleasure intends to *give* the kingdom—deny to its heirs their daily bread, and leave His little *flock* to hunger? This expression obviously points to nourishment and sustentation; but the *μὴ φοβοῦ*, *fear not*, extends further, and reminds them of the enemies who threatened their life, the wolves of ver. 4. The Lord in his majesty assumes the same tone to his people as Jehovah in the Old Testament, see *e.g.*, Isa. xli. 10–14; but in that he calls it a little flock we have the New Testament assurance added—I am thy true, thy good Shepherd! *Ποίμνιον* or *ποιμένιον*, "flock," is not in itself a diminutive (as many incorrectly say); but the *μικρόν*, "little," is added, for it remains a truth, the remembrance of which should be mingled with all our assurance, that the number of those who aspire to the kingdom of heaven is few in comparison of the many (Matt. vii. 13, 14). Not the entire people, called by the name of Israel, receiveth the kingdom, but the little company, now oppressed in its midst! These few are, further, weak and defenceless in themselves, conquering by patience, exalted before God through their humility alone, and reckoned among His people—hence in Jer. l. 45 (where also עֲצַת יְהוָה previously) they are called צְעִירֵי הַצֹּאן, "the least of the flock," and in Zech. xiii. 7, הַצְּעֹרִים, "the little ones." It may indeed be assumed that our Lord, alluding to these passages, intended further to intimate by the *μικρόν*, "little," that they are simply *μικροί*, or *little ones*, to whom the great *δοῦναι ὑμῖν*, "give *you*," remains an eternal promise. The *ζητεῖν*, "seek," ver. 31, is no fearful, and restlessly careful pursuit of the kingdom (like the *ἐπιζητεῖν* of the Gentiles, ver. 30), but the childlike acceptance of the kingdom already given of the Father: not forgetting with this, however, that it must be our entire and absolute good pleasure to give Him our whole heart; and, for the sake of the treasure in heaven, to renounce and forsake everything earthly, on which the heart's affections might hang.

Vers. 33, 34. That which, in Matt. vi. 19, was merely the prohibition of *θησαυρίζειν, laying up treasure*, appears here more emphatically as a commandment to *sell τὰ ὑπάρχοντα*, "what ye have," (ver. 15). As to the meaning of this requirement, see on Matt. xix. 21. We have often seen that selling, and giving *alms* of the produce, is, under certain circumstances, and always according to the measure of superfluity, a duty which must be literally fulfilled; having its deepest meaning, however, in the release of the heart from the devotion to worldly good, and in the subordination of all our substance to the purposes and services of love. The *treasure in the heavens* is the better capital which accumulates through good works wrought in faith and love, as is fundamentally explained in 1 Tim. vi. 17–19; the title of citizenship, and its actual possession in the heavenly kingdom. This is *our* sure and certain personal treasure, (ver. 34), in contradistinction to all earthly goods, lent for a season, and in due time to be taken away.

Verses 35–38. Further and further does the Lord proceed beyond the occasion which gave rise to his discourse; in order to show *to his disciples* what habit of mind must ever be cultivated by them, if they would attain unto life—anticipating parables, which, as Matthew gives them to us, have their most appropriate place at the *conclusion* of all his discourses. The preliminary general exhortation, vers. 35, 36, he here grounds upon a promise to the faithful, vers. 37, 38, and warning to those who forget the end and aim of all, vers. 39, 40. The essential requisites are *watching* and *working*, both in their union and mutual influence. The burning *lights* (a slight prelude of Matt. xxv. 1) are the hearts or eyes fixed in the simplicity of love and faith upon the Lord; the clear and unqualified aim of the whole soul, in the light of life, which thinks of nothing but eternal life: see further on Matt. vi. 22, 23.* The girded *loins* correspond here to the whole body or conversation there; pointing to zeal and diligence in good works, in connection with simplicity of the inward spirit—a figure very natural and frequent where flowing garments were worn, as *e. g.*, Jer. i. 17; and referred also to the inner man, 1 Pet. i. 13, Eph. vi. 14.† But here the burning of the lights, and the girding of the loins for action, are already presupposed; and the exhortation runs—Relax not the girdle of your diligence, suffer not your lights to be extinguished, until your Lord cometh! And now there is a transition from the Father in heaven to Christ, who is the Shepherd of his flock, the Lord of his servants, the Bridegroom of his faithful ones—preparing for them a marriage-feast in the bliss of eternal fellowship with himself. All these several presentations and aspects of the same truth are concisely blended together, one running into the other in a manner which presupposed among his immediate disciples a prepared intelligence; and that the Lord himself is speaking out of the amplitude and depth of his stores of instruction for his chosen people. Therefore the *ἀναλύειν ἐκ τῶν γάμων*, "return *from the wedding*," must be understood of a *feast* generally, after which the Lord requires the attendance and service of his servants; yet not without an intimation in the background to the effect that it is no less than a marriage-feast. The *ἐκ*, "from," which is here in apparent contrast with Matt. xxv., maintains its specific significance, when we remember that this marriage-feast begins in its glorious preparation long before the consummation of its perfect joy; that it is, in a certain sense, celebrated already in heaven, from which the Lord comes back to his waiting servants. He would only find them waiting and watching; having sustained the test, they shall be servants no longer, but shall all together be translated into the wedding-guests of the superabundantly merciful Lord; and then, more than that, become the Bride of his love and his joy! Yet does the majesty and the holy righteousness of their Lord require that they approve their worthiness, by faithfully watching awhile for him, that when he cometh and knocketh, they may *εὐθέως*, "immediately," open; for when the hour of decision has come, be it in the second or the third watch (he seems as if waiting himself!), he waits not a moment longer, not even while the garments are being set in order, or the lights trimmed. Thus *those* servants only are blessed, whom their Lord shall find watching in *longing* and patience;* but they shall be transcendently and inconceivably honored by their Lord! With a solemn *Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν*, "Verily, I say unto you," he gives them a promise which we may compare with that glorious one in Rev. iii. 21, scarcely knowing which of them is the greater; and concerning which some one has said—Let no man contemplate it but when clothed in the profoundest humility. As among men a bridegroom might, among his assembled guests, in the fulness of his joy, do them more than the honor absolutely required; and as in the heathen *Saturnalia* the masters were wont to minister to their servants, so will Christ in his own person wait upon us at his heavenly table! If our waiting for his coming has required us in any degree to fast, what abundant compensation for every abstinence is *this* eating and drinking in the kingdom of God! The Lord will, as a servant, *gird himself* (ver. 35, chap. xvii. 8), will come forth to them in the zeal of his all-devot-

* The plural *lights*, which simply belongs to the plural address, has been made by Braune to indicate "the several energies of body and soul;" but this is a very inapposite idea, for each individual has but one light—one aim, one eye, one heart.

† Lisco's negative idea, that of removing all obstacles, is very impoverished. There is in the expression the strong positive notion of readiness for all earnest work.

* Braune beautifully says: Patience makes longing mighty, gives it strength, and saves it from being overstrained; longing makes patience watchful, and saves it from growing torpid. Without this longing, patience would enervate the servant; without the patience, his longing would fret and corrode him.

ing love; just as Stephen saw him *standing up* from his throne to welcome his first beloved martyr. He *hath already* served us, ever since he took upon him the form of a servant; he is continually serving us in long-forbearance, putting on our garments and washing our feet —else should we find it hard to believe what he here saith. But then at length he will most perfectly *serve* us, pouring out all the long-restrained fulness of his heart's affection, and giving us the final and most unreserved proofs of his love to his own, as our Shepherd and our *Host;* παρελθών, "come forth," too, that is, turning to each in the great company, devoting himself entirely to every individual one. The washing of the feet in John xiii. was a type and earnest of this; even as every renewal of his holy supper is a prelude and prophecy of that heavenly feast (Rev. iii. 20; xix. 9) whereof it is said—Eat, O friends, drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved! Cant. v. 1.

Verses 39, 40. See Matt. xxiv. 43, 44. Olshausen very needlessly and incorrectly refers the οἰκοδεσπότης, "good man of the house," to the representative of all unbelievers, the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, "ruler of this world;" for *this* warning, too, is addressed to the called and believing servants of Christ. The *servant*, as being installed under-lord or οἰκονόμος, "steward," ver. 42, is at the same time *master of the house* in his own appointed domain: this is the obvious reason for the change in the expression. The gracious Lord and Bridegroom represents himself as coming like a *thief* upon the possessor of all false and unwarranted goods, upon him who holds his natural or spiritual possessions in unrighteousness: taking away from the unfaithful and corrupt servants that which he had given them.* This it imports you *to know*—such is the fundamental idea of the whole saying as it warns his servants against all ἀφροσύνη, or *thoughtlessness.*†

And now Peter interrupts the Lord by asking him, whether he spoke these things to them as disciples, or to the whole of the people, as being the covetous sinners upon whom the Judge would come *as a thief.* Many think that he intended to make a distinction between the Twelve and the rest of the disciples, announcing that the honor promised in ver. 37 could only be the prerogative of the Apostles. However, even if τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην, "this parable," refers to the entire discourse, and Peter is thinking of a distinction and preference, yet the essential difficulty which occasioned his question could only apply to the last-mentioned and doubtful threatening of vers. 39, 40 (involving a new similitude of the thief); and the distinction between πρὸς ἡμᾶς, "to us," and πρὸς πάντας, "to all," may most simply be referred to the several applications of the Lord's words to the *disciples* or to the *people*, as obviously exhibited in vers. 1, 15, 22, 24. Peter deems the threatening of instant judgment too strong for disciples who had once been made true believers, at least as they seem to be addressed to them pre-eminently or even exclusively as *servants;* hence he only ventures to ask—Or *even*, or *also*, to all?

Verses 42–48. The Lord answers only indirectly, giving back the question, and leaving the reply to the consciousness which every one of them had of his own position and state—"Who then is such?" On the repetition of the whole discourse in Matt. xxiv. 45—51, this same formula is retained in their remembrance, and that deep meaning in it brought out which indeed is not undiscernible here—"*Who then is such?*" This is the true and supremely important question; and not every one even of you, my disciples, can give the joyful response —"I am he, the faithful and prudent *steward!*" The Lord grants to his Apostles that there is a distinction among his servants, that there are many who are set over others; but in the case of all such he only makes their responsibility the more rigorous. We cannot admit, with Braune, that, on account of the people, and to obviate misunderstanding, our Lord only indefinitely explained himself upon this premature question: to us the indirect answer seems *definite* enough. On the double notion of faithful and wise, see in Matthew, where the οἰκονόμος, "steward," is called only a δοῦλος, "servant;" but here we must regard the οἰκονόμος as the true intermediate idea between the Lord, ver. 39, and the servant, ver. 37. He who is faithful knows and keeps it well in mind, that he is, as a steward, only a more responsible servant, that he must diligently execute all his Lord's commission with respect to his house; the unfaithful steward, on the contrary, plays the master himself. Further, in Matt. xxiv. 48, that *wicked* servant is another than the faithful and wise one; but here, in order to answer the somewhat over-confident question of Peter by a more severe warning, he is the same who has apostatised into a wicked character; for ἐκεῖνος, "*that*," ver. 45, cannot possibly refer back to the οἰκοδεσπότης, "good-man of the house," of ver. 39, but indicates him who had been set over the men-servants and maidens, over the θεραπεία. Upon the διχοτομεῖν, "cutting in sunder," as upon all the rest, see our remarks upon Matthew—it is obvious that the ἄπιστοι, "unbelievers," here are those who have been *unfaithful*, but with an intimation that they are to be similarly punished, at least, as those who have been from the beginning *unbelievers.* This is the first answer to the question; then immediately follows a second, more severe—If ye, my servants and stewards, should prove unfaithful, ye shall be punished not merely like all those who have been called but have refused to obey the call; your punishment shall be all the more severe on account of the graces and gifts which ye have received! This additional clause is peculiar here, and demands a few words of

* Thus ver. 39 belongs appropriately here; and is not, as Schleiermacher thinks, an incorrect interpolation.

† Not as Von Gerlach would correct the German Trans.—*Das aber wisset ihr ja*—ye know it, but look well to it. We must admit that the Lord may come to his servants even as a thief.

explanation. It is the reverse side of the benediction pronounced in John xiii. 17. The distinction between knowing and not knowing refers, primarily, like the question, ver. 41, to that between the disciples and the people; then, prophetically, to that between Christians and Heathen; further, to Christian teachers more highly instructed and so-called common and ignorant people; and finally, with more and more restriction, to all relations to which it may be applied.* Ἑτοιμάσας, "prepared," without ἑαυτόν, "himself," appears to point back to the parable, where those who waited for their Lord were required to have all things *ready* for him; but in its strict meaning it indicates the preparation of the heart, the readiness of the individual himself (comp. ver. 40, γίνεσθε ἕτοιμοι). Δαρήσεται πολλάς or ὀλίγας (suppl. πληγάς, according to classical usage as pointed out by Grotius), "shall be beaten with *many*, few stripes," refers to the law of Moses, Deut. xxv. 2, where it was appointed, with typical allusion to a deeper meaning, that the offender should be beaten according to his fault—כְּפִי רִשְׁעָתוֹ בְּמִסְפָּר. The offender also who, μὴ γνούς, "knew not," is yet not dismissed without punishment, but receives the ὀλίγας, "few stripes;" his ignorance being not without its own lesser guilt, is also pretypified in the law of Moses, Lev. v. 17. Just as every natural man should know, even of himself, the righteous requirements of God (see afterwards ver. 57, and comp. Rom. i. 19, 20, 32, ii. 14, 15, as also Prov. xxiv. 12); so especially must there be presumed in the case of every *servant* called, a certain knowledge of the will of his Lord. If any one has received this in a higher measure than another, and yet has lost it again through the folly of unfaithfulness, or the idleness of neglect, it will not avail him to plead μὴ γνούς, "knew not," before the judgment; that which was given will be rigidly required, of that which was intrusted to him a strict account will be demanded. The position of not knowing, may be attributed to one who has failed through lack of investigation and prayer; though he also is relatively guilty, since the perfect knowledge of his Master's will was within his reach. But it most literally applies in the case of him who knew not, and not through any fault of his own, the specially revealed will of the Lord; who, however, knew enough of it to bring him within the range of responsibility. Hence, to embrace this case with the rest, it is not assumed simply in his guilt that he did not according to his Lord's will, but—that he did commit things worthy of stripes. The concluding sentence assures us generally, that in the preliminary times of doom and severance which will precede the final judgment, the Divine righteousness will admeasure condemnation as well as blessedness, in degrees strictly corresponding to desert.

And now, after having warningly exhorted his own to heavenly-mindedness, watchfulness, and *fidelity*, the Lord proceeds to establish the grounds of this last, in words which he places in close connection with the earlier discourse, vers. 1–4. He refers to the impending *conflict* between his disciples, followers, and confessors, and the opposing world; in order definitely to point out to them how absolutely needful their *fidelity* would be. He first exhibits his own example; his own course through a baptism of sufferings in order to the kindling of the living and life-giving fire; that thus his followers may encourage and strengthen themselves in him, upon whom so heavy a burden had been laid. He then repeats some part of the instructions given to the Apostles, Matt. x. 34–36; thus taking up the thread of discourse where it had been broken off at ver. 9.

Verses 49, 50. The meaning of this profound utterance of our Saviour's heart has been almost universally missed, and its force destroyed, by the unwarranted connection which has been established between the *fire* and the contention and division mentioned afterwards. That which our Lord declares to be the most essential, unconditional design of his *coming*, before he makes reference to the restraint yet imposed upon him until it was accomplished; that end which he elsewhere always declares to be to save the world, and which he here so intensely desires to hasten, must necessarily be something essentially good and unmixed with evil, which was to be brought down from heaven *to the earth*—an intimation this last which must have its force. He places this *heavenly fire* in full contrast with, and opposition to, the waters of his overpowering sufferings which would engulf him in anguish and death; that fire, consequently, is in itself—just as the Lord longs to see it kindled—by no means "a fire of disquietude, alarm, contention, and great change," not a "distinction of the old, that the new might be established on its ashes"—indeed the *separating* and *purifying* influence of fire (Isa. iv. 4) is certainly not here the first and fundamental idea. The εἰ, "if," must certainly be understood as *utinam*, as a particle of desire, like the Heb. אִם; comp. Gen. xix. 42, xxii. 42, and often in the Old Test., *e.g.* Josh. vii. 7, Sept. for לוּ.* Consequently, this fire, which our Lord would so gladly see burning over all the earth, was

* It seems more natural thus to regard the proposition as proceeding from the universal, and applying itself in a more and more restricted sense, than conversely, as Alford says; who regards the saying as in its highest sense applicable to his Apostles and ministers, and having its application gradationally downwards. But the essential truth remains in both cases the same.

* Not with Schleiermacher (and the Eng. and Dutch Bibles)—"And what will I rather, *if* it be already kindled? Can I change or hinder the necessary course of things?" Neander similarly—"What more do I desire, if it burns? The aim of my operation upon earth is so far attained!" Euthymius: "τὶ πλεῖον θέλω ἐὰν ἀνηφθῇ; τὶ πλεῖον ἀναμένω ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. But all this is inapplicable; for the Lord, in ver. 50, tells us that this fire does *not yet* burn, he has yet to endure much in order to it. *Anxiety* before it, and *desire* for it, are the complement of each other.

not yet burning; his baptism must first be consummated. Contention and persecution of the truth, however, already amply abounded; and that belonged, both in the case of the Forerunner and of his followers, rather to the baptism. What remained, then, to be waited for? What was this fire? The "all-quickening fire," as Novalis correctly says, which is opposed to the waters of death; the fire of the Spirit with which, according to the Baptist's early word, he was to baptize unto a new life; the Pentecostal fire in the pure sense of that word. That is the "fire of divine *love* which the Holy Ghost kindles in the hearts of all believers," the first traces of which are seen in Luke xxiv. 32, but the flame of which bursts forth in Acts ii.; according to the sentiment of Fricker's precious hymn, which sets the expositors right—"O dass doch bald dein Feuer brennte, du unaussprechlich Liebender!" (O that already thy fire burned, thou inexpressible Lover!) Most assuredly, when the light of truth becomes the quickening fire of love, it must approve itself to be a purifying, separating element, condemning and putting an end to all false life. But this condition of its operation is brought forward first in ver. 51; the discordant separation is by no means itself the fire, it is only the inevitable method and concomitant of its kindling and spreading; until "his *sacred* flame enlightens the whole of his father's house; the whole wide world being quickened, illumined, warmed, and set on fire of love; all souls universally glowing with the holy influence." The fire of life and love bursts forth out of the deep waters of the Redeemer's bitter crucifixion-baptism! (see on Matt. xx. 22). Here, as there, the Lord speaks of it as a sacred, mysterious counsel of the Father, to which he himself, for the sake of the world's salvation, must be subjected; but now there is mingled with it the utterance of a presentient foretaste of the final suffering, of that *anxiety*, now already begun, which was to be consummated in such profound anguish. This is a most impressive testimony, not only to a *passio inchoata* before the *passio extrema*, but also to the actual harmony and concurrence of both in the great, essentially one, redeeming passion. We must not allow this undeniable cry of lamentation, extorted from the human weakness of the God-man,* to be taken away by an incorrect translation, such as would make πῶς συνέχομαι mean —How am I pressed towards it, how greatly I long for it! For, the ordinary signification of συνέχεσθαι is altogether against this, indicating a pressure and disturbance of spirit,† an intense suffering on some account (from fear, hunger, sickness; see in the New Testament, Matt. iv. 24: Luke iv. 38, viii. 37; Acts xxviii. 8; and, indeed, Phil. i. 23); moreover, the whole sentence would then be a mere repetition of the former wish; and, finally and conclusively, the συνέχεσθαι or *straitening* by means of the τελεσθῇ, "be accomplished," is in itself indicated as a beginning of the βάπτισμα or *baptism*. Most appropriately does the Lord here utter an intimation, which, spoken aloud before all the people, would be in any degree intelligible to his nearest disciples only as concerning his own already inwardly beginning sufferings—just at this point, when he is inculcating the persistent stedfastness of all his followers against the enmity of the entire world.

Verses 51–53. The full explanation of this has been given in Matt. x. Where the fire of Divine love is kindled, and peace seeks to come down from above to the earth, this can only take effect, first of all, in connection with divisions, caused by the opposition of unbelieving men;* the Lord foresaw all this, and it was indeed his own will, since his peace could be attained only by means of this warfare. Let them cry out against the fire of the Holy Ghost, and bring the same water to quench it which they poured upon his own head—they will not succeed in extinguishing the work of God generally upon earth, nor will they do any other harm to the faithful, who abide in the fellowship of Christ, than to bring them through their cross, Matt. x. 38, to a resurrection unto victory.

Verses 54–57. The Lord had now been speaking many things to his disciples, his words stretching far onwards to the final day of account when he should *come back* for his servants (after the departure therein presupposed); and he had further indicated the present time, *since he had come* now first, and in which the διαμερισμός, or *division*, between his disciples and his enemies was beginning to take effect (not without appeal to the people's decision)—as the beginning of the ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, *from henceforth*, of a continuous conflict. All this the μυριάδες (myriads), ver. 1, might have heard, and something of it understood; but at the conclusion he naturally returns to this *people* again, and gives *them*, on their part, the result of the whole warning and exhortation, as it affected themselves. Concerning the *wisdom* of remaining stedfastly faithful to the end, and thus avoiding condemnation, he could speak only to his disciples and servants; but concerning the same wisdom, in thinking of that future condemnation, and thus, by pondering, avoiding it, the wisdom which would at least effect the *beginning* of a separation for the kingdom of God, he can speak to all the people. Whosoever only will, may and should come over from the multitude into the little flock; may discern the signs of that time in which the kingdom had made its first entrance; and in his own con-

* This Neander acknowledges as "the first trace of Christ's soul-conflict in the near approach to his death."

† It is even the technical word for constriction in breathing. Schleiermacher has "oppression."

* The number five in ver. 52, or rather the division into two against three (with majority on the one side), has a proverbial character. But we cannot hold, with Sepp, that the five is alluded to as the number of *imprecation* in the East (for they are not all five placed under a malediction); nor find a prophetic reference, with Lange, to the five confessions in the household of the church.

science so voluntarily judge himself as to see the necessity of seeking grace while it was offered. Thus we clearly perceive the internal connection of this concluding word with all that had been spoken before. There are repetitions which the Lord utters according to his own deep-laid plan, for purposes of specific conviction. First, we have a reference to the signs of the time; taken, with variation in the expression, from Matt. xvi. 2, 3, where ver. 6, the Lord warned the disciples, as here ver. 1, against the leaven of the Pharisees: we thus see that he, at the same time, carries back his discourse to its original strain, before the appeal about the inheritance had interrupted it. "In earthly things ye are wise and prudent enough; wherefore do ye not also of yourselves *judge* (without arbiters, taking good note whence the life of man truly comes) what it would be right for you to do in this great *time of grace?*" That is, in order to obtain their rights in another *process*, and one infinitely more momentous than any concerning earthly inheritance—against the adversary; and thus to escape the impending arrest of the divine *justice!*

When the people in Judæa saw *the* cloud, according to its usual course, coming up from the west or from the sea (1 Kings xviii. 44), they might safely predict that a shower was coming: when the first traces of the south wind were felt, they could prognosticate heat (Job xxxvii. 17), and so it came to pass. The Lord now, as in Matt. xvi. 3, grounds an appeal to the hypocrites upon this: they could seize and rightly interpret the external appearances of earth and heaven, but their profound insincerity of heart, and wilful misapprehension of divine things, permitted them not to mark the signs of the time which his coming had introduced! The parallel with Matthew, the reference to ver. 1 of this chapter, and the uniformly consistent meaning of ὑποκριτής, "hypocrite," throughout the New Testament (see again chap. xiii. 15), alike forbid us to accept the refinement which would on this special occasion adopt the fundamental meaning of the word, as it occurs in Lucian's ὑποκριτὴς ὀνείρων—as if our Lord would half-ironically say, "Ye critical judges and discriminators of signs!" *Hypocrisy* is ever, indeed, the first leaven, the πρῶτον ψεῦδος, or initial falsehood, which stands in the way of man's perception and acknowledgment of the truth. The Lord had only taken his illustration from the clouds and winds of heaven (already as similitudes of the tempest of judgment and heat of tribulation); but now he makes his words more general, and adds the (yet more obvious, and therefore first mentioned) face or *appearance* of the *earth*—in connection with which we may refer to the reckoning of the harvest weeks, John iv. 35, and the like. "Ye *know* how to test these things; *how* or *wherefore* are ye so foolish as not to discriminate and test this time? Why but because ye are hypocrites, and will not!" *This time*, the time of God's gracious visitation (ch. xix. 44); the manifest tokens of which have constrained the people's voices to join with the voice of God, in crying—God hath visited His people! chap. vii. 16, i. 68. The Lord points further, to all those signs of the time, concerning which see on Matt. xvi.; but especially here to the βιάζεσθαι, or *forcing*, of the kingdom of God, which was made manifest in the warfare that had broken out, and mentioned just before, vers. 51–53. Can, then, the natural understanding, for the sufficiency of which this text has been strangely enough cited, test these things, and discern what is right? Assuredly—but, first of all, only when a revelation of God in its signs lies obviously before it (for that is the question here); and, secondly? Alas! it *might* and it *should*, indeed; but it *cannot* and it *will not*, for the most part, because of other reasons which the Lord here bewails, discloses, and rebukes; it does not draw the simple and necessary deduction from the plainest and most indubitable premises, *because*—the sinner does not conscientiously use his reason, and will not of and in *himself* judge that which is right! This is the profound, and appropriate meaning of the following verse as it is uttered in this connection. Ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν (by no means merely, as Lange thinks—from your own private relations) obviously means, first of all, *of yourselves*, as in chap. xxi. 30, so that not even signs and wonders should have been needful; but the *reason* why I of myself should discern and judge myself aright, lies only in this, that I have *in myself*, in the protest of my conscience against my sin, the standard of divine truth; the herald of repentance when repentance is required of me, the announcer of grace when grace is preached to me. Thus the deep truth is just as Luther's gloss gives it—"Can you see how it goes with the creatures, and why do you not see *what is wanting in yourselves?*" Alas! indeed, he who sees *that*, and desires to see it without hypocrisy, is (as Oetinger says) "the true philosopher, who learns that which is right *in his own* person." *Only take note* (ver. 15); admit the great need of your own poor souls, which can derive life from no other possession than the proffered grace, which, when laid hold of in faith, makes it rich towards God! Take note, before all things, that *ye* have actually no *right* before God; so that ye may, while in the way with him, and before hell closes your course, obtain justification and peace.

Verses 58, 59. Here we find the confirmation of what we have before remarked upon this saying as it is reproduced here from the Sermon on the Mount—that it is here generalised beyond its specific meaning there, and, as it were, *spiritually explained*. The mere reference to placability as towards a brother with whom I may have matter of litigation, would not be a distinctive *conclusion* of this discourse—albeit it was occasioned by the contention of the brothers about their inheritance—and would be an inexplicable subsidence of the strain of it into a matter quite foreign to vers. 55–57. But the here intensified judicial expressions (the Latinism δὸς ἐργασίαν, *da operam*, probably a Roman legal formula; as also κατασύρειν and πράκτωρ, the officer, *executor*), induce us to

suppose that the Lord designs to exemplify, by the complainant against his fellow-creature in the court of law, the guilt of want of love generally which cries out against the sinner before the presence of God. Thus is exhibited in this ἀντίδικος, "adversary," the accusing Moses *or the law*, which "often personally, as it were, comes forward in the heart of man" (Braune); and the Lord stringently urges upon all the necessity of seeking the mediation of grace to interpose and prevent the impending condemnation, before the time runs out, and nothing remains but that eternal prison-house in which all the loveless, covetous, contentious parties alike come to everlasting harm.* With respect to this comparison and relation between God and men, the Father hath appointed his Son to be arbiter and mediator: happy they who make their appeal to him, knowing in themselves what they themselves come short in!

THREATENING APPEAL TO THE IMPENITENT, OCCASIONED BY THE REPORT OF PILATE'S INJUSTICE.

(Luke xiii. 2–9.)

There were present* at that time some who had failed to mark what in themselves demanded their own judgment and condemnation; and thus came into collision with our Lord, like that covetous man, ch. xii. 13, or that woman, ch. xi. 27. Such were the hearers who listened to his words! These had in their thoughts an occurrence which had recently taken place, and had been much talked of, in Jerusalem (as the article περὶ τῶν shows); and when the Lord ends his discourse by the threatening of the eternal prison of condemnation, they begin their hasty account of a fearful crime which the abominable Pilate had once more committed. It is probable that they did not relate this as a mere *novelty* (to come to something new); but they told him, presuming that he knew it not, and as in some sort connected with his word just spoken as *they* had interpreted it, how the governor of Judæa (ch. iii. 1) had caused the blood of certain *Galilæans* to be miserably and shamefully shed in the midst of their sacrifices; they not being under his jurisdiction (see ch. xxiii. 7–12), and the act being in express contravention of the stipulations which forbade him to bring soldiers into the temple. By this they would say—"Dost thou call that a δίκαιον, or "right" act, or should we not condemn such an atrocity? Is not that a sign of *this time*, in which the oppressed people of God *suffer so many things* from the Gentiles? And what sayest thou to this, thou who assertest thyself to be the Messiah and the Redeemer of God's people from the hand of their enemies?" What he has to say, is very different from what they supposed or desired. He avoids all interference with political matters, now as he had ever done, with as much strictness as he had declined all intermeddling with matters of inheritance; for he is set, not to be the Judge of the Romans, but the Judge of the sins of Israel. He does not even take the *sacrifices* into consideration, so as to enter into the question of Pilate's terrific desecration of holy things, and of his guilt in mingling the blood of the victims of his own tyranny with the blood of the victims offered to God. He immediately seizes this account of the lamentable murder, or rather execution, in the temple, as occasion for that which concerned *his* office; he turns it to a threatening summons to all the impenitent, to whom such events as this should be no more than appeals for penitence, and types of coming judgment. His answer has two complementary parts. First, a plain and literal threatening of general destruction to all who do not repent; connecting this for *Galilee* with the report they had brought (vers. 2, 3)—and reminding them himself of another similar for *Jerusalem* (vers. 4, 5). But then graciously follows in his condescension a new *challenge* to the repentance which alone can save—in an affecting *parable*, which exhibits long-suffering as an argument to humiliation, and which makes the transition from the people as a whole to *every individual* (vers. 6–9).

Verses 2, 3. *Suppose ye!* Thus does he assail in his first word the foolish hearts of the narrators, specifically humbling and casting them down; suddenly passing from all that they calculated on hearing, to the piercing application to themselves. It was their will that Pilate alone should have received our Lord's condemnation; they had not considered whether, and how far, these Galilæans themselves had sinned against others; and whether they, on the other hand, had not offered themselves as victims of tyranny, and made themselves martyrs of God's service.†

* For that is the meaning of παρῆσαν here, and not "came thither," like προσῆλθον, ver. 31. Further, the ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ (which is different from ἐκείνῳ, Matt. xii. 1, xiv. 1) in connection with this *expression*, is not to be taken in so "indefinite" a sense as such formulæ generally are. Alford thinks my connection too fine-drawn, but I can retract nothing here. He has no proper ground for his own remark, that there is no such connection at all.

* Neander's interpretation, "the Messiah would appear against them as a complainant," forgets the declaration of John v. 45.

† Braune misses the meaning when he assumes that these narrators of the outrage themselves concluded the specific guilt of these Galilæans, and

But the Lord's severe and convincing language presupposes *against their will* what they, according to their own style of arguing, should have thought of—that these *Galilæans* (in the general turbulent spirit of their whole community) must necessarily have committed some outrage themselves, or involved themselves in some outbreak, which gave occasion to Pilate's wrathful command that they should be slain wherever they might be found, even though in the act of sacrificing in the temple. Thus, looked at externally, they might appear to have been sinners beyond others whom these things befell not; but even this supposition of *their* guilt instead of Pilate's, though more correct in itself, he does not admit as right; but tells them instead —Such are ye *all*, fundamentally! This is a holy example of the manner in which the blinded world should ever be answered, and its condemnatory rates of others' judgments be applied to itself. *Being sinners* and *suffering* according to desert—this is the great point which all alike must attend to, which must be eternally and unwearyiedly held up to their averted eyes. Although the Lord desires that at every time, and in every particular case, proportionate punishment should be inflicted on specific guilt; yet he maintains in all cases the connection of suffering with sin. Consequently—"If ye repent not, ye will all suffer what your sins deserve, that is, in like manner, proportionately, perish! *This* is what I, your righteous Judge and compassionate Saviour, have to say to you impenitent sinners, on your way to judgment, if ye must have my sentence upon these things —nothing more than that ancient word μετανοεῖν, *repent*, which you are so unwilling to hear." They *knew* very well what this meant —these hypocrites, who would not, in this time of mingled ruin and salvation, judge ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν, *of themselves*, this δίκαιον, or "right" thing; just as afterwards in Hades it is enforced from the conscience of the rich, luxurious son of Abraham. "If ye be not converted, the sword of God and not merely Pilate's is at hand"—see Psa. vii. 13, and the like preaching in all the prophets. The Lord also speaks as a Prophet, when he says ὡσαύτως, *likewise*—this not being, as many think, stronger than ὁμοίως, *in like manner*, in ver. 5, but the reverse; by this latter expression he afterwards makes prominent the *similarity* of the judgment impending over all in its external manifestation, while ὡσαύτως belongs more generally to the strongly emphasized ἀπολεῖσθε (ye shall *suffer* your punishment like these), not however without pointing prospectively to what subsequently happened. The Galilæan people were also destroyed by the Roman sword, and, in consequence of their persistent obstinate spirit of insubordination, for the most part during the passover sacrifices at Jerusalem.

were disposed to condemn them rigorously; for such an assumption is highly improbable, when we take into account the tendency at that time to regard with favor every insurrection against the Romans.

Verses 4, 5. "Not *Pilate*, whose tyranny ye protest against, did those things which ye suffer, but God, who in manifold ways warns sinners by types and earnests of coming judgment." This is the meaning of what our Lord now himself relates, or brings to their remembrance—the well-known falling of that *tower* upon the wretched eighteen, whom it *slew*. This means to say—The one is just like the other, whether Pilate or a falling edifice, the hand of man or so-called accident, all is by the hand of God (Amos iii. 6). However various in the kind and degree of their guilt these eighteen might be, yet are they hurried away with an equal doom of the Divine judgment, the depths of which, as dealing with individual men, man cannot penetrate. Thus much is certain—they were *guilty* before God; but now beware of thinking that the special doom or suffering of these eighteen indicates a specific and greater guilt! (Comp. now, what is incorrectly quoted upon the former instance, John ix. 2, 3.) It has already been remarked that the Lord now turns from the Galilæan people to the *dwellers in Jerusalem*. We know no more what kind of building this πύργος or "tower" was,* than we know of the particulars of this downfall: if we bring the *wall* of the pool שִׁלֹחַ, Neh. iii. 15 (which is the same, indeed, with שִׁלֹחִ) into comparison (both rendered "Siloah") we might regard it as a proper *tower*, and admit the probability of the assumption that those imprisoned by the Sanhedrim were confined there. This, at least, furnishes an apt parallel with the case of the Galilæans: in both instances they were liable to punishment; in the former they had fallen under the sword of the government, in this they were overtaken by the anticipating judgment of God, reinforcing the judgments of men. Ὀφειλέται (*debtors*), too, instead of ἁμαρτωλοί (*sinners*), seems to point the same way, if it does not merely contain an allusion to ch. xii. 58, 59. The ὁμοίως, *likewise*, in this latter case, was yet more strikingly fulfilled in history: the inhabitants of Jerusalem perished under the downfall of the temple and the city together upon the whole mass of the guilty (see Amos ix. 1); their Babel-tower slew those who were lusting after a false freedom, as the guilty prisoners of God's justice; even as finally the fabric of the universe will fall around mankind, and in his death the tabernacle of his body falls upon every individual man.

Verses 6–9. "But ye have not all thus perished yet; ye live by the longsuffering of God, which leadeth you to conversion; your Lord yet leaves you a term of grace wherein He

* The word itself indicates any high building, like מִגְדָּל, see Matt. xxi. 33, and especially Luke xiv. 28; it *might*, therefore, be a "garden-house of some great man," in which a merry company were assembled—or anything else, for the expression in itself is quite indefinite. The description ἐν τῷ Σιλωάμ is highly obscure in consequence of the ἐν, but probably refers to a district or field, so called from the brook [like the modern village *Selwân*—Am. Ed.].

waiteth for the fruits of repentance." The fig-tree has been generally, and without sufficient examination, made to correspond with the πάντες, "all," the entire people of Israel; and to this view Matt. xxi. 19, and xxiv. 32 have seemed to conspire. But it is not difficult to reconcile all these passages, by supposing Matthew's predominant reference to have been to the people generally, and *here* to the individual as involved in that. We are disposed to admit that the Lord takes his allusion from the figure employed for Israel in Joel i. 7; that this originated the specific fig-tree, and that in a certain sense he does include the whole nation, as the three years' coming and seeking (about which more hereafter) indicates. But withal we must maintain that the whole is only represented by the *individual*, and that the Lord thus makes a transition to every ἁμαρτωλός, *sinner*, and ὀφειλέτης, *debtor*, among the people, thus more severely singling them out. This alone seems adequately to respond to the awakening and heart-searching tendency and scope of the whole discourse, from the very beginning of which these yet living are opposed, as individually impenitent to those already condemned and cut down; the specialising *eighteen*, too, tending in the same direction. Moreover, it might fairly be asked what the *vineyard* would be, if the one fig-tree were in itself the whole of the nation. It cannot be alleged that the entire earth is represented here as the Lord's vineyard (although in Matt. xiii. 38, it is the field which is to be sown); and to regard this feature of the parable as only intimating that the fig-tree, the nation, was not standing in an open unsheltered waste, but abundantly cared for and protected, is too violent an outrage upon the uniform prophetical phraseology to be admitted. Then the *vineyard* is Israel, but the fig-tree (uniting the two prophetical symbols) is every individual example and illustration of the character of the whole; for as in another parable the one man not having on a wedding garment does not imply that all the rest had it, so does the singling out this unfruitful tree by no means intimate that all the other trees or vines were fruitful. The Lord so orders his words, that every man may immediately think of himself; and passes in his discourse from the cutting down of the unfruitful tree to the Sermon on the Mount and the Baptist's preaching.

The other very usual error in the exposition of this parable, especially in the practical exposition of it, is that of regarding the *dresser of the vineyard* as being necessarily Christ, the interceding Mediator at the right hand of the righteous Father.* But in most of the parables which precede and which follow this, having the same character, Christ is the Lord; and is it not, similarly, He who is the certain man that had a fig-tree, in *His* vineyard? He is, indeed, the Lord whose *coming* is spoken of, who *seeketh* fruit, and whom the dresser appeals to with Κύριε, "Lord," as deeming the cutting down and condemning things altogether beyond his own province. Even if the *three years* are only regarded as a proverbial notation of any definite time (or, possibly, with some latent reference to the fact that after three years a tree would give certain indication whether or not it would ever bear fruit), yet even then the *coming* must refer to Christ alone; but, for our own part, we see no reason to deny the reference discerned by Bengel and others to the three years' teaching of Christ, the third year of which was now elapsing—and hence we find it said ἔρχομαι, "come," and not ἦλθον, *came*. That the intercession only required this one year to be waited for, while Israel had forty years of suspended judgment, does not affect the matter in the least, for the longsuffering here exhibited in its threatening limitation can now, as ever, surpass its own limits. Who then is the dresser of the vineyard? The definite article attached to this should not be taken as denoting any one single laborer in the whole vineyard, but simply associates with one tree one who cares especially for *it*: and we are firmly convinced that the Lord here, as in Matt. xxi. 33, means the guides and leaders set over the people; a view which brings out a very much overlooked precision and fulness in the parable. Thus it embraces the two ideas; that of the responsibility of every man for his own individual soul, and that of the responsibility of those appointed to watch over the souls of others. Their office is thus exhibited as in a glass to the pastors of the people; and in a manner all the more humbling to them, inasmuch as it exhibits, in the assumption of what this dresser had done, what it was their duty *to have done* to the souls committed to their care. Sore judgments falling upon sinners, such as those before alluded to, and hurrying them away without repentance, most significantly preach to the preachers, and say—Did they perish through your neglect? Have you done all that it was your duty to do to them? Thus the parable cries now as then—Seek, with all the earnestness of your souls, to save yourselves, and to save others, from coming judgment! He who would have less cause to be anxious about his own salvation, let him supplicate and labor for the souls entrusted to his care!* Finally, in the deepest undertone of this most pregnant figure, the meaning is evolved—Let every man be the keeper of his own soul, let every man pray for the extension of his own term of grace, that in it he may more diligently labor! If any man complains—"No man careth for my soul, to convert and do me good," it says to him—On that very account

* Many refer it even to *the Holy Ghost* (Lange in this agrees with Alford, who regards it as quite clear)—but this appears to us, in a parable so simple, addressed to the people, too hidden an allusion.

* I must hold to this interpretation, in spite of all protest. It is not irreconcilable with this, that the Lord elsewhere announces to the husbandmen their own coming condemnation; he here only humbles them by the exhibition of what *should be* the duty and diligence of a husbandman or dresser of his vineyard.

convert and mend *thyself*, labor as the dresser of thine own tree, which should be so precious in thy charge! This *last* lies deep in the urgency of the intercession, this unprofitable tree pressing heavily upon the heart, as well as in the application of the subsequent words—How can I myself cut it down, that is not for me to do.

This idea, however, is only in the background; the final ἐκκόψεις, "thou shalt cut down," (mark, not ἐκκόψω, *I will cut down*) is obviously the admission, enforced from the impenitent soul, of the Divine righteousness. The tree stands, like every one which is *planted* in God's vineyard, in its own good place, and has been abundantly *cared for* hitherto (at least by God himself through the abundant means of grace in his very fruitful hill, Isa. v. 1); on that account fruit is *sought* on it, the Lord asks concerning this tree which he has in his vineyard. If he says—I find none! it will avail nothing that we ourselves, or others, have held the leaves for fruit. But we must not prematurely refer this to the fruits of good works, before that first fruit of repentance is yielded, without which all other fruit is worthless. We see plainly that this first command to cut it down, against which intercession avails, is designed only to convince of guilt and to threaten deserved punishment—it is that laying of the axe to the root of the tree. Although unfruitfulness in itself is sufficient cause for cutting it down, the guilt of this unfruitfulness is increased by the significant remark that the barren tree absorbs uselessly the good of the land, is in the way of others' good—a theme ample in profit for the preacher. The digging about and dunging embrace all that may be done externally in God's appointed way by patient fidelity; the issue depends upon the internal good or evil nature of the tree itself; hence Luther's translation excellently advances to the interpretation—"Ob er *wolle* Frucht bringen," whether it *will* bear fruit—though this is not in the text. *But if not*—then even the voice of love can object nothing more to its being cut down.* It must not be overlooked, in our interpretation of this, that it is, indeed, only the voice of *divine* love and patience which is placed in the heart and upon the lips of the intercessor; just as it is only the grace of God which digs and dungs in the labor of his servants. It is a testimony of *the Lord's* patience, that the laborers thus intercede, that that they can thus in faithful anxiety interfere. But this *very same* love and fidelity deems at the end the cutting down righteous and necessary. Thus the loving-kindness which was exhibited after the severity of vers. 2–5, returns into severity again; indeed it is very significant that the parable ends with this warning tone, the Lord making no answer of assurance. That loving-kindness was plainly exhibited in vers. 3 and 5, and is not revoked; but as it regards the individual, whether or not a long year of grace might be supposed for the people, the thought must have arisen—Dost thou know how long thy day of grace will last? Hast thou received an answer, if *thou* shalt not this day be cut down?

The writer has been accustomed from the beginning of his ministry to adopt this section, Luke xiii. 1–9, as the Gospel for the annual fast-day (Rom. ii. 1–11 being the Epistle). In fact, the whole of the Gospels could not furnish one more appropriate for such a day; and we shall review it in this light, that we may mark the inexhaustible fulness of its contents, each particular of which, as it rises prominently before the mind, might be a yearly penitential subject. Everything is involved in it which a mission of repentance to a people demands: the turning away from political relations to the real amendment of the inner man in the sight of God; the rejection of all false lust of freedom which seeks man's good in external things, or would restlessly seek to help itself that way; the judgment pronounced upon all improper condemnation of others, and comparison between sinners, while all are guilty alike and will without repentance perish, though with repentance all may with equal certainty be saved; the subordination of all judicial inflictions of God and all calamities by him permitted, to the preaching of repentance to all who behold them; the reference to the people of the land as a whole, as also to every individual sinner counting as one in it; the solemn prospective glance at the doom of Israel as foreshadowing and typifying the judgments of Christendom; the plain and the parabolical words, the gentleness and the severity of God, the long-suffering tolerance (how many times already had it been said—Cut it down!), and the limits of the prescribed period of grace; the duty and the blessing of the cure of souls; the care for others imposed upon every one both as laborer and intercessor; and all the other gracious truths which will be found by every man's thoughts who shall diligently seek them.

* We must not add ἔτος once more to the εἰς τὸ μέλλον; the meaning is simply *in posterum*, like 1 Tim. vi. 19.

HEALING ON THE SABBATH; THE DAUGHTER OF ABRAHAM LOOSED FROM THE BONDS OF SATAN.

(Luke xiii. 12, 15, 16.)

There were, in the midst of the mass of the impenitent Jews, pious souls. This poor woman is probably one of them: for the Lord can hardly be regarded as calling her a *daughter of Abraham* simply in the carnal sense, or as one of the chosen people; and he says nothing to her about the forgiveness of her sins, or of her sinning no more. Further, the zeal of her devotion led her to the synagogue on the sabbath day; and, when her health was restored to her, she immediately before all the assembly glorified God with a full heart. Yet was she plagued of *Satan*, like Job, not for her punishment but for gracious test and discipline; there is not in the entire New Testament a single syllable which sanctions the idea that possession of the devil, or a delivery to a harmful power of Satan, must necessarily have been the result of specific guilt on the part of the sufferer.* On the contrary, many of those who are healed are at once right in their hearts with God; while those who are in a state of frenzy so-called, are often found on the retirement of the malady to have been by it and in it inwardly advanced. Her affliction was great, for the *εἰς τὸ παντελές*, "in no wise" (comp. Heb. vii. 25), notwithstanding its anomalous position, scarcely means to say that she could *only not entirely* lift herself and look up, but that she was so entirely bent down as not to be able to look up *at all*; and consequently, that in all probability she did not perceive the presence of Jesus. Therefore does he at once regard her with compassion, calls her to himself and heals her on the sabbath, doing the works of God from the unrestrained impulse of the love of God. With most majestic simplicity he only announces at first the fact—"Poor woman thou *art loosed* from thine infirmity, thine eighteen years are now ended—lift up thyself, for thou canst!" But, because her faith still required some instrumentality in the miraculous work, he lays his hands upon her—for that reason, and not for the sake of the act itself.

And now the *ἀρχισυνάγωγος*, "ruler of the synagogue," is indignant, for he is under the necessity of beholding once more that stereotyped matter of offence perpetrated before his eyes—the healing on the sabbath! Yet what can he do to show his vexation, full as he is of the spirit of caste and official dignity, though devoid of all sympathy with a good deed? He does not venture to address Jesus;* nor indeed the woman, for her glorious sabbath-thanksgiving to God repressed his direct indignation against her, by appealing to the latent good feeling of his nature. He therefore does as all men do who make indirect and covert attacks, avoiding the right object, and never venturing on the right word; he turns, in a manner almost ridiculous, to the whole innocent multitude, and preaches to them, though they had nothing at all to do with the matter, a strange, inconclusive, and most self-stultifying sermon. He begins, indeed, in a very stately manner, with an almost literal quotation from Exod. xx. 9, 10; but loses all sense of propriety at once, and knows not what he is saying afterwards. "In the six working-days *come*"—hither then, if they were sick? Thus the *sick* must rather on the sabbath day remain at home, and not come to the synagogue where the power of God might perchance give them healing? What then had the poor woman *done*, that he forbids all others to do the like in future? She did nothing on her own part, uttered no one word of supplication; she did no more than come forward at the Lord's bidding, and lift herself up, when she felt that she could. One hardly knows how to understand that wonderful imperative—On the sabbath day *μὴ θεραπεύεσθε!* whether—*Be not made whole*, or what? Thus the woman would be in duty bound to reply—No, Lord, this is the sabbath day, *I am not yet loosed*, tomorrow I shall be able to lift myself up, and praise the Lord! We see that the man has become, in his blind zeal, a very fool; he is constrained in his bitterness to allow the *θεραπεύειν* or "healing" of the wonderful power of Jesus, as ready to be exerted all other days of the week for all kinds of afflicted; but yet forbids to *the people* their *θεραπεύεσθαι*, or being healed, that is, their reception of God's grace, on the ground of its being an *ἐργάζεσθαι* or work!

It is on this account that the Lord spares him in the answer which he, though unaddressed, is constrained to give. He applies to him personally the epithet which befitted his whole class, *ὑποκριτά*, "hypocrite"†—but immediately extends his words (as in the former case) to all

* As we may constantly read now-a-days. Even Neander assumes that such conditions always proceeded from some moral disorder. But at the foundation of all this there lies a denial of the objective power of Satan, and a disposition to carry these cases as much as possible into the region of human physical nature.

* Schleiermacher—"He would seem as if he took no account of Jesus in what he says." This is not enough, or rather is saying too much.

† We do not prefer, with Bengel and others, *ὑποκριταί*, as if the ruler had not deserved the express designation. This plural might very easily have been a correction added to the *ὑμῶν*: the Peshito gives it in the singular—נֹסֵב בַּאפֵּא; and we must suppose that the speaker, on the present occasion, would have one word, at least, immediately addressed to him.

people generally in the synagogue, who shared the ruler's feeling. Consult what has been already said on Matt. xii. 11, 12 (Luke vi. 9), and compare Luke xiv. 5 ensuing; from which it will appear that in Luke alone we have three similar incidents, and analogous answers. But each of the three is characteristic and individual; the Lord in the present case naturally says nothing about the falling into a ditch, but merely refers to the *loosing and leading away* their cattle to watering; showing them that not one of those rigorous censors would deny to his own property, the cattle, the care which was daily necessary, because it was the sabbath; though even these two simple operations were much more like working than his laying a hand upon the sick, or than the θεραπεύεσθαι, *being healed*, on the part of the people. Closely and specifically laying hold of their common life and its customs, he casts down the folly of the ruler's reply by the reasonableness of his own; he justifies them in what they do to their cattle, not indeed on account of the self-interest which impelled these hypocrites so to act towards them, but because the law of God did not actually design that an ox or an ass should suffer thirst on the sabbath, after having been fed in its stall. These hypocrites might indeed, if they had been so rigorously in earnest about preserving the rest of the sabbath, have allowed their beast to wait, without endangering its life, till the first of the six days; or with a little trouble might have previously provided in another way for its watering. But such earnestness was not in their spirit. He therefore puts them to shame for their want of love towards *man*, and that their hearts were sealed against his Divine ἀγαθοποιῆσαι, or *doing good*. And in speaking of a *daughter of Abraham* (for he sees before his eyes an Israelitess indeed), he sets before them the strongest contrast with a mere animal; for such a prerogative, when a reality in the sight of God, was a very high dignity, comp. chap. xix. 9 and John i. 47. He *knows* at once, not without a divine intuition into all the circumstances, all that was here to be known, and all that it was right for him to say: the piety of the woman was obviously to be seen and heard of all; by a profounder knowledge he attributes the ἀσθένεια or "infirmity," by which the woman had become contracted or grown together, to a πνεῦμα or *spirit*, consequently to Satan in its ultimate cause;* and, finally, of the eighteen years he had been informed by no man. (The ἰδού contemplating the whole, comp. previously ver. 7, ἰδοὺ, τρία ἔτη, corresponds in the Sept. with the Heb. הִנֵּה, *e.g.*, Deut. viii. 4; and brings out the years pro-

* The Evangelist's narrative derived the "spirit of infirmity" from the Lord's own words. Braune thinks it a "strange expression;" but it is perfectly in accordance with a condition, which was neither natural sickness nor the customary possession. The Lord never laid his hands upon the actually possessed, as here, ver. 13.

minently, as well known to him, or as if they were written on the woman's person.) "Could it be forbidden to loose, if one could, a woman so frightfully bound, on the sabbath day? Do ye then acknowledge no necessities of charity besides the necessities of interest? Here is in very deed a work of necessity and a work of love!" He designedly and calmly concedes to their folly that his ἀπολέλυσαι, *loosing*, and the laying on of his hands, was a work; in order that he may thereby make his own acts of healing, thus placed in common with human actions generally under the law, types of all works of love which his followers may ever perform. The cold over-saintly ones might say, If she has been bound these eighteen years, surely she might wait yet one day longer! But that very circumstance he makes an argument of the contrary, for he who loves his neighbor as himself would rather say—Not one moment longer must she suffer, if help can be afforded her! Could it be *forbidden* thus to help? Οὐκ ἐδει, *ought not, catechetically* answers, in infinite condescension, the inconsiderate, proud, and unintelligent δεῖ, "ought," of ver. 14. *Men ought* was the theme there; so now the *ought* is abundantly returned—*Ought* not, *must* not she, according to the law of love, which specially ordains God's works for the sabbath as man's labor for the remaining days, be loosed from this misery? But when our Lord so specifically mentions the *bond* with which *Satan* had bound this woman, we think that the reason must not be merely sought in the comparison with the unbound cattle; but (as the Lord embraced all things in his penetrating glance, and ever contemplated man's spiritual relations to God) we apprehend that he secretly beheld in this συγκύπτειν, *bent*, and ἀνακύπτειν, *made straight*, a *type* of spiritual conditions. *Satan*, verily, has bound wretched man like an animal to his stall, so that he looks down to the earth; but Christ looses the bond, and lifts up man's face to praise his God once more. Happy is he who, after being *loosed*, needs no further *leading;* but spontaneously goes to the *water of life* for the abiding refreshment of his soul!*

* We pass over altogether what follows, Luke xiii. 18–21; since we cannot find any connection here for the repetition of these two parables, comp. p. 269. Schleiermacher agrees with Storr in referring this Ἔλεγε δέ to the preceding, as if the Lord thus continued to speak to the synagogue; but we confess that we perceive no connection. And it is hard to understand how this is an interpolation "giving the Evangelist's view;" that he is commenting upon the narrative of the healing, in these parables, and by way of appendix (as Lange thinks), appears to us a very artificial supposition. We would rather say—if the *non liquet* is thought inadmissible—that vers. 18–21 are an introduction to the following ver. 22: Thus did the Lord continue (after these his earlier parables) to sow the seed, and to hide his leaven. But even this does not satisfy us.

ANSWER TO THE QUESTION WHETHER THERE ARE FEW THAT BE SAVED: THE STRAIT GATE AND SHUTTING OUT OF MANY.

(Luke xiii. 24–30 [Matt. vii. 13, 14, 21–23, viii. 11, 12, xx. 16].)

This solemn question, addressed to our Lord while on his way to suffer for the salvation of man, may be proposed to him by men, with three various designs, and in a threefold spirit. It may be objected *haughtily* or wantonly, with different degrees of pride, down to the scornful contradiction of the word which had already declared that there were few; it may be uttered *good-naturedly*, the hard saying being rendered light by defect of apprehension, and with vague good wishes and hopes on behalf of self and others; or proposed *despondingly*, in a more or less disheartened spirit; almost despairing, if the Lord meant strictly "few," but a little in doubt upon that point. In all these three inspiring motives, the question is really asked, Is it assuredly so? but it is only the desponding spirit which asks in true earnest, longing for an answer, while doubting in the very slightest degree whether any other will be given than that which already was latent in the question. The haughty questioner knows himself better, and contradicts in the form of a question. The easy-tempered spirit hopes confidently enough for an answer which will set him at rest. We gather, however, from the manner in which he here publicly accosts the Lord in the way, and still more, from the answer, inspiring fear rather than consolation, which he receives, that this questioner, so indefinitely introduced by Luke,* is not a man who has been sorely tested and disheartened; but neither is he an altogether frivolous mocker, for the Lord enforces upon him immediately the duty of earnest striving; consequently we must regard his tone of mind as the result of the mixture of good-natured doubt with something of Jewish bigotry and loftiness.† Luther's translation of the concise expression in which Luke gives the question, hits its meaning precisely—Lord, dost thou actually intend to say, is it thy literal and earnest meaning, that few are saved? The man had either heard with his own ears, or been told by others, what the Lord had uttered in the Sermon on the Mount, and probably, also, the often recurring declaration of Matt. xx. 16, there is so much earnestness in his disposition, that he can not altogether shake off the impression; it followed him and allowed him no rest. The objection, however, which his question implies, rests upon his Jewish supposition that of course all the Jews will be safe, and consequently that there must be essentially many to be saved. This we are given to understand by the answer, which with its "*Ye*" down to verse 28, embraces the Jews who stood around at the time.

Instead of an open and explicit answer, the Lord at first evades the question in ver. 24; while, at the same time, he reasserts his former word concerning the strait gate, *demanding* of every one earnest and strenuous diligence for himself. On this follows immediately the *reason* of it, giving the real answer in a twofold way: *Every man* may be saved, but many will not through their own fault. He speaks further with *For:* many will not enter in, though they desired it after a certain manner, and thought themselves secure (vers. 24–28)—others (in themselves many) will enter in, though *ye* suppose otherwise, ver. 29. Finally, in ver. 30, the warning conclusion is deduced—Thus will the first and the last change places; returning back to the first note—Therefore *strive!*

Verse 24. "*Question* not much—*strive* rather!" This is the first key-note of the reply; and it is applicable to all such and similar questions which man's curiosity may presume to throw out for the gratification of his curiosity, while his own soul's interests are not fundamentally cared for. The question in itself involved a double error: first, the supposition that it cannot possibly be so hard a case, since all Israel must necessarily sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom; and then, that the σώζεσθαι, or being saved, was a thing altogether taken for granted *in his own case*, the question being asked only for the sake of others. Both these delusions are answered by the Lord's single first word—ἀγωνίζεσθε: for its full and pregnant meaning is, *Strive—ye!* First of all, and preëminently, this referred, as we have said, to the Jews (verses 28, 29 show this), but then more extensively to *all men*, as sinners and needing a σώζεσθαι, or salvation—in opposition to whom, as eternally contradistinguished from them, stands this one sinless Son of Man, whose sublime discourse never adopts the word *we* when the sinful condition of man is the theme! To enter through the *strait gate*—that is now and ever the great concernment! Without sufficient grounds, Griesbach reads θύρας, *door*, here also at the beginning instead of πύλης, *gate*: but the variation of the

* For all persons besides Christ retire into the back-ground; their history being recorded not for the sake of its reference to them, but for its application to us, and as introducing the Lord's words addressed to us all.

† Schleiermacher is certainly wrong in thinking that "Jesus had been accustomed to send forward messengers who should announce his coming, and every one might observe their little success; consequently the question was *assenting*—Is it not true, that there are only few?" This is quite inconsistent with the answer. If we must thus seek motives, it would be more obvious to say that the man would think—So *many* follow thee in thy journeyings; in what sense wouldst thou speak of few?

phrase in the next verse is founded upon as good reason as the literal reference to the earlier utterance in this. Both words are pertinently chosen as related to each other: not, however, that *πύλη* is an external gate and *θύρα* an inner door behind it; but *πύλη* gives the comprehensive idea of an *entering* generally (an open way for passage, a door or pass unlocked, hence here quite parallel with the whole of the narrow *way*), while *θύρα* gives more definitely the distinctive idea of admission or exclusion, when the discourse reaches the shutting of the door. Thus, in as far as *πύλη* here of itself may be regarded as designating a free and broad gate, the *στενὴ πύλη*, strait gate, of Matt. vii. 13, contained in it an *ὀξύμωρον*, (*oxymoron*). Yet was it there as here—a gate, nevertheless, which stands open for *εἰσελθεῖν*, or entrance, and that to every man, who seeks it in the right way and truly finds it. *Strive*, struggle with all earnestness, and with self-denying determination, throughout all the impediments of the whole course* — then *shall ye be able!* Thus, this word most decisively repudiates the idea of any hidden divine decree which from the beginning excluded any man, and by which actual *ὀλίγοι*, or *few*, are determined; and refers the whole matter to ourselves, of whom the *εἰσέρχεσθαι*, entering, and *ἰσχύειν*, *being able*, are predicated—a word before which the whole brood of human and conventional methods of evading and denying its force should retire into annihilation.

But though most assuredly all might, and all could, if *they* would, enter in, yet this true and perfect willing, even to the final end and entrance, is a great and glorious and therefore rare thing. The Lord does not merely confirm, he *strengthens* also his former utterance, and makes the gate more strait than it first appeared in the former declaration. Then the contrast was with the many who naturally walk in the broad way; but now, even among those few who care for the kingdom of God, and actually strive after salvation — there are *many* who strive in vain! This is indeed a hard saying, and there is much that is highly critical involved in it.† And first, it may be said with strict propriety that *ζητεῖν*, *seeking*, is not *ἀγωνίζεσθαι*, *striving;* and that the Lord here, according to ver. 28, refers to that perverted endeavor of Israel described in Rom. ix. 31–33, which passes by the strait gate, knocks in vain at a false door, and by no means *can* establish a righteousness of its own, or discover a broader way than that of regeneration through faith in Christ. For in connection with the second *εἰσελθεῖν*, "enter," we do not find *διὰ τῆς στενῆς πύλης*, "through the strait gate," and hence we may understand it as meaning that many will seek *to enter*, by other ways broader than this, into the kingdom of God and its salvation. But the meaning penetrates deeper, and, according to the strict and emphatic connection of the entire discourse, includes the idea that there are many who even run for a time in the right course of the narrow way (1 Cor. ix. 24), eager to *contend* for the crown through the "strait gate"—but they neither run nor strive lawfully (2 Tim. ii. 5). What then is that *ζητεῖν*, or seeking, which is false, or which avails not to the final entering in; which, however it may resemble the lawful striving, only engenders a false confidence, which will be undeceived at last? It may be replied that the many do not, properly speaking, *strive*, their earnestness and zeal are not sufficiently intense,* and that may well be: but we must add—what is, alas! too commonly forgotten—that many there are who strive only *too much*, that is, who secretly introduce into the good fight of *faith* self-righteousness in its deepest disguise, would enforce their salvation by the *ζητεῖν*, or seeking, of their own personal energy, working and will, forgetting all the time that it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy (Rom. ix. 16). This declaration is the necessary complement for the right apprehension of the meaning of our Lord's words—or we may take for that purpose words of his own on another occasion, Matt. xviii. 3, xix. 14, Mark x. 15, spoken for our encouragement under the form of stern requirement. The final *οὐκ ἰσχύσουσι*, "*shall not be able*," makes it manifest that he is pointing, not merely to a lack of energy applied, but also to an excess of the wrong kind of energy—They shall not accomplish their purpose by all *their own* might, to renounce which, indeed, is the true warfare of self-denial, and the only method of attaining to that simplicity and poverty of spirit which can alone enter through the strait gate of grace.†

Verses 25–27. Hitherto the gate has been only strait, now at length the door is *shut*. The Lord dilates his warning declaration, predicting —first, the impending *rejection* of the many; as exhibited in a similitude wherein a renewed rejection of those who revolt against the first is solemnly asserted—and then, in ver. 28, the misery of those who are thus irreversibly *thrust out*. The *τότε*, "then," of ver. 26 answers to the *ἀφ' οὗ*, "when once," of ver. 25, and in it lies the emphasis of the whole. This has immediate reference to their *exclusion* at the first period of judgment in the kingdom established upon

* In this expression of our Lord, we have the germ of Paul's subsequent phraseology, in which the idea of the athlete and the contest, with and without figure, so habitually occurs.

† "A more direct contradiction to the destructive error of the final restoration of all the fallen than these words contain, can scarcely be imagined." So says Von Gerlach, and we unite with him in protesting against the error; but *this* discourse of our Lord, properly understood, is not one of the strongest protestations against it.

* According to Roos—Would enter with "slothful wishes;" or Von Gerlach—Seek it "in a certain external sense."

† The unqualified translation of this passage which the generally penetrating "*Kalender für Zeit und Ewigkeit*" (Villingen in Schwarzwald, 1843. Romanist alas!) gives us—"They shall not be able, *because* they do not apply *force* enough"—is certainly biassed, one-sided, and false.

earth (ver. 28), and not to the day of final condemnation. Compare on this what was said on Matt. xxiv. 48–51. Ver. 27 does, indeed, extend forward its threatening, for the several judgments stand in close connection; but the being excluded is not yet, as such, eternal torment.* The Master of the house is *risen up*, after long and patient waiting, to bring in the first concluding period of his kingdom's revelation for all who have been made worthy; they who regarded themselves as having the prerogative to enter, and who unexpectedly find themselves *without* when the door is suddenly shut, begin to utter most earnestly their "Lord, Lord," and will not submit to his first rejection, for they flatter themselves they have been in fellowship with him, and that he must, in spite of every appearance, know and acknowledge them. We shall find it hard here to include in this prescription all Israel, seeking the kingdom independently of Christ, unless we firmly hold fast the principle that in such widely-comprehensive representations as this, we are not to expect that every circumstance will precisely harmonise. In the present case the accompanying ὄχλοι, *multitudes*, are most obviously in our Saviour's view, and the discourse connects itself with, and springs from, them—then *figuratively* extending its range further. The *eating and drinking* in the Lord's presence (note—only ἐνώπιον without any internal communion) suggests to us immediately the miraculous feedings; but the καὶ πίνειν, "and drank," includes a reference to the fulfilment of that wilderness type, 1 Cor. x. 3, 4, in the Christian sacrament; the general fundamental idea remains—"Yet were we admitted guests at the *some-time* table of thy kingdom and grace, where thou wast so compassionate and patient! Thou hast taught in our streets, among our houses and towns, giving thy public instruction to us as most frequent and attentive hearers"—as was abundantly the case at this very time,† and will ever be the case with many who place their sole confidence in this, down to the final shutting of the door. But although these objectors mean to say—Who, if not *ourselves*, shall enter in to thee? yet have they never purely and essentially *done* his will; and they receive as a whole and in common (though not without degrees of difference) that fearful word spoken before in Matt. vii. 23; they remain without as evil-doers, and through their own personal fault.*

Verses 28–30. Without disparagement to the much wider and deeper significance of the first warning, the Lord now turns the immediate application of his word to Israel not seeking the kingdom of God, or if seeking it, seeking it otherwise than in the true way. That which he thus predicts is a repetition from Matt. viii. 11, 12. Thus, moreover, they are not *few* who shall sit down at the table (see the popular notion, Luke xiv. 15, as it is rightly to be interpreted)—this, though intimated (and asserted in Matt. viii. in connection with these words), is by design not expressly uttered here.† The excluded now first *see* ("to their intolerable vexation"—Roos thinks) the blessedness of those who are admitted—compare afterwards chap. xvi. 23. The *coming*, entering in, and sitting down in enjoyment, is the antithesis of the mere ζητεῖν, "seek," previously used. Whether, as Bengel suggests, the successive order of the four quarters prospectively hints at the process of the Gospel's missionary history, which began with the East and now rests in the South, we would leave undecided: however it may offend some, the thing itself is certain. The Lord probably takes his last saying, ver. 30 (*here* uttered with a strictly corresponding εἰσίν, *are*, and ἔσονται, *shall be*), from an earlier declaration which had been spoken in full as we find it in Matt. xx. 16; thereby referring the answer here given to *both* those places in which he had spoken of the "few." It is still remarkable, in regard to the prophetical allusion just mentioned, that in fact, and on the whole, the *Oriental* first Christians have become the last, and that the late comers from the South to all appearance may become the first. Thus much is certain, amid these doubtful applications, that the word of the Spirit often embraces, as we see in this discourse of our Lord, and generally elsewhere, the most specific fulfilments of its meaning in individual cases and in internal things, in immediate connection with its typical exhibition in the general progress of his kingdom: for the history of that kingdom is so ordered by his hand as to be the counterpart of all his other wonderful works (Psa. lxxviii. 2).

---

* And *so far* this is not literally one of the strongest texts to establish the definite loss of salvation in the case of the many—though the final judgment lies threateningly in the back-ground of the former.

† Which adjunct idea Schleiermacher makes prominent: "This word was spoken in Galilee, where many thus heard, and ate and drank with him." This is correct enough as the point of connection for the whole figurative discourse, but we cannot admit what follows—"and stood in the relation of guests to Jesus!" For this is inappropriate and untrue: who was a guest of Jesus? *This* word is therefore figurative, and reaches much further.

* It is most striking that ἐργάται stands here solitarily in Luke, which always designates laborers in the hire and service of another. We never find פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן so translated in the Old Testament: but in 1 Macc. iii. 6 the expression is thus found. We have already referred to this in our *Andeutungen fur gl. Schriftv.* ii. Sammlung, among the allusions to passages in the Apocrypha. Compare, moreover, Xenoph. *Memor.* ii. 1. 27.—τῶν καλῶν καὶ σεμνῶν ἐργάτην.

† Miserably deficient is the narrow interpretation of Schleiermacher, that "only to the Palestine Jews was it so preëminently hard, to find this first entrance; *the others, not* a few, but very *many*, might enter in, from all places and ends of the earth!"

REPLY TO THE HYPOCRITICAL WARNING AGAINST HEROD: THE FOX AND THE PROPHET-MURDERESS; PROPHETIC DEPARTURE FROM JERUSALEM.

(Luke xiii. 32–35 [Matt. xxiii. 37–39]).

Our Lord's long last journey to Jerusalem, as recorded by Luke, will always retain some measure of obscurity for the harmonists. Two things, however, are sufficiently plain: first, that he mentions individual occurrences without strict regard to chronology, even repeating and intercalating some things elsewhere recorded; and, secondly, that in his account of the entire journey, the emphasis is laid upon the Lord's going to encounter his closely impending sufferings and death. We cannot concur with Wieseler's recent scheme;* and think it very doubtful whether Luke xiii. 22 indicates the setting out towards Bethany of John xi. 1; to us it seems more like an intimation of a continuous onward course after chap. ix. 51. And here in chap. xiii. 31 the *same day* cannot signify a definite day of departure, for that would not consist with verse 22. We mention this now preparatorily, as it will be found of moment for the interpretation of the three days.

Another preliminary question before we enter on the subject is this, What was the meaning of the warning against the snares of Herod, on the part of the Pharisees? or, Did the information that Herod sought to kill Jesus rest upon any foundation of truth? It is scarcely imaginable in itself that the Pharisees would warn the Lord with a sincere and honest intention, and the idea is contradicted by the severe reply which they received; but it is almost equally obvious that the entire story was no more than a false report. That Herod, after the beheading of John the Baptist, should have ventured to conceive an attack upon Jesus, accords neither with his character nor with the simple account of Luke ix. 7–9, which represents him as greatly desirous to see the Saviour, a desire, too, which chap. xxiii. 8 once more exhibits as having been permanent. Thus these two passages of the same evangelist forbid us to assume that Herod wished to frighten Jesus away from his territory, and employed these Pharisees to that end. It were better to say, that, if they did not actually invent the *θέλει σε ἀποκτεῖναι*, "will kill thee" (which, again, seems unconformable with their craftiness of character), yet they had taken up some groundless report and brought it to the Lord—in order that they might put an end to his too long wandering about and evasion, and thus hypocritically hasten him to Jerusalem, with the design, further, of testing whether he would be accessible to fear.* This very probable supposition best harmonizes with the otherwise very obscure answer of Jesus; which certainly does not, as has been said, "make it very plain that the words of the Pharisees were *no* falsehood."

Verse 32. We can now altogether agree with Ebrard, that the Lord, penetrating their cunning device, replied to them *ironically*—"Tell this Herod, who, *according to your representation*, is so crafty." "That he terms Herod crafty, as if he believed them; and that he further commissions them to go to this Herod, whom they thus complain of to him—both these things, *taken together*, intimate plainly that he perceives *their* craftiness."† *Herod and yourselves are altogether in concert and alike*—this is the fundamental idea for our understanding of the word. *They* had begun—*ἔξελθε καὶ πορεύου*, "get thee out and depart"; and he now, in his first *πορευθέντες*, "go," immediately gives them back their dismissal. Now, although the designation "that *fox*" very aptly describes one who had acquired and maintained dominion, less by energetic vigor than by subtle intrigues, and might very probably have been an expression in common use which the Lord thus gave them to understand that he knew; and although such a comparison "in its ancient sense and use" might, as has been said, contain a less offensive allusion than in our times; yet we cannot believe that our Lord would *directly* and in earnest have spoken in such a manner of the *ruler of his country*, and with the possibility of their going and saying—He called thee a fox! This would have been unexampled in the whole tenor of our Lord's deportment, who so scrupulously maintained decorum towards the existing powers of the land; always diverting the question both from Herod and Pilate

* And particularly in his assumption that Luke ix. 51 corresponds with the coming to the feast of Tabernacles, John vii. 10; for this would be too early, being half a year before, for the *ἀνάλημψις* now approaching (a word which we must not explain away); besides which, such a public journeying towards Jerusalem very ill harmonizes with the *ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ* of John.

* "They make Herod's murderous character their pretence; he had already caused the Baptist to be put to death. That was a crafty scheme, if it had succeeded. Jesus, in exhibiting fear, would elevate the courage of his enemies, and, more than that, would have destroyed his own reputation among the people, thus making himself an easy prey" (Braune).

† Neander thinks it would have been unworthy of our Lord, to rebuke the Pharisees through Herod, and that he would have told them plainly that he penetrated their craftiness. But it appears to us that he *does* let them know it, though in their own tone, and in a manner which *they* would well understand. Yet Neander himself says, just as we have said, that these Pharisees probably acted from motives of their own, using for their own purposes a report probably untrue.

when occasion arose for speaking against them, and for deep reasons not even using in all its rigor his own prophetic prerogative of inveighing against rulers. That he does call Herod a fox, however, remains certain after all; but the case is very much altered, and does not transgress the limits of propriety to be preserved, if, as Olshausen says, "this word is in reality aimed only at themselves, under the name of Herod—that *that* fox, of whom they idly reported, existed nowhere else than in their own hearts." In fact this seems to express itself in the ironical tone of the ταύτῃ, *that*, itself. How closely compacted are you and your Herod in cunning against me! The merely bestial, that is, equally stupid and weak, the despicable fox-cunning seems to form a contrast with the more intensely evil enmity of Jerusalem, the public murderess of the prophets, springing as it did from human malignity, or indeed from the roaring lion of hell: but both are quite in concert if we understand it thus—"Now will ye as foxes concert with the fox to affright me away, and speed me to the place where more violent attacks and indignities await me." Suffice it that the Lord gives them to see that he penetrates their hearts' design: tells them himself what they might go and repeat, "I regard not your wiles or your power; *I go my way*, without any respect to your *Depart hence! Behold*, what evil am I doing, that I should fear death from the ruler of the land? My works, as you see them, are altogether unpolitical and without harm—*I cast out devils* (which is *your* stumbling-block, but which Herod the Sadducee will not believe), and *do cures* as my useful occupation!" He designedly omits to say anything here of his *doctrine*, which indeed did not concern or trouble Herod, in order to adapt his words still to the ironical fiction; he does not allude to his preaching the kingdom of heaven—but the Pharisees well know what his works signify and what they attest. These works I do *to-day and to-morrow*—we can find in these words only a *proverbial* expression: As long as it pleases me, as long as it is appointed to me; and also to-morrow, instead of departing hence to-day according to your will. For it is just as plain that the σήμερον, to-day, in verses 32 and 33 are the same, as that the expression for the *third* day is varied in order to show that the proverbial, and not the literal sense, is intended. Thus we are not to think of three literal days of journeying from here to Bethany or Jerusalem,* nor can we admit the explanation that on the third day the Lord would leave Galilee, would end his work there; but the expression is perfectly parallel with John xi. 9, 10, and says—I have my appointed time, in which I can continue to walk and to act, fearless and undisturbed. *Here*, however, we must add—A time which is fast running out, only three days, that is, a few days left to run.† Some have been disposed to interpret the τελειοῦμαι, "I shall be perfected," in strict harmony with the ἐπιτελῶ, *I finish* ("I do"); although the very form of the word shows that it was intended to indicate something different and contrasted. It has even been taken transitively, and therefore tautologically—I finish all these works; or in an indefinite middle sense (De Wette's translation—*vollende ich*—I perfect), applying it to the *journeying* as not to-day, but on the day after the morrow, or when it pleases me.* But how superficial is this meaning, how contradictory to the following verse, where the Lord assumes for the following day merely the same πορεύεσθαι, "walk," as to-day and to-morrow, and by no means a τελειοῦν, τελειοῦσθαι, *finishing*, or anything like a ceasing, and removal elsewhere. We see that the days are not to be taken literally; but the τελειοῦμαι, "*I shall be perfected*," on an already appointed *third* day, that is, a day no longer in the distance, must mean something distinctive. Had not his being *killed* been spoken of, and must not the Lord be supposed to have given a reply *to that?* Does he not in the parallel clause (verse 33), speak forthwith of ἀπολέσθαι, *perishing*, the place and time of which were well known to him? But if the τελειοῦσθαι refers to this, we must give up every idea of a literal reckoning of the days, which would at best only reach as far as the entrance into Jerusalem. We have, then, good grounds for understanding the Lord to say—I *die* indeed, but not through the artifice of the fox Herod, ye more than foxes; and not yet to-day or to-morrow! This is the only reply of the Lord to these cunning ones, which corresponds with the situation of the case, and harmonizes with every other consideration: "I do my duty, and undergo my destiny; I distribute life—and go to my death." But the Lord designedly employs a word which certainly does not in itself signify *dying;* the expression is a pregnant one, which embraces at once life or death. We understand it less as saying—*Then come I to the end*, than as rather saying—*I am perfected*, that is, I finish my *course*, attain my *goal*, accomplishing perfectly by my death the great task of my redeeming life. Thus Phil. iii. 12 is to be understood, according to the phraseology of the race-course; comp. Acts xx. 24. (On the other hand, we venture not to penetrate so far as to the meaning of Heb. v. 9, ii. 10.)

Verse 33. The connection is now very clear and precise: "On a *third day* (which will not come before it should come and must) I shall

* We cannot certainly, with Sepp, who is ever ready to find similitudes and mystic allusions, discern in these three days' journeying a figure of the three years' ministry.

† Alford does not concede this, because of the positive use of the *three days* in an affirmative sentence—of which no instance can be brought where the proverbial meaning is implied; but we think that it is in itself highly natural, and is attested in this case decidedly by the whole context.

* Schleiermacher, in an oral delivery which I penned down—"On the day after the morrow I will go quietly on my way, without either haste or fear, without any constraint of Herod." Almost like Dr. Paulus—"I have yet some days in which to effect certain cures, but will bring them to a close on the third day, and then voluntarily go on my way."

arrive at the end of my life and its work; *but till then* (that is, yet a few days, for I mean not literally the third day) *I must walk*, or even *journey*.* Thus it is not according to your direction, but as the Father hath appointed unto me." Further—"I shall not indeed remain here, whence ye would have me depart (πορεύεσθαι, as in verse 31), but assuredly go *unto Jerusalem*, not however to escape danger from Herod, but—to fall into your and your fellows' murderous hands. Do ye suppose that I know not this? Or that the thought of this would affright me?" For one moment the tone of irony, keenly touching their secret, is heard, before the sad lamentation of slighted love bursts forth and absorbs all else. "*Jerusalem* the holy city, in which Satan also has his course, may not lose that honor which has been her appropriate prerogative from the beginning; to her belongs the preëminence, and she shall keep it; there have the enemies of God's kingdom their seat, and all those who plot against my doctrine, consentient with that of all the prophets, concerning that kingdom; it would to others be unsuitable, *it cannot be* (οὐκ ἐνδέχεται, comp. ch. xvii. 1) *otherwise*, than that *a prophet* (even every one) must perish there, and not elsewhere!" It is to be observed that as the Lord had in Nazareth involved his own lot with that of all the rejected prophets, so now he assumes the same position at the close—partly in humility, partly in love, which would thus, as it were, conceal the heavier guilt of their putting himself to death, as the Messiah and the Son; but it also infolds that truth to which, as the ground of his future teaching, his own lips must bear witness, that before his death he occupied preëminently the prophetic office to testify concerning himself, in order to consummate and close the prophetic position and function. If it be asked why the Lord did not think of John, the prophet whom Herod had put to death out of Jerusalem, the answer is at hand, that he does thus remind them of this recent exception, as if he should say: "Herod has indeed put the Baptist to death, anticipating and preventing your appropriate act, but that was a specific case, against the will and course of things, an exception which will not affect my fate; the rule will be exemplified in my person at Jerusalem."

Verses 34, 35. We have already given our opinion upon the light and venial doubt which has been raised, as to whether or not the Evangelist Luke merely incorporated these words—which in Matthew form the final and solemn farewell of our Lord—because of the connection of their subject with the present.† But now more directly considering the words, we are led to decide, more explicitly than before that the Lord did at this earlier time actually utter these words. Can we suppose that Luke did not indeed know to what place they belonged, or that the guidance of the Holy Spirit would not have shown him the impropriety of placing them here, *if* the Lord only spake them once, and at the solemn close? We can, in deed, perfectly well understand how Jesus contemplating in his prophetic glance all tha impended over him in Jerusalem, should have broken out in such a cry as this, a cry which afterwards, when its sad presentiment was fulfilled, was once more uttered and recorded.* The sense remains on the whole the same as we have expounded it in Matthew; and the comprehensive glance over all the prophetic missions and invitations down to this last and greatest, makes its connection with the preceding verse very plain.† But the latter clause, concerning the house left, and the seeing him again, must naturally have a modified sense here, receiving afterwards its new meaning; and there are many examples of such wider application of earlier sayings. It is admitted by most that ἔρημος, "desolate," which would indeed only suit that future farewell and departure, is not here the true reading; the omission of this here is as significant as the absence likewise of ἀπ' ἄρτι, "henceforth." The Lord *now* only says—*Your house*, around which the children of Jerusalem were gathering for the feast, but not gathering around me, who have so often there taught and solicited them‡—behold, *I leave it to you*, that is, soon to receive its full doom, but now for the present I come not today or to-morrow into the temple. Consequently, further—Ye shall, for this time, see me and hear me first in your midst *at the feast*. It is wrong, however, to forget that the whole of verses 34, 35 is an address to the inhabitants of Jerusalem in common; and thence to refer the last *ye* again to these Pharisees—"Ye shall first see me, when we meet once more at the feast." That is a very inadequate explanation of the great Hosanna-cry, which neither these nor any other Pharisees uplifted to greet him; it is rather the Lord's purpose to predict here his final entrance, which he had in Zechariah before his eyes: "O Jerusalem, thou wilt receive me once more, for it is so decreed, as *him that cometh* (of whom all the prophets have spoken); thou must festally and solemnly receive, as sent unto thee in the highest sense—and then crucify, me!" The prospective allusion to this joyful greeting in the far distant futurity, in the same expression as Matthew's

* That is, "on the way of my work." Thus it is not necessary to insert, with the Peshito, an ἐργάζεσθαι after αὔριον—as Neander thinks the complete sense requires.

† Hence many decide, without further ado, that the words belong not here, as, *e.g.*, Grotius, Meyer, De Wette, Schleiermacher, Neander.

* This meets Schleiermacher's objection, that such an address to Jerusalem would be unlikely in Galilee.

† But we must be on our guard against the trifling which sometimes connects the *fox* and the *hen*.

‡ For οἶκος is obviously here *the temple*—and does not, as Stein most whimsically interprets, signify "all which pertains to the happiness of family and public life."

repetition uses, is assuredly based upon its *type* in this first Hosanna.

And now let the whole reply be glanced over again, in all its richness of meaning: how the Lord exhibits in few words his own perfect knowledge of man, instantly detecting the true fox—the precision and boldness of his instantaneous rejoinder—the scorn which meets the cunning, the brief severity with which he treats the hypocrites—the holy serenity which pervades the whole, undisturbed in his firm prosecution of his conscious way—the piercing energy of this denunciation, in connection with the tenderness of his lamenting love, preserved down to the very end of his toiling, long-suffering life—finally, the sublimity of that prophetic glance, with which he surveys as well the history of the past, as the process of his own life and death, and in verse 35 anticipates the last and most glorious scenes of all.

A SECOND SABBATH-HEALING.

(Luke xiv. 3, 5 [Matt. xii. 10, 11]).

Whether this second conflict of our Lord with the Pharisees on occasion of his healing on the Sabbath, a conflict which exhibits a deportment on his part very similar to that maintained on other occasions, but which bears essential marks of being a distinct occurrence, is to be placed in chronological sequence after the denunciatory discourses of chaps. xi. and xii., is a question still open to discussion. The mere position of the account does not enable us to determine positively in the affirmative; though the section cannot be assigned to a *later* period of the last journey (similarly with the whole of chaps. xiv.–xvi.), for the Lord appears now to have leisure for visiting houses and imparting instruction. Grotius assumes, entirely without foundation, that the host was a member of the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem; Luke simply describes him as an ἄρχων, a ruler (of some sort), who, like most such, was of the sect of the Pharisees.* Even after such rigorous denunciations, so rigorous that they might have seemed to be an anticipation of his final renunciation of them all, the Lord is seen to be still ready to accept the invitations of these worse than Publicans to their tables; and when they exhibit their malignity he can all the more unrestrainedly confront and correct them with the simplicity of truth and love. If we bind closely together vers. 1 and 2, it might be thought probable that the sick man was brought by the Pharisees for the express purpose that they might test the Lord—see what he would do on the Sabbath day, or possibly whether his power was equal to the curing of this dropsical man. In such a case, the kindness of the Physician towards a man who suffered himself to be thus misused, comes out into still greater prominence. But the ἦν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, "there was before him," does not indicate of itself anything more than a coincidence; and thus the Lord, notwithstanding the παρατηρεῖν, "watching," of which he was well aware, at once heals the sick man who appeared in his presence. The καὶ ἦν, "and there was," disproves Pfenninger's notion that the man had been brought in consequence of a sympathising inquiry; it is much more natural to suppose that before the sitting down (ver. 7), at the approach and in the act of coming into the house (ver. 1), the sick man had presented himself as a petitioner in the forecourt. We must then regard the παρατηρούμενοι or *watchers* as surrounding and observing him from the very beginning. Suffice it that Luke designs to tell us that even here, as soon as a sick man comes before him, the Lord is ready to help. On this occasion he anticipates the polemical question which had so often been put, just in the way in which, *e.g.*, Matt. xii. 10, his enemies had put it to him; and in the manner in which he simply proposes the question it is already answered. There are many such *questions*, the mere proposal of which puts all gainsayers to *silence*, which we ourselves need only to propose, if we have also the simplicity of victorious truth on our side.

The illustration of an ox fallen into a pit or well might be thought to have some correspondence with the malady by which this man was perishing, just as before the binding and loosing the animal might have been chosen with reference to the woman's being bound; but the circumstance in itself was of general proverbial significance. The reading υἱός, *son*, which Rettig defends in *Stud. u. Krit.* (1838–4), and which, if genuine, would require ἢ βοῦς, "or ox," to be regarded as a spurious and unapt addition, is, in itself, despite all critical authority, so inappropriate that we cannot admit it; we cannot suppose that Jesus would require it of these heartless Pharisees, without any qualification, that they should treat every stranger to them with the same love which they would feel towards their own children! That would be quite discordant with his constant custom, which was to enter into the position and adapt himself to the character of those with whom he contended, for their keen conviction; and Olshausen is right in saying that we must assume here the same conclusion *a minori ad majus* from an animal to a man, which holds good in

* Or as a Pharisee who at the same time was an ἄρχων. Thus only can we translate it, and in no case regard των φαρισαίων as rigidly dependent upon ἀρχων; for the Pharisees, as such, had no official leaders, or heads, none at least who are called ἀρχοντες in the New Testament.

analogous sayings. The strange juxtaposition of "son and ox" Rettig himself cannot admit;* on the other hand that of "ox or ass" is warranted by Exod. xxi. 33, which appears to be the essential foundation of such a proverbial expression as found also in the Talmud, comp. Deut. xxii. 4. Should it not be as *lawful* to do that in love to a poor man which selfishness would do for these two most useful beasts—as lawful as to provide entertainment and receive guests on the Sabbath day? Is not this rather commanded by the very nature of the Sabbath, instituted as it was by God's love, for the cure of man's whole nature? Before, they *kept silence*, because they *would* not give any answer; but now it is yet more emphatic—They *could* not! No man among them was shameless or irrational enough to reply—I would not do even that, but rather let my ox or my ass remain! or—That would be a very much more important matter, the case of a most useful beast! or even—That would be less an act of labor than this of thy healing!

THE UNGROUNDED PRETENSIONS OF PROUD PHARISEES AND UNREFLECTING FOLLOWERS REPELLED. THREE PARABLES TWICE OVER: THE BEING INVITED, OUR OWN INVITING, AND THE REFUSING GUESTS; THE REQUIREMENTS OF DISCIPLESHIP; THE TRUE ABILITY BOTH FOR BUILDING AND WARFARE.

(Luke xiv. 8–35 [Matt. xxiii. 12, xxii. 2–9, x. 37, 38]).

Here, too, we have not merely a real, but also a chronological connection: chap. xv. 1 first introduces a new scene, without stricter definition of time. The formula *συνεπορεύοντο δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί*, "and there went great multitudes with him," *might* indeed be taken as beginning anew with the same indefiniteness as *ἦσαν δὲ ἐγγίζοντες αὐτῷ*,† "then drew near unto him," chap. xv. 1, but the matter of his sayings, when viewed by a correct spirit of exposition, forbids us to assume any such loose connection. The Lord evidently continues to speak to the people in the same strain which he had begun at the meal just left; he repels, in ver. 26, those who thoughtlessly followed him, just as he had before repelled the unwarranted claim to "eat bread in the kingdom of God." We, therefore, do well to embrace the whole section, as including all that was said both within and without the house, under the one concise theme—*Rejection of unfounded pretensions*, see ver. 15, in the middle of the whole. The Lord abases *proud Pharisees*, who were unjustifiably confident of the kingdom of God; and also *thoughtless adherents* from among the people, who regarded his discipleship as an unwarrantably light matter. This gives us two co-ordinate portions of the discourse, which correspond in their plan and treatment. We have *three parables* for the abasement of the Pharisees in connection with the feast, and then again *three parables* for the warning repulsion of the unthinking crowds, spoken on leaving the feast. And we can hardly think that it was Luke only who thus blended them in such symmetry.

Still more precisely, in each case we perceive two conjunct similitudes in connection with a third. In the former part there are two *preparatory* lessons (so to speak) given in similitudes which spring directly from the feast, and afterwards the *consummating* third similitude, which is evoked by the direct expression given to the unfounded pretensions in ver. 15. The first parable of all, springing directly from an obvious occasion given, and already seizing the ultimate principle which gave it here its force, is directed against the pride of *the invited*, and therefore spoken to the guests. The counsels here given, seeming as they do to exhibit common prudential maxims of life—Be not proud, lest thou be put to shame! Be rather lowly, so shalt thou be honored! are suddenly, in the more wide-extended *concluding lesson* of ver. 11, so deepened and spiritualised, that they in themselves appear obviously to condemn the Pharisaical *pride* of the Jews in relation to the kingdom of God, just as in Matt. xxiii. 12. The second parable, vers. 12–14, is then added, without any external challenge, and as a counterpart of the former; directed against selfishness in the *party inviting*, and, therefore, addressed to him who bade him and the other guests—Bid not with selfish aims, but in the spirit of active benevolence, and with reference to the future recompense! In this is condemned by a figure the *selfishness* of the Jews with regard to love of their neighbor, springing from their practical ignorance of the mercy of God; and its conclusion, ver. 14, gives it plainly to be understood

* Sepp, indeed, quotes (ii. 337) in favor of this reading, a similar saying from the *Baba Kama*, 5, 6. (If an ox or ass, son or daughter, man-servant or maid, fall into a well)—but even there the pair is not so coupled precisely, and if it were, we have no right to insert into the New Testament a later Jewish tradition.

† As Scheibel argues, who denies any connection throughout chaps. xiv.–xvi. (*Das Abendmahl des Herrn*, p. 118).

that only the righteous, and not all the Jews as such, will attain a happy resurrection. When, at this point, the idly-devout cry of ver. 15, interrupts his words, softening down if not directly opposing their intensely earnest application, with a tacit assumption that the eating bread in the kingdom of God would be the prerogative of all Israelites, and preëminently of all the Pharisees—the Lord proceeds, according to his wont, to make this stone of stumbling thrown in his way a foundation for a further, and still more explicit, declaration. Hence the third parable, vers. 16–24. "Verily, ye are all bidden to the supper of God; but because those who were bidden cling to self and the world, instead of truly *coming* in the prescribed way of repentance and faith, therefore they will not taste the bread of the kingdom of God, but others in their place!" The concluding lesson, ver. 24, passes directly to the undisguised interpretation of the whole.

The Lord has gone out, and the crowding multitudes, the ὄχλοι πολλοί, seem to say that *they* were disposed to receive the invitation aright, and *come* to the supper as required. But he sees through them; and, continuing the same train of thought, once more begins to utter the language of repulsion, humbling and teaching those who throng to him from the people. We have, again, *two* yet more general preparatory similitudes teaching the great requirements of his discipleship; the *third* then supplements them, as a warning against that apostasy which is the certain issue of such spurious or half discipleship. In this case the *instruction*, as we might have expected, comes first in unfigurative words—In order to be my disciples, it is requisite that the dearest objects should be renounced, ver. 26, and the Divine discipline voluntarily submitted to, ver. 27. Both these lessons are illustrated in two coordinate parables concerning *building* and *warfare*, which do not by any means (as our exposition will show) mean one and the same thing, but have a progressive idea in their signification. In the *building* of conversion, the only true counting of the cost is—that a man should see his own absolute incompetence and emptiness (or renounce everything); the retaining of any by-love, such as would hinder its completion, being a *humiliating* and disgraceful half-work, vers. 28–30. In the *conflict*, inseparable from a continuance in discipleship—with God who layeth his "cross" upon us, in order to our furtherance and preservation, the only wise condition of peace with the Almighty One is—that a man should see his own feebleness, and voluntarily submit, vers. 31, 32. That all this may be perfectly understood, ver. 33 follows, with a plain lesson at the close like that at the beginning—To renounce all that a man hath is the material for building, to pray for peace is the real might in warfare! Finally, in vers. 34, 35 we have the *third*, conclusive similitude of the worthless salt, which cannot be made good again, and is fit for nothing but—to be *cast out* (and trodden under foot); and this concludes by the strongest utterance of that fundamental idea of *humiliation* and *disgrace* which has pervaded our Lord's warnings from ver. 8 downwards.

Verses 8, 10. With the malignant παρατηρεῖν, *watching*, of the Pharisees, corresponds the gracious ἐπέχειν, *marking*, of the Redeemer and Physician of souls to all that comes before his attention: he pays special attention to the deportment of the guests in taking their places, wherein was most plainly brought to light the deplorable baseness of their spirit. After, as we may suppose, a long and beautiful grace, a most petty contention arises about their several seats and dignity; for the excellent custom of assigning beforehand to guests their respective places had not yet been established. Thus unworthily to be seeking their own honor on the Sabbath day, and that, too, in the presence of the Holy One of God, whom it had been their design to entrap and abase, at once lays these crafty assailants open to his censure, exhibits their character precisely as he denounced it in chap. xx. 46, and gives him a vantage-ground for beginning the attack in a manner which would be likely to disconcert their plans. The Lord avoids the appearance of assuming an unseasonable tone, and uttering lessons designedly prepared for the assembly: he simply lays hold of the circumstances of the moment, according to his custom ever to seize humanity in its external exhibition of itself, and to illustrate and pass sentence upon the internal dispositions which the external act betrays.* Luke introduces the Lord's word at the outset as a παραβολή, or "parable," the form which would best correspond with the decorous instruction of a guest at a feast, and this at the same time hints at the profound spiritual application which comes out so impressively at the conclusion, ver. 11; one might almost say that the Saviour now essays to heal that far worse than bodily dropsy, the inflation of pride, the dropsy of the heart, in these miserable men.†

When *thou* art bidden—simply the ordinary form of speech, which does not involve the necessity of embarrassing the subject by insignificant inquiries as to the individual person addressed. Did he speak to him who stood nearest, or to the chief person present, in direct

---

* Schleiermacher: "The dignity of these words appears in this, that without any appearance of profoundness or severity, they lay bare the secret disposition lying at the foundation of the external behavior which they condemn."

† Kleuker: "The morbid and restless desire of the creature in his vanity for the better place." To what lengths this drove the later Jewish scribes, many evidences show. Simeon Ben Shetach, invited by King Jannæus, placed himself between the king and the queen. Being asked why he did so, his reply was that it was written—Wisdom maketh him to sit among great men (Eccles. xi. 1, comp. Prov. iv. 8). This circumstance is found in Hieros *Berachoth*, fol. ii. 2.

condemnation; or conversely to one who modestly remained below for his encouragement? Nothing of the kind, but as Luke correctly and plainly writes—*πρὸς τοὺς κεκλημένους, πρὸς αὐτούς*, "to those that were bidden," "to them." The *scriptural* foundation of this מָשָׁל, or "parable," which is not limited to the Jews or to the East (it even appears in Baron Von Knigge, and in Alberti's *Komplimentirbuch*), but which our Lord has illustrated in its profoundest meaning, is Prov. xxv. 6, 7; comp. in Ecclus. i. 29, though the son of Sirach elsewhere omitted this among the rules of his guests. The warning, however, places the evil in the strongest light by addressing the least modest, who at once took possession of *τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν*, the one pre-eminent seat, with which afterwards *τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον*, "the lowest place," is strictly parallel. When, therefore, some more honorable personage comes in at a later hour—for here also the most eminent ones seem to regard it as dignified to come in last—he who bade not only *thee* with thy pride, but him *also*, will naturally say, and without much circumlocution (without even the prefatory *φίλε*, "friend," which greets the humble man)—Make place for this man, as it is fit! and as of course it is not to be supposed that the whole company would rise and make a general movement downward, nothing remains but that thou take the lowest place as the result of thy impropriety, and that, too, very properly, with shame and disgrace. The shame which does not attach to the mere sitting below, falls upon him who is sent down from a higher place; and that is finely intimated in the *ἄρξῃ*, "begin." If it is thy aim to have honor in the the presence of the company, it should be thy prudence so to act as to be sent upwards rather—thus would thy aim be better secured. This might seem at first to be a mere common rule of discretion, which approves and confirms the desire for honorable place; but it appears so only until we mark the application of the parable to the final and essential allotment of our place in the supper of the kingdom of God—for the third parable, ver. 16, is thus really prepared for in this first. And it is also quite right when rightly understood—though the *ἵνα*, "that," in the application must not be overmuch pressed—to abase the *κενοδοξία* (vain glory) by seeking the true *δόξα* (glory)—If thou wilt be the first, then be the last! The Lord's gracious wisdom reminds us poor mortals of those frequent *humiliations* which arise in the external relations of our early life, as if for types and warnings. How often is something similar to this occurring; one who thinks himself great meeting with one still greater of whom he thought not, and before whom he must recede: but how ineffectual generally are these humiliations in abasing pride, which still seeks other methods of exaltation, masked with yet finer subtility! Our polished guests, under similar circumstances, act very differently from those grovelling Pharisees, ver. 7; they adopt, in their sense, the Lord's counsel, and seek for honor with hypocritical humility. How often is this seen even in the ordinances of religion, even at the holy supper of the Lord; the same spirit being exhibited under a disguised expression, which, in a thousand forms shows, in daily life, its undissembled eagerness to obtain the *πρωτοκλισία* or chief seat. And the sentence with which our Lord closes is ever receiving a manifold fulfilment.

Verse 11. The exaltation of self was at that time the essential spirit of the Pharisees, and of the whole people with them; as it is of all men generally under the influence of their inborn pride. This foolish, unprofitable, and disappointed striving is exhibited everywhere in human affairs before the presence of men: every one desires naturally the uppermost place, at least relatively to others seeking *τὰς πρωτοκλισίας* "the chief seats," and forgetting in that passion the rights of this or that *ἐντιμότερος*, "more honorable person" than himself. Although the Lord, speaking directly of these external things, does not intend to be understood as levelling all distinction, but rather *confirms* the outward proprieties of higher and lower in human life; yet does he take occasion to denounce the blinded folly which *seeks* in such externalities a vain honor instead of the true, and in such a frivolous and contemptible way as to need no deprivation of its object to put it to shame. But fundamentally all place, and position, and title are alike petty and external. As, however, man's internal pride is manifested in these things before man, so is it more emphatically *before God;* he knows the abject ones who cringe before their fellows, and the indolent who care nothing about higher or lower, provided only they have their share, both alike utterly regardless of their abasement before the Supreme. He knows every publican and sinner who exalts himself above other publicans and sinners worse than himself, and it is to this that the closing saying of the parable points; that profound declaration which we have already contemplated on Matt. xxiii. 12, and which we shall soon hear again in a most impressive connection (chap. xviii. 14). That he who presses forward is repelled, he who humbly retires is advanced; that pride is abased, and humility exalted; is one great antithetical fact, which is pretypified in ten thousand ways in human life, and will have its eternal consummation in every soul at the last day. On the one side stands the Lord Jesus Christ,* according to Phil. ii. 8, 9; and on the other that first of all sons of pride, in whom, according to Isa. xiv. 13–15, this parable had its first and most awful fulfilment. Choose then, O man, between the way of Christ and the way of Satan!

Verses 12–14. The excellent John Newton† condemned most vehemently the vain parties and feasts of Christian people; appealing to Luke xiv. 12–14 as a passage of Scripture which

* To whom no man assigned in this feast the seat of honor. He waits calmly to occupy the place which will be his, and meanwhile speaks in the midst of their tumultuous striving a few words of penetrating truth.

† In his very edifying letters, several times issued in German.

few seemed to regard as a portion of holy writ, and which was more neglected than any other: but such sentiments rest upon a very superficial exposition of the letter. More perverted, however, were the theory and practice of the enthusiastic Müller of Bristol,* who for more than thirteen years acted literally on the injunction of Rom. xiii. 8, and thought that every man who willed to perform the commandments of God, according to John vii. 17, would be inwardly convinced that every injunction in the Sermon on the Mount must be understood *literally*, in the strictest sense. But, after all, this is in any case the least which our Lord designed to say here—that we should rather invite the poor and the maimed than our own friends, neighbors, and relatives to our feasts; indeed, the rigid literal fulfilment of this parabolical commandment, given to be understood by us in its spirit, would involve an unjust contravention of the instincts of love and propriety—just as we have had occasion to see on several earlier occasions. Schleiermacher, therefore, has something like right when he says—"this would be to subvert the natural procedure of all social life!" Bengel's remark is simple and excellent—"Jesus invitationes ex necessitudine naturali et civili quasi *suo loco relinquit*, ipse meliores præcipit. Humanitatis officia non plane tollit," (Jesus *leaves to their own place*, as it were, invitations of natural or civil necessity, his own precepts relate to those of a better kind. He evidently does not destroy the offices of humanity). The "not" of the text may here, as often, be taken as signifying *not so much, not only;* and, generally speaking, the whole form of expression has a proverbial character, pointing to the internal disposition with the illustration of a striking example (see the right interpretation on Matt. v. 46, 47; Luke vi. 32–34). Nor can we agree with Ebrard, that there is no blame here intended to the host, but only to the guests as intending to return the entertainment; and that the entertainer had bidden Jesus with a good intention, and without any relative or neighbor. Ver. 1 makes this very questionable; the Lord graciously leaves uninvestigated the design in which he himself was bidden, but we must assuredly assume from the whole character of the feast that the host required such an exhortation as he received, to expend in a better manner his hospitality and generosity. There must have been friends and kinsfolk in abundance, or otherwise the Lord's address would have been altogether unseasonable and misapplied; and indeed the general claim laid to the best seats proves of itself that rich and distinguished neighbors were not wanting there.

The Lord designedly sets out with the double designation *ἄριστον ἢ δεῖπνον*, "a dinner or a supper," including them both afterwards under the general *δοχή*, "feast," of any kind; and the *φίλους*, "friends," connects itself strikingly with the *φίλε*, "friend," of the previous parable. There it was assumed as the common rule, that the giver of a feast should have his friends for guests; but now the discourse reaches suddenly beyond—"But properly these should not, so much as the poor and needy, be bidden." The gradation of the guests, as, alas! they are generally invited and present, proceeds from the nearest outwards. The *φίλοι*, "friends," are partly to be taken as a general comprehensive designation, and partly as rightly taking precedence of relatives; *ἀδελφοί*, "brethren," indicates a nearer relationship than *συγγενεῖς*, "kinsmen;" but finally come the neighbors, yet (*nota bene*) only if they are *rich*. It has been thought desirable—though with some violence to the diction, since the *τοὺς* and the *σοῦ*, "they," are wanting in connection with *γείτονας*, "neighbors"—to refer *πλουσίους*, "rich," to the whole series together, since to bid the *poor* relations, and thus acknowledge the rights of their kinship, could not but be an excellent thing. But the general tone of the whole discourse forbids us thus to press its individual words. It was no harm in Tobit that he said to his son—"Go and bring what poor man soever thou shalt find out of our brethren, who is mindful of the Lord" (or in the Greek *ὃν ἂν εὕρῃς τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν ἐνδεῆ*). The Lord condemns here only the selfish disposition, which has the expected return in view; and estimating the *φίλους* or friends by that standard, counts many to be such who are altogether without love. He therefore refers to the laws of Moses, with all their inculcation of charity in festal feasts and rejoicings; such as Deut. xiv. 28, 29, xvi. 11, xxvi. 11–13, comp. Heb. viii. 10, and the saying constructed from them, in Ecclus. xiv. 14. The motive of our Lord's counsel explains at once its true meaning—*Lest they also* bid thee again, and thou shouldst thus seek to possess thy wrong recompense! This *μήποτε*, "lest," is precisely the same as in ver. 8. For the temporal recompense is to be feared and avoided similarly with the humiliation in the former case. "Metus mundo ignotus" (a fear unknown to the world), as Bengel ironically adds. *Ἀντικαλεῖν*, "bid thee again," appears to be the term which corresponds to our reciprocation of favor; but he who has the ability and the disposition to spread a table for others should not remain within the circle which selfish calculation prescribes, Matt. v. 46, but remember that infinitely better recompense, which is held forth not indeed as a mere *ἀνταπόδομα*, "recompense," but in the high declaration—*μακάριος ἔσῃ*, "thou shalt be blessed."* The reference to *eternal* recompense is lawful and right; we may not say (with Schleiermacher) that there is a gleam of irony passing from ver. 12 into the *ἀνταποδοθήσεται*, "thou shalt be recompensed," of ver. 14, for the Lord's words are here sublimely real and earnest, when he finally points forwards to the *resurrection*, he declares what is the goal of

‡ See *Des Herrn Führungen im Lebensgange des Georg. F. Müller, von ihm selbst geschrieben* (Stuttgart, by Liesching, 1844).

* Braune overlooks this *ἔσῃ* in the original, when he applies the German translation—so *bist* du selig! to the present blessedness of giving and showing charity.

honor and reward to which he had referred from the beginning, using the orthodox and current language of the people, and of the Pharisees. But when the "resurrection *of the just*" is appealed to as evidence of his confirmation of the doctrine of a *first* resurrection,* we must demur; that is not the immediate meaning of his words, they contain merely an intimation that only the righteous will rise to a *blessed* resurrection of *recompense;* as we understand also in John v. 29 the resurrection of life. Comp. on Luke xx. 35.

And now interposes a guest with his interesting saying, ver. 15. We hesitate to admit that he was actually much impressed (as Bengel understands the ἀκούσας—audiens, eoque tactus); or (as Braune thinks) that his "elevated feeling, sensible of the incongruities and follies of the prevalent customs, is susceptible only to the blessedness and freedom of the children of God;" or that he uttered (as Olshausen has it) his "joyful enthusiasm;" for the Lord would not then have replied so severely to the well-intended utterance of his earnest emotion as we find he did: we must gather the internal meaning of such a word spoken to Jesus from the answer which he immediately made to this man himself, as appropriate to his own case. The man was disposed rather, as we prefer to think, to purify the atmosphere, overcharged by the two former parables; and to say something edifying which would not give offence to any party. His aim was partly to redeem the rest of the company from their utter silence; and partly to put an end to the too intense spirit of moralizing, by something benignant of his own. His words, however piously they sound, contain a threefold latent impropriety: first, his sensual conception of the resurrection of the just, the φαγεῖν ἄρτον, "eating bread," in the kingdom of God being used without any qualification, just as the Evangelist in ver. 1 had used it to describe the present meal;† then the confident assurance of his pretensions to eat it as a Pharisee and an Israelite, knowing nothing of ch. xiii. 28, 29, overlooking or pretermitting the little word δικαίων, "just," in ver. 14; finally, his indolent, contented remission of the matter into distant futurity, thus bringing the too rigorous and critical exhortation to a close. He sits complacently at his kinsman's feast, and prattles about the heavenly table. The Lord says—*Blessed* wilt thou be, rather, if thou doest good to the poor; and the man immediately appropriates the words, and gives them another turn in his pious way of talking—Yea, verily, we shall all be happy indeed, when we have once entered there! (Meanwhile let us enjoy ourselves here without too much of such discourse.) The cry, indeed, uttered with a better meaning and higher intelligence is perfectly correct, and fundamentally in harmony with Rev. xix. 9. Hence Joh. Von Müller, himself genuinely m ovd by it, remarks—"What blessedness, even to feel this!" It is a foretaste of that future blessedness, to be able thus to anticipate it.

Ver e 16, 17. But since this pious spokesman of the whole company is, alas! far from uttering a well-grounded claim to the participation of the supper of God, the Lord makes his words the foundation of a yet more severe continuation of his own discourse, instead of being silenced by them. As to the relation of this parable to its later variation, Matt. xxii. 2–14, we have said what was necessary there. The Lord speaks here, throughout the parable as a whole, more gently and in a more concealed tone, than in Matthew; but the conclusion in ver. 24 is all the more plain, emphatic, and piercing. The one *servant*, who here carries the invitation, represents in a certain sense all the invitations of God in general and as one whole, and is, so to speak, the calling *voice* of God in itself, as uttered through all his messengers;* but yet it is conclusively the Son, the Messiah himself, calling men to the kingdom of heaven; it is he himself who now speaks, as is plainly shown in the expression—*at the hour* of supper. The great essential is *coming* in penitence, faith, and good works, when the invitation is given; the *being invited* is nothing in itself. The point is to come *now*, and not with spurious devotion to talk about a future blessedness; for the hour, the time of coming, and entering, and eating, is already now. He who will not come now, will then be left without; the keen point of the word of invitation lies in the hasty summons—All things are *now* ready! The gracious host tarries not, admits no question whether he will be pleased to wait till to-morrow or the next day. Finally, what boundless matter of exposition and preaching in the *all things* which the Lord had made ready for those whom he calls.

Verse 18–20. *All* began with one consent to excuse themselves from obeying the gracious and earnest—Come! None of those who were bidden came; hence again at the close—*None* of them shall taste of my supper. Consequently it is manifest that the πολλοί, "many," who were called according to ver. 16, are only those of whom this can be said; not, therefore, as elsewhere, all Israel, or the collective number of all who were to be called throughout the world: this more restricted view which pervades the parable is to be carefully observed. Its ἀνδρες ἐκεῖνοι οἱ κεκλημένοι, "those men which were bidden," are such as were specifically and preëminently, *primo loco* and in preference to others, *the called* of the kingdom of heaven; such as, in virtue of their position, endowments, understanding, and responsibilities, occupied the same relation to the people of Israel which these occupied to the heathen—the Scribes, Pharisees, and Rulers, as the leaders and representatives of the people at large. We might

* The Irvingite exegesis naturally enough lays hold of this—see *Ueber den Rathschluss*, etc. II. 60.

† Too boldly expressed by Bahrdt—Happy for him who lives to *feast* in the kingdom of God.

* Roos, "The company of all the preachers of the Gospel."

say without much danger of error—"the representatives of the theocracy," of whom *not one* believed on Jesus, according to John vii. 48. We must not, however, overlook the other side of the question, which, in reference to the relation between ver. 14 and ver. 15, should be made very prominent—that these rep esentatives and leaders regard themselves as the "just" and as righteous, the rich and the whole in contrast with the poor and the maimed, as we shall see on ver. 21. These have gladly accepted the invitation which is presupposed, ver. 16, as having preceded; they have prided themselves on being the certain and honored guests, and have acted as if they expected nothing better than the final happy summons to the enjoyment of the feast: and yet *they come not!* It now happens just as they themselves avow in John vii. 48, and as the Lord here announces as well-known—they began (and continued steadfast to the end, from the first to the last) to excuse themselves ἀπὸ μιᾶς (understand γνώμης or φωνῆς), with one mind and one voice. Not merely ἀπὸ μιᾶς παραιτήσεως, *pariter et simul;* but it is intimated also, that with all the variety of their apologies as they now follow, their refusal is one and the same, as if they had all concerted it. And wherefore so? The true meaning, the innermost principle of the preaching which invited them to *come*, and which is here only represented in its gracious aspect as the gospel of good tidings, is implied and understood, though unexpressed, to be—Repentance and Conversion; and this is what they unanimously decline. They know this well, they understand the prophets' שׁוּבוּ אֶל־יְהוָה, "Return unto Jehovah," and the Baptist's and Christ's μετανοεῖτε, "Repent," well enough to turn from them: therefore nothing more explicit needed to be said to these wise ones.

We must now further inquire into the specific meaning and specific distinction intended to be expressed by the *threefold* refusal; and it is melancholy to observe how seldom in sermons or in expositions the distinctive significance of the three answers is retained, well-known and almost proverbial as the section is in Christendom. This much in general is clear at the outset, that the ground of the first is opposed to the heavenly inheritance, as a whole, while the oxen of the second are contrasted with the attainment and possession of better substance in detail; and that the marriage joy of the third is intended to be set in opposition to the true eternal happiness of God's kingdom and God's supper. Thus we have most obviously a *dichotomy* presented to us—the *good things* and the *enjoyments* of the world, its riches and its pleasure, are the things which withhold those from coming who are dependent upon them. The earthly mind will not part with the morsel in the mouth out of regard to that which is promised of God; prefers the flesh-pots of Egypt to the manna pledged in abundance; the husks which now fill the belly to the ample provision of bread which abounds even for the servants in the Father's house; counts the pottage of lentils of more worth, as pacifying the present appetite, than the first-born prerogative which must wait for an inheritance in the future. Now-a-days men speak loftily of "material interests;" and the endless schemes of invention and industry, by which arts are improved or wealth is gained, allow but little time or inclination for seeking reconciliation with God, or the way to heaven. Similarly, in this parable the two former recusants have the appearance of something like laudable occupation to plead—such respectable *men of business* must forsooth be excused when God summons, for this world demands their most sedulous attention and most thrifty devotion of time, in its manifold exactions.* So also the learned, and even the learned in divinity, have their profoundly important investigations in hand, their intricate questions which they must go to prove. Alas, poor sinner! investigate, prove, and test thy own heart, rather than thy fields, thy oxen, thy documents ancient or new! Ponder in thy soul the fact that thou art thyself, with all thy effort and toil, only as an ox bearing the hard yoke, so long as the answer given to the great invitation is—I *must* do this or that, I *must* and can do no other! But to both these, who thus have the excuse of something to *do*, is opposed now the other who has something to *enjoy* as his apology—he has married a wife, and in her he finds his field and oxen, and everything; independently of her he knows, thinks of, and cares for, nothing just now. Probably it was but for one object that he married at all; without having any piece of land of his own, without knowing or caring how any family might be provided for after his marriage;† but that troubles him not now, he is without disquiet and perfectly content. Such are the thorough men of the world, from the highest in rank down to the most squalid, who are bending all their energies to attain the pleasure (or the pain!) of the moment; and are ready with their irritable *I cannot!* whenever the servant of God brings home to them the instant appeal. To the one the wide world is his bride, in whose broad arms he thinks himself happy; while the other weds his little fragment. Why dost thou not come *with* thy wife, if susceptible of heavenly things; or, if she is not, without her?

This gives us the twofold refusal, as it obviously lies before us; but three are specifically mentioned—how, then, are the two former distinguished? First of all, we find on a calm and simple inspection of the whole, that there is a

* Are we to regard the ground bought without being seen as an indication of covetousness, Isa. v. 8? We doubt it, and would rather regard the purchase as a conditional one—the ἰδεῖν being equivalent to δοκιμάσαι. But we would not positively decide.

† The question here is not of hindrance through marriage generally (I am married!), but of the first tumult of wedded passion as the type of all carnal enjoyment. This man did not lose his freedom through his wife, save as it was his strong will to lose it.

progression of contradiction and refusal to accept the invitation—each being more decisive and infatuated than the former. The first speaks in the most courteous manner, and, so far as the gentle request to be excused goes, is mechanically followed by the second in a tone far too common and too dangerous; his ἔχω ἀνάγκην, "I must needs," is set against the careful ἀναγκάζειν, "compel," of the servant (ver. 23, which is not the case with regard to the first rejecters), and thus his ἐρωτῶ σε, "I pray thee," has at least some specious foundation, although with great impropriety and with resolute selfwill he prefers to follow his own ἀνάγκη, or "need," never intending any other. The second dispatches the invitation somewhat more curtly—*I am going* now on my urgent way, and may not permit myself to be hindered; there rest my security and my pleasure; let that suffice. But the third, whose οὐ δύναμαι, "I cannot," has only the specious sound of courtesy, says this essentially in a half mocking tone—I have a wedding and festal merriment of my own; no other is of any import to me; thou seest how it is, and mayest leave *me* content! For the Jews this would point back to the law of Moses, Deut. xxiv. 5; and the διὰ τοῦτο, "therefore," suggests an apparent reason which rendered the *request* to be excused unnecessary. And with this general view accords on the whole what an anonymous writer in the *Kirchenfreund für das nördliche Deutschland* (1839, No. 71) has suggested upon this exegetical problem; viz., that the distinguishing element of the three answers lies in the words which express the *inward disposition* of those who excuse themselves. So regarded, it is an external circumstance which imposes a necessity upon the first to decline; he allows himself to be ruled by this necessity, and it may be expected of him that, when the pressure of circumstances is withdrawn, he will yet come: the second yields with more readiness and complacency to the restraining difficulty, and does not feel disposed to surmount it: while the third, and most wilful, utters his scornful and harsh—I cannot do otherwise! There is a certain truth in this, but not the whole truth, nor does it do full justice to the text: for the last οὐ δύναμαι, "I cannot," is not so fundamentally to be distinguished from the first ἔχω ἀνάγκην, "I must needs," as the expression of inner disposition, both resolving themselves into the middle term *Tel est mon plaisir* (Such is my pleasure); and further, this essay is wrong and one-sided in finding the difference *only* in this, and in declaring that it is not to be sought, where it is commonly sought, in the distinctive circumstances which restrained the three parties. We have plainly seen that the *possessions* and the *pleasures* of the world are here distinguished; but there must also be a certain distinction between the two things which unite in expressing the former, for the Lord did not make this difference without a purpose.

Finally, then, how are the *piece of ground*, and the *oxen*, as they together significantly exemplify the former, to be regarded in their dichotomy? This has long been, and still is, the question; and most marvellous have been the perversions of preachers and expositors in their dealing with it. Luther himself strangely erred when he regarded the former as the priests and spiritual guides, who say—We must cultivate the land, that is, govern the people; while the latter cling to worldly honor and consideration, *bulls* or oxen being in Psa. xxii. the earthly rulers among men! Others have reversed the order, and referring the three subjects to the three relations, civil, spiritual, and household, have made the oxen (though their *yokes* belong certainly to husbandry) animals destined to sacrificial purposes! The ingenious Herberger involves himself in the snare of his own ingenuity, when he is deluded into saying —"The Lord Jesus, *without doubt*, referred to three most eminent sects—the Essenes, who cultivated the land; the Pharisees, who were proud, despotic, violent oxen; and the Sadducees, who were altogether and obscenely carnal." These are specimens of error in the exposition which will dispose the reader to forego any further enumeration of them. And yet the true exposition lies palpably at hand. We have already shown that the piece of ground indicates possessions in this world generally and in mass, while the *oxen* correspond with individual property in detail—and this of itself might well satisfy the requirements of the subject. But this is not the only point in these full and pregnant similitudes—what then is the most essential and fundamental distinction? The Lord himself, as his own expositor, mentions it when he repeats the parable, Matt. xxii. 5, and places ἀγρός, "field," and ἐμπορία, "merchandise," in connection with one another—why then has not this been used as the key to the obscurity of our present passage? The second of the two has also his own piece of ground, and indeed that not a small one, for he can employ upon it no less than five yoke of oxen; the distinction, therefore, in the process of development in human life lies in this, that the former settles down contentedly in his estate, while the latter uses his heritage like a thrifty economist. Hence the full and significant classification which the Lord makes of the people of the world, refusing to come to the feast, by dividing them into—first, those who rest in *property*, or rather, in this case, acquired possessions in the secure and joyful first feeling of possession;* then, such as are absorbed in commerce or *business*, for the increase of their property and its revenue; and, finally, those who, possibly without any possessions or anxiety about them, are enjoying themselves in inactive *pleasure*, simply as such. And with this well agrees the circumstance not remarked at first,

* Which would decide what we left undecided before, that the ἰδεῖν is not equivalent to δοκιμάζειν, but is the joyous beholding of his own landed property now obtained, the first joy of *possession*. Sepp, however, goes astray when he speaks of the three impediments as—*pleasure* (in the country-seat bought for that purpose!), industry, and sensuality.

that eager activity is first made *prominent* in the case of the second, in the πορεύομαι, "I go," which does not brook being hindered, and in the laudable prudence of the δοκιμάσαι, "to prove."

Finally, that we may not omit any trait in the parables, the requests to be excused depict in a very striking manner the half hypocritical, half wilful spirit of the two recusants of the former class, who use the same conventional form of speech in their refusal. On the one hand they admit, from their own internal feeling (and therein differing from the third), that their grounds of excuse are not in themselves essentially valid; therefore each says ἔχε με παρητημένον, treat me obligingly this time, let me pass as excused. On the other hand, such a style of speaking as the response to so glorious a summons to the feast of the King of heaven, betrays a certain tincture of scornfulness, almost as if it ran—I thank thee most obediently for thy offer of blessedness! Now, however affectionately the servants of God may execute their commission, and yield to the honest utterance of every sincere heart, it is beyond their instructions and their prerogative to grant *such* a prayer; the servant cannot have any one *excused*—all that he can do is, as we shall see, to *tell* his Lord what has been said to him.

Verses 21-23. The fundamental ideas which are exhibited in the sudden turn which the words now take, and according to which the anger of the great Host against the despisers, passes over into boundless benevolence towards others in their stead, have been observed upon already at Matt. xxii.; but the distinctive characteristic element in the present parable consists in this, that substitutes are *twice* introduced here instead of those who were first called. Those who enter in, ver. 21, are not the heathens among the Jews, for the *city* is still, according to Matt. xxii. 7, Jerusalem and Israel,* but those among the people of Israel who were outside the circle of those self-complacent, satisfied, vainly-invited men; that is, the publicans and sinners of chap. xv. 1, see Matt. xxi. 31. Their figurative description points back with verbal precision to ver. 13, in order thus to bind together the two similitudes, and in the third to give a retrospective hint for the interpretation of the second—Exercise benevolence towards the desolate and needy, even as God himself does in the administration of his kingdom! Previously, the *poor*, generally, had been opposed to the *rich* neighbors; and then (in the place of the dear friends and kinsmen) *in specie* the halt, and lame, and blind, the wretched and the despised, whom a dignified great man would hardly like to place at his table; but the repetition of these expressions now, as borrowed from the former similitude, requires the explanation of a spiritual meaning—the spiritually poor and spiritually rich, who gladly and at once obey the call of God. Nor is the specific contrast with those other despisers, which is involved in the words, to be altogether rejected as trifling—The poor have not bought land or oxen to demand their care, the blind cannot go to see and prove anything, the lame cannot go so eagerly and intently here or there; finally, the maimed have no inducement and no ability to assist at the merriment of weddings. Such poor and wretched ones, or rather all such people who are to be found (τοὺς πτωχοὺς κ.τ.λ.), the servant brings in according to the commandment of his lord, finding them in all parts of the city where they are to be found (ῥύμαι are the smaller, narrower passages and alleys, where such people most abound: comp. Isa. xv. 3, where we have the same word in connection with πλατείαις). They come without any refusal, and the servant reports joyfully of his message accomplished; but he observes, and confidentially reports to his master, that *yet there is room.* The feast and the house are both on a great scale—and here we may think of the many empty places of the absent *many*, for whom all things had been ready; and still more of the large and liberal benevolence of the great Host. A precious expression is this ἔτι τόπος ἐστι for the riches of the compassion of God—especially when we note the point too often overlooked, that it is not the Lord himself who utters it, but the servant, who knows his master's mind and his master's house full well, gives the assurance first, and his lord approving his words confirms them by repeating—that my house may be *filled!* "Nec natura nec gratia patitur vacuum" (neither nature nor grace suffers a vacuum)—remarks most beautifully the good Bengel once more. Oh that the proud Jews could have conceived of this amplitude of provision in the kingdom of God for all people! Those who are now called, ver. 23, are actually the heathen; and this only does Matthew adduce. These are yet more wretched in their need, who lie homeless (in the sense of Eph. ii. 12) in the highways around the city, having their miserable lodgment under the shadow of the hedges (Bengel—"sepes mendicorum parietes"). The poverty and abasement of these may forbid them to believe, and their ruined abandonment might disincline them to accept the good tidings, that such as they are invited to the high feast—therefore they must be *compelled* to come in. Observe the significant progression in the character of the three invitations: to the first called it is only simply *said* that the time was come, for more than that would be inappropriate after their long earlier calling; the poor and the infirm are graciously taken by the hand and *brought in*, this being absolutely needful in the case of the maimed, and halt, and blind, who would come, but hardly could; finally, there is the ἀναγκάζειν, "compel," for all who were found without, in which the invitation now supplementary triumphs over every false ἔχω ἀνάγκην,

* Still less may we understand vers. 21 and 23 of a twofold calling of the Gentiles, as if first those who were nearer, and already shone upon by the light of revelation, were called; and then afterwards those who were further removed, locally and *morally!* (Von Gerlach). So Roos: First the Romans and Greeks, then the Barbarians. But the text does not harmonise with this view.

"I must needs" (ver. 18) that might arise among those without. The perversion of this saying both in the theory and the practice of the church since Augustine explained and justified the *compelle intrare* by the incorrect and subtile thought—"Foris inveniatur necessitas, ut intus nascatur voluntas" (without let there be found a necessity, that within be born the will). This willingness to come is not to be effected by any external and actual *compulsion;* nor does the Lord's saying speak of any such, for, according to ver. 17, he would receive only those who *come* and come *voluntarily* (Matt. xxii. 3). As those who were brought in came in at the same time of themselves, so now, also, the invariable and indispensable εἰσελθεῖν, "to come in," is connected with the ἀνάγκαζον, "compel," in order to obviate any perversion. We must understand the word in the same sense as the παραβιάζεσθαι, "constrain," of Luke xxiv. 29, Acts xvi. 15, that is, of the urgent appeal and *supplication* which will not take refusal.* Where there is no proud and refractory refusal, but only, on the contrary, an excess of self-abasement, and the unbelief which that engenders, saying, "I am not worthy, nor can it be truth that I am invited, I *cannot* go in my beggar-garments to that high table—and even though this fundamental thought should be overlaid by the abject feeling which prefers the free living of the mendicant to the table of a king, the servant's reply is—"I cannot admit thy excuse, I cannot carry back such a message to my Lord, thou shouldst and thou must come! Thy misery must be no hindrance, such as thou art was I to bring! That thou abidest so complacently in thy misery, makes the matter much worse; but to such as thou art must I tell the whole unqualified truth!" This is the true ἀναγκάζειν or "compelling" of evangelical preaching, as it admits not of being applied in the case of those depicted in vers. 18–20. For the rest, that *on the whole and in mass* there is assumed here in the case of the Gentiles such a compelling of the predisposed mind, followed by such a believing and acceptance of the call, is in strict harmony (exceptions on both sides being allowed for) with the record of the first transitional history of the Gospel: hence the language of Acts xxviii. 28; Rom. ix. 30, and other passages. It is of the call which went forth *at the hour* of the supper that the parable primarily speaks—and from that time it goes forth more and more mightily (vi semper majore pensans *moram*), with progressively greater vehemence; for the ἤδη ἕτοιμα, "now ready," gives a fervent impulse to the bounty of the Lord, and makes him long that his house may be filled. Hence, in ver. 21, ἐξελθε ταχέως, "go out *quickly*," which in the similitude would simply mean—before the feast has grown cold, so that this richly spread table of grace may not be prepared in vain!

Verse 24. It has been strangely insisted upon that this concluding word must belong to the parable; but it obviously does not harmonise with it, and is added to it by our Lord in his own name, as he often closes his similitudes by passing over into their open interpretation. How could such a sentence be appropriately uttered by the master of the house, and reconciled with all that had preceded? It is said that in the ὑμῖν, "to you," the one servant is addressed as the representative of many; but the connection between vers. 23 and 24 renders such a change in the form of address intolerable, not to say that the simple cast of the whole is grievously hurt by this sudden substitution of many before unmentioned servants. To avoid this harshness, some (as Bengel) have supposed that the master is addressing the already introduced poor of ver. 21. But we cannot discern what point or force such a saying of the entertainer would have just at this moment, whether spoken to the servant or to the guests; it would introduce at the close of all something which, to our feeling, would be slightly discordant. What does it concern the servant just now, when he is sent forth to herald a new and more urgent invitation, that those first invited will not taste of the feast? Such an assurance is not only at this point discordant, but it is altogether unnecessary, for the servant know that doubtless already, since he had come back after an unaccomplished errand, and was commanded to go and invite others in the stead of those who refused—he certainly needed not any solemn λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, "for I say unto you." And as it respects the poor who have come in, are they to be lifted up, as it were, and have their joy increased by a side-glance at those who had lost what they were to enjoy? How inharmonious a close would this be, of a parable constructed with such tender graciousness throughout! On the other hand, when it is placed in the lips of the true *Lord*, and regarded as his intimation of the *significance* of his parable, it assumes all its appropriate impressiveness and power. First comes *his* ordinary λέγω γάρ, "for I say," with its well-known emphasis, and then by the ὑμῖν, "to you," the application of the lesson, hitherto addressed to one, is extended to all the guests at that feast of the Pharisees.* Further, the majestic turn given to the words at once reveals his meaning—*My* supper, to which I not only invite you, but which I as the Son, with the Father, have myself prepared for you! Similarly, the recurrence in the γεύσεται, "shall taste," to the confident expression of ver. 15, has its significance, as giving a decisive answer to the false confidence of that apostrophe: "Assuredly ye are all *called;* if not the only such, yet the first and most preëminent; ye are

* Hence the current "nöthigen" (press), in the sense of *einladen* (invite), which remarkably elucidates the idea.

* The γάρ by no means requires us to assume this to be a continuation of the words of the κύριος; it rather joins on to the former καὶ εἶπεν, and means to say—So will God hereafter rather call in the Gentiles to fill his house, than pursue you who scorn it, with useless grace. The parable is ended, and it all comes to this—*For* ye are, by your own full determination, those who remain without!

as truly called to eat bread in the kingdom of God as to eat bread to-day at this table—but ye are *only* invited, and ye are invited *in vain*, for ye *come* not! Verily I say *unto you* in this parable, and if ye will not understand that, I say unto you over and above this parable, that others, hitherto not called, shall enter instead of you and taste of God's supper and mine." The transition from the ὑμῖν, "to you," to the third person, the ἐκείνων, "those," of the parable, is thought to be inconsistent with this view (Olshausen regards it as decisive against it), but we cannot help thinking that this gives a still keener edge and delicacy of precision to the Lord's words, which thus with a kind of irony half openly and half covertly address the present company. I say *unto you* (who were intended in them) that none of *those* who were bidden in this narrative (ye know now full well that they are yourselves) shall sit at my table in heaven. Thus the ἐκείνων is, first, a conclusive reference to the main figure of the parable as exhibiting themselves; with an additional undertone (not unfrequent in his word) of depreciation and turning away on his part; and thus forming a somewhat ironical contrast with the dignified ἀνδρῶν, "*men*." For these scorners, however much they may assume to be genuine *men* in rank, consideration, understanding and consistent behavior, are alas! men also in excusing themselves and turning away; although they pride themselves, in their contempt of the poor within and without, in that first invitation which they nevertheless reject.

Verses 26, 27. Although the συνεπορεύοντο, "there went with him," of the Evangelist points to the circumstance that he is relating occurrences which took place in the great final journey of our Lord, and, consequently, ver. 25 may be regarded as the formula of a new commencement; yet the subject of the following discourse shows, as we have already said, that there is an immediate connection between it and the preceding, and therefore this πορεύεσθαι or journey of Jesus must at least be assumed to have followed immediately on the breaking up of the feast.* *I say unto you*—the great requisite is, *to come*, and eat of *my* supper! This we have just heard, and now the Lord proceeds almost as if continuing the same discourse—If any man cometh to *me*, and will be my disciple! The true acceptance of the invitation at the time of supper, is to come *to him*, to receive what he saith, to yield to his requirements, and follow his teaching. Is this a mere "loose coincidence;" the unity of the whole being fortuitous, or the mere result of the Evangelist's art? We think that these discourses were thus uttered by our Lord in immediate sequence; just as we often find, and shall especially in chs. xv. and xvi., that the Lord continues for a considerable space to dilate upon the same train of thoughts, until they are brought to their full conclusion: and may not this be regarded as no slight argument of the historical certainty and authenticity of the evangelical records?* The essential meaning of these two utterances, so often repeated in various forms, we have developed upon Matt. x. 37, 38. This was his hard saying, concerning which it might have been said by many—"He capriciously repels, instead of attracting, the people!" But in what sense the keen and rigorous expression of "hating,"† *here* only (besides John xii. 25) used, is to be understood, and how it is *not* to be understood, every unbiassed reader may apprehend at once—for to hate parents, wife, and children is in itself (as Grotius says) an *impium*, an ungodly thing; and to hate one's self an ἀδύνατον, impossibility, Eph. v. 29. In this place let the significant ἔτι δὲ καί, "yea and also," have its significant prominence, the meaning of which Rieger so excellently brings out: "Every thing without us derives its power of harm from the love of our own life; for all external objects blow upon this latent spark, and derive their agreeableness and fascination from their pretensions to sustain our own life and happiness." Consequently, he who hates and forsakes all things else, without hating and renouncing his own life in them, hates and renounces them all in vain. Thus much at the outset, at least as the ground and foundation of a sincere intention, belongs to the first coming, and to the first conditions of discipleship: in the subsequent following of the Lord, the cross laid upon him by God, becomes more and more understood by the disciple.

Verses 28–30. This figure will naturally carry us back to Matt. vii. 24–27,‡ but we must not confound the distinctive reference of the two. There, the laying of a firm *foundation* is made prominent as the great essential, here the

* Schleiermacher thinks it necessary to the style of the Evangelist, that in that case the end of the meal should be expressly mentioned. In any case the real connection of the subject would fall into the scheme of Luke's plan; we cannot but think it more probable, however, that the Lord himself continued the ideas on which he had been dwelling.

* To what was prefatorily said upon this entire section, vers. 8–35, we may add the remarks of Braune, which almost exactly hit the point: "The Lord saw now in the people a vague and indistinct *inclination* towards himself, as in the Pharisee he had seen a vague and indistinct *aversion*," only that these words scarcely describe the inclination and aversion in both cases so rash and unthinking, and in which all *humbleness* was wanting.

† Lange thinks it "well worthy of observation that these rigorous words in their most rigorous expression occur just in the gospel of the Christian humanity"—and asks, "was it the Evangelist Luke who was bound to the Hebraism *hate?*"

‡ This parallel is simple and obvious enough; and there is no necessity for Sepp's subtle reference to the unfortunate building of Pilate (or the tower of Siloam!) any more than for the allusion found in the next parable to the unfortunate campaign of Herod against Aretas. Most inappropriate is all such learned trifling.

prosecution of the building is spoken of, which has its own peculiar difficulties. It might appear there, that the sure foundation would secure everything, and that all the rest depended upon that; but now the Lord continues the figure and adds its complement to what was before a general and introductory saying: He tells us that any man, *even after having laid the foundation*, may nevertheless be put to confusion. Let no one fail to note this, who would rightly understand the whole. What, then, is in this case the *building?* Not so much the first coming to the Lord as such (which is rather presupposed in the θέλειν οἰκοδομῆσαι, "intending to build"), but the *following* of Christ in his full *discipleship*, the μαθητὴς εἶναι, "being a disciple," with all that pertains to that expression. Nitzsch, in a sermon on this text,* says, "It is easier to throw life away, than to lead it in a Christian manner." The great end is not to be gained with swift dispatch, but we must build, and continue to build, till the ἐκτελέσαι, "finishing," is attained; the perfection of discipleship is, again to quote Nitzsch, "the great design, and the great prospect, which we all have ever *before* us." The expression πύργος, "tower," signifies any high building, but it seems to be selected with some slight allusion to that old, but ever renewed, history of *Babel;* for the children of God must not build as those children of men did; their building is not to remain unachieved, it must finally in a right sense reach unto and reach into heaven. But all half-Christianity becomes a Babel in the end.† The *sitting down first*, and considering well from the very beginning all that is involved in the continuing and finishing, is to commence with deep thoughtfulness, not rashly and superficially, in contrast with that unconsidering and thoughtless running after him, which was witnessed at this time, and which the Lord intends to humble and repel. The bare, precipitate resolution is very far from accomplishing all that is necessary at the outset; we cannot thus build from above downwards, as if we were already in heaven, as children begin to paint their houses from the roof. Nor do the walls, staircases, and doors complete the perfect dwelling-house; the ἐκτελεῖν or *finishing* embraces much, even down to the last and smallest nail and bolt which pertains πρὸς ἀπαρτισμόν, that is, to the garnishing and furnishing (not to say the decoration) of the house. How many builders of houses deceive themselves still in this counting of the cost, as well in the actual fact as in that which it here illustrates! A building left unfinished provokes men to mockery, as does every abortive effort of will without power, betraying a lack of prudence in planning for the accomplishment of its plans; and it is on this, alas! universal, fact that the Lord bases his parable, but only that he may extend and vary its application. In some human undertakings, indeed, intelligent men would regard it as honorable in a man to desist from a project rather than to persist in its accomplishment through all kinds of unjustifiable means; there are great ruins in our land which need not fear mockery. But in the building of God's discipleship, the completion may be righteously demanded and expected of all who have begun; in this case the not continuing brings its own fitting disgrace in the sight of God and man. It is only the complete and decided Christian who enforces the respect of the world; but the world is quick to indemnify itself upon those who are only half-Christians, and who visibly give up the object which they profess to aim at: the savorless salt is trodden under their feet. Indeed, it is a different case if they only see and are constrained to admit, that a man, though he has not finished his building, is industrious and unwearied in his efforts, and that however slowly he proceeds, he is likely with such zeal and earnestness to accomplish his enterprise at last. But when they actually see the building at a stand, or falling down, after it had been begun (indeed, if they sometimes only think they see it), the man's name, οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, "this man," becomes a reproach and a proverb. Thus the world readily anticipates and takes upon itself the judgment upon a disgraceful incompleteness in religion; that condemnation of a beginning without finishing, which belongs only to God, but which is foreshadowed and pre-announced in the true though maliciously meant condemnation passed by sinful men. Or if it should come to pass (though the rule here takes no account of such an unusual exception) that under some circumstances the children of the world should *praise* me for having become rational again, and having given up the foolish rigor of piety—then will the devil in his time take their place, and finish the mockery in his own way.

When it thus happens to one who has actually laid the foundation, we may strictly speaking say (and this reconciles our parable with Matt. vii. 24, comp. Matt. xiii. 20, 21) that the foundation itself was wanting, that is, that a well-considered decided beginning was not made in order to a thorough completion; for the hasty laying of a foundation without due counting of the cost is itself, as it were, a foundation *without* foundation. This is in the meaning of our Lord, since the subsequent incompetence springs from an original lack, from a love of the world and of his own life, which the builder has not thoroughly renounced but retained. Therefore sit down *before* and reckon aright, *whether thou hast sufficient!* But how then? Are we to finish this building from the resources of our own providing? Far be that from us, we cannot even

* Whose sermons have so much profound exegetical value, that we cannot but lament his not writing direct exposition.

† The disciple, however, must *build*, fundamentally and loftily build. Alford's view, that the man's wishing to build the tower is itself a vain idea, is assuredly incorrect: not a syllable in the parable warrants that thought; it is opposed to the essential meaning of the two similitudes in their connection (building and warfare), and is not in harmony with the phraseology of our Lord and Scripture generally.

begin it from them. *We have not* wherewith, we are *not* to build with our own: to know *this*, to cast away all our own materials as useless, and to venture in perfect self-consecration upon the ground of grace, is the essential requirement, as ver. 26 has told us.* There is consequently a concealed irony in the *εἰ ἔχει*, "whether he have," which points forcibly to our own poverty; and the true counting of the cost which the Lord requires, is to set out with the determination to renounce ourselves and build upon the fast foundation of grace. Lest the first parable should be misunderstood, and this great truth not be perceived in it, a second now follows, which more plainly brings out this essential relation of the case.

Verses 31, 32. Dost thou, that is, think thou hadst and still hast sufficient, then does the Lord, in the process of discipleship, apply to thee his rigid tests, and proves to thee that he is too mighty for thee; he will fight against thee with his sanctifying power and discipline, so that thine impotence as opposed to him, shall become manifest to thyself—well for thee if, after that, thou seekest peace with him, in order to a new and genuine beginning. The *building*, before, looked rather back to the commencement (*ἤρξατο οἰκοδομεῖν*, "he *began* to build"); but now the *warfare* exhibits, properly speaking, the finishing unto victory, the winning and maintaining our great object. This similitude is often entirely misunderstood by those who, despite the connection directly established between ver. 33 and ver. 32 by the *οὕτως*, "so," interpret the *desiring conditions of peace* of a disgraceful discontinuance of the war and relapse into the *world*, as if it meant—If he has not power, he should not have undertaken the war any more than the building, or should now make peace again. Whatever analogy may seem to lead to this mischievous exposition, it is altogether opposed to the *true* analogy of both these parables; for the Lord, who had just before given up the leaving off midway to its appropriate scorn, could not with such a tone as this in any sense counsel such discontinuance of the war; and *τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην*, "*conditions* of peace," clearly corresponds to *τὰ πρὸς ἀπαρτιαμόν*, "*sufficient* to finish," as does *εἰ δύνατός ἐστιν*, "whether he be able," to *εἰ ἔχει*, "whether he have," this being the object which it should be in both cases a man's wisdom to secure.† We would rather say that the second parable continues and expounds the former in *another* aspect of the matter; bringing out, to speak more correctly, the *inner* meaning of the previous *ἔχειν*, "have," inasmuch as it can only come from the sense of want, and consequent seeking of grace, from the sense of powerlessness and consequent seeking for peace. *War*, as the Lord here intends it, can only be where there is already a beginning of discipleship: man naturally is at peace with the world and its prince, and does not seek conditions of peace with God. Consequently, that other king, with whom this conflict has to do, can by no means be the prince of this world or the devil;* but no other than God, the disciple's Lord, opposing himself as an *apparent* enemy to his children, because his sacred and sanctifying power and discipline must ever be in conflict with all their independent life and will, until it be extinguished. We must understand it in the sense of such passages as Job ix. 19, 32, 33, xv. 24; comp. Judith xvi. 16. God comes with twenty thousand against our ten thousand, that is, with always twice our power, be we strong and well armed as we may.† *Our* ten thousand have been already received and acquired in our previous discipleship; it is the strength which we have, and which seems so adequate, and which we are tempted to count our own, and use against the further disciplinary power of God. This is a foolish and melancholy declension into the old, not yet wholly uprooted error, which assumes that we are, or have, or can do, anything of ourselves in the presence of Him to whom all power belongs—and it is ironically exhibited in the relation between man and God being set forth as the going out of one *king* against *another* king! We must begin and achieve the *building*, but never as in *conflict* with him, who alone has, and imparts the power and resources requisite. In this matter all proceeds from beginning to end only in *peace*, in peace *sued for*. Not that men deliberately and consciously purpose to fight against God, any more than they duly considered, in the former case, that they could not finish the building; they simply value themselves upon the power they have as their own, even while piously attributing it to the "rich grace of God." It is not merely *before* the commencement of conversion and the first suing for peace, that proud man thus exalts himself, rashly declaring, when God opposes him with his law—that he will keep it with all his heart, practise all virtues and avoid all vices; when God threatens him with temptation—that he will soon pass through it, resolute not to fall; when God speaks of solemn tests and Christ speaks of his cross—that he is ready, with fixed decision, to bear and encounter all! But here the Lord refers to that worse folly—against which the *first* supplication for peace should insure the disciple for

* Olshausen refers to Augustin, *Conf.* viii. 6, speaking of two disciples—Et ambo jam *tui*, ædificabant turrim sumtu idoneo, relinquendi omnia sua et sequendi te.

† Alford here agrees with me, and speaks of the ordinary misinterpretation—which destroys all the sense.

* Braune, alas! still holds to this; and Lange, too, who interprets it of the "prince of darkness."

† There is probably a subtle significance in the change of *ἐν* and *μετὰ*. Man is, even in authority, as it were only one person among (בְּתוֹךְ) his fellows, but God comes in kingly majesty with his ministering hosts. Or better, with Alford: "Can I, with (*ἐν, with all that I have*, all my instruments of war) my ten thousand, stand the charge of him who cometh against me with (*μετά*, being *only as many as he pleases to bring with him* for the purpose—see Psa. lxviii, 17, E. V.) twenty thousand?"

ever—viz., that those who, when converted, afterwards turn the grace which they have received and their little kingly power against the King of kings, instead of continuing for ever to seek, in yet more perfect self-renunciation and holiness, fresh accessions of grace. Be thou ever so well equipped with excellencies—he will make them sins to thee; be thou ever so full of good resolves—his tests will break them; regard thyself as ever so well furnished and armed to appear and stand before him at his coming—he will at last, in death and judgment, remain mightier than thou.

To the previous *disgrace* of the building unaccomplished should now, properly speaking, correspond the disgrace of going forth to the battle in impotence and being overcome; this aspect of the case is, however, pretermitted now as being sufficiently understood from the preceding. On the other hand, nothing is said in ver. 32 (let it be well noted!) of scorn or shame, since to pray for peace in the presence of the more mighty one involves no disgrace, is rather the most praiseworthy prudence that man can exhibit. To send an ambassage, is voluntarily and *humbly* to take up the cross with which the Lord opposes us, and to *bear* it in self-sacrificing devotion before our essential and true crucifixion. He who is refractory against the cross, as well as he who recoils before it (for the fleeing before the other king is also in vain), appears here a *θεομάχος*, a fighter against God; he who takes up the cross *submits*. Thus the two similitudes are, when accurately regarded, parallel with the two utterances of vers. 26, 27; to *hate* the world and our own life, is essential to the first *coming*, else the cost has not been justly counted; the *cross* of discipline, test and trial in order to confirmation of faith, comes against *those who are following* Christ, and to sue for peace is ever the only strength in this warfare. The latter applies the test to ascertain whether the former has been genuinely and fundamentally done. Thus from beginning to end the cost of being a Christian is great; and yet it is not too great for such as are poor and humble in spirit. *Peace with God* ever renewed, graciously assured and confirmed by the seeming opposition of his grace, confirmed in obedient submission to his guidance, reception of his sanctifying influence, enjoyment of all his infused gifts and energizing power—this is finally, and in the highest sense, the consummation of discipleship under the cross.

Verse 33. By this emphatic reiteration the Lord would ask—Have ye truly understood all these things? The *οὕτως*, "so," which must not be superficially passed over, gives the express and formal interpretation, not only of the sueing for peace in the second similitude, but also of the counting of the cost in the first; for the renunciation of all this is ours, is the common foundation and central idea of both; the *ὑπάρχοντα*, "what one hath," are not only the cost of the building, but the strength also for the war.* Thus it is a *self-renunciation*, the sincere and humble acknowledgment of our abiding poverty and helplessness; such as in relation to God truth and right alike demand from us all through. He who submits to be brought to this condition by the salt of truth, and the discipline of God in the teaching and guidance of Christ, has thereby himself become salt, for the riches of God's grace and the power of his spirit then enter into the needy and empty soul.

Verses 34, 35. This saying concerning salt the Lord here utters for the third time; let the exposition, therefore, be consulted upon Matt. v. 13 and Mark ix. 50, where it will be seen how pointedly the latter passage especially coincides with the connection of our present place. There it was made prominent at the close, how the salt of humility and self-denial is bound up with the *true peace one with another;* here it is similarly represented, after ver. 32, as bound up with the prayed for and experienced *peace with God*. There are those who would here interpret the *ἐν τίνι ἀρτυθήσεται*—wherewith, then, will the food be seasoned? or again—in quo cibo eo (scil. sale) utetur, *in what* shall it be used as seasoning? But both these interpretations are incorrect, and the saying is assuredly the same in all three passages (as the *ἐν τίνι ἁλισθήσεται* of Matt. v. is decisively expounded by the *ἐν τίνι αὐτὸ ἀρτύσετε* of Mark ix.). It is the savorless salt itself which is spoken of here down to the final *αὐτό*, "it;" *εἰς γῆν*, "for the land," also is not the same with *εἰς κοπρίαν*, "for the dunghill," for the *οὔτε*, "nor," forbids that; it is good neither as laid upon *ground* (or arable land), nor as mixed with *manure*†—in brief *εἰς οὐδὲν ἰσχύει ἔτι, εἰ μὴ βληθῆναι ἔξω*, it has no longer any virtue or goodness for anything. Thus, finally, the disciple who has utterly apostatized from his calling and the beginning of his discipleship is not to be restored; he is abandoned already to the scorn and contempt of men.

---

* There are passages which we cannot hear and read with too keen inquisition into their words. *Τὰ πρὸς ἀπαρτισμόν*, "sufficient to finish," we *have* not, but the great builder, who himself edifies us, affords them to us; *τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην*, "conditions of peace," he does indeed assure to us who ask them, but in this case our *ἐρωτᾶν*, "desiring," is made more prominent as the condition, and hence *τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην* itself designates our prayer.

† Men do not sow on salt (Psa. cvii. 34), nor is salt used as manure, though many strangely so interpret here. (See Deut. xxix. 23; Judg. ix. 45; Psa. cvii. 34; Jer. xvii. 6; Zeph. ii. 9.) If the noble and excellent substance is useless for its own proper function, it is not to be used *εἰς ἄλλο γένος*.

HIS RECEIVING SINNERS VINDICATED FROM THE CENSURE OF THE SELF-RIGHTEOUS. THE SINNER'S REPENTANCE OR PUNISHMENT, IN A SERIES OF PARABLES.

(Luke xv. 4–xvi. 31.)

We would scarcely affirm, with Ebrard, that the parables of chap. xv. are closely connected with the subject of the previous chapter, as exhibiting in its utmost clearness and force that spiritual poverty and sense of helplessness which Christ requires in those who come to him, and to which alone he assures acceptance; though we are free to admit that in Luke's arrangement the doctrine of Jesus in chap. xiv. is a certain preparation for that of chap. xv. (Ebrard, after joining these two chapters somewhat too closely, makes the connection between chaps. xv. and xvi. much less strict than it really is.) Nor can we accept Olshausen's view of the *contrast* between the exhibition of compassionate love as now depicted, and the strict severity of what had preceded; thus making the point of junction between these discourses the contrast between our Lord's rejection of some and acceptance of others. For although the Evangelist seems in chap. xv. to make a certain reference to chap. xiv. 25, giving prominence in his present description of the crowd around our Lord's person to the better, humbler element in it, yet the words of ch. xv. 1 themselves have all the appearance of a new commencement generally. In particular, the *πάντες*, "all" (omitted by the Vulg.) which Luther has groundlessly translated by *allerlei* (comp. Matt. ix. 10, *πολλοί*), must not be understood of all the publicans and sinners of this immediate place; it manifestly enlarges the scene to embrace the whole sphere of our Saviour's general teaching. Where and when this now specifically took place, does not affect the question at all; it is the constant and ever-recurring scene, the drawing near of sinners, and the murmuring of the "righteous"—as it is exhibited in Matt. ix. 10, 11, Luke vii. 39, and once more, in this place. Grotius rightly discerns this tone of generality in the form of expression *ἦσαν ἐγγίζοντες*, *were* murmuring ("murmured"), and compares chap. iv. 31. And as the concise *εἶπε δέ*, "and he said," of ver. 11 can only indicate an immediate sequence of discourse (according to Luke's habit of interpolating such remarks to quicken attention); so must the keen discernment of a profound exposition come to the conclusion that the whole of the sixteenth chapter (which closely binds together its own two halves in vers. 14, 15, and hangs ver. 19 on the sentences, vers. 15–18, spoken in connection with ver. 14) belongs to the series of connected discourses begun with chap. xv. 1.* Consequently, chap. xvi. 1 does not introduce a general formula (though the expression might seem to imply as much), but the Lord's address to the *disciples* corresponds to that addressed to the Pharisees, chap. xv. 3; just as we have once and again seen in chap. xii. 1, 15, 22, 54. Even Schleiermacher found chap. xvi. intelligible only in connection with chap. xv.; and it is very generally allowed, because so obvious, that the disciples referred to in chap. xvi. 1 are those who had just come to Jesus, the publicans who stood at the threshold of discipleship. But it is equally plain that the Pharisees in chap. xvi. 14 are continuing the mockery of chap. xv. 2.

This is the profoundly significant manner of the Evangelists generally, and of Luke in particular, by formulæ apparently indefinite to carry on the most precise and definite narrative, thus leaving something for our intelligent investigation to find out, and accustoming us to understand the same words in different senses in different connections. When we read with the necessary discrimination, keeping this fact in mind, we shall be able to lay a sure foundation for the right understanding of the two parables concerning the unjust judge and the rich man, in their harmony and connection; and to disentangle the former especially from the confusion in which expositors have involved it.

And what a mighty and gracious testimony is that which, in ver. 2, is extorted from the lips of his enemies! Yea, these stony-hearted men are constrained involuntarily to greet the Saviour of sinners with such a Hosanna, and thus unconsciously to fulfil their duty in directing poor sinners, by themselves rejected, to the true source of their salvation.

This is not, indeed, their conscious purpose; their own perversion of mind and wickedness of will in this remarkable utterance is great and manifold. "*The sinners!*" (or, as without the article, Such *sinners* as these!) They altogether forget the *repentance* of these sinners, as coming between their *hearing* and his *receiving;* hence it is forcibly set before them in vers. 7 and 10, and affectingly depicted in vers. 17-20. Their infatuated charge—"*He receiveth them!*"—condemns in him the first intercourse with such sinners, his having anything to do with them at all; leaving out of sight the fact that such sinners might, and would, be brought to repentance Luke records only, ver. 1, that *they* drew near unto him that *they* might hear him; why, then, did not these malignants confine their rebukes to that alone, even as in chap. xiii., 14 the ruler of the synagogue had condemned the *θεραπεύεσθαι*, "being healed," of the people? Should he

* Not, indeed, all spoken in one breath, as we may naturally suppose; yet, in close sequence, as a series of connected thoughts for the same hearers.

not, then, heal them and teach them; should he not let them draw near and hear? *Hearing* is, as teachers to the people should have known, the only true way to the beginning of repentance and faith, and the ceasing to be a sinner. These people came not, as the Evangelist testifies, to see signs, to eat bread, to be delivered from their sicknesses, but only to *hear*, comp. chap. v. 1. It was the Lord's deep earnestness, that truth of his (as chap. xiv.) so rigorously decided and requiring such rigorous decision, which ever drew to him the souls deeply conscious of need, while it repelled only the idle concourse of the crowd. "If hearts are to be attracted, they must mark something genuine to suit their case. No man tempted and tried would go to a free liver, but to those whose reputation is that of being strict. For from such they hope honorable and just dealing, and more likely cure (*Berl. Bib.*). The humble *hear* and *learn*, they find the seeking and accepting grace of God in the pure truth of his word as issuing from the lips of Jesus; the proud and perverted *murmur* and *condemn*, their dark understandings darken the love of God where it would shine most brightly. These did not, indeed, dare to direct their words immediately against the Holy one of God; but they διεγόγγυζον, that is, they murmured among themselves, here and there, yet so that their murmuring should reach his ears—though he would otherwise have known and marked it well.

In this saying of the Pharisees, which we must closely analyse, in order to seize the proper point from which our Lord's long answer proceeds, there are several distinct grounds of error, which we may thus exhibit. First: We are not sinners ourselves! Then—as Luke himself writes in ver. 1, adopting the current phraseology: Only by gross and scandalous sins, *e.g.*, by such unrighteousness as the publican's, does a man become a ἁμαρτωλός, or "sinner." Thirdly: With this they conjoin the uncharitable and irrational condemnation of whole classes of men as such—All publicans are such sinners—while the Evangelist, on the other hand, designedly places between them a note of distiction in his καί, "and." Finally: By such premises—adding to this false major an equally false minor—they arrive at the unscrupulous and malignant conclusion that even he, the Holy Prophet himself, must be a sinner too! "Tell me with whom thou consortest, and I will tell thee what thou art." This ambiguous common-place they apply to him as they would to any other common man—who might have no special vocation to trouble himself about those who need instruction and amendment. And even in such a case their meaning is perverse, for *every* pious man has in reality and in the end both the obligation entailed upon him, and the ability to discharge it in some sense; the rule of Psa. i. 1, as applicable to ourselves, only requires us to avoid the fellowship of sinners so far as it might be a temptation and a snare; else must we in love and in pity strive to exert a wholesome influence upon them. And is the Lord Jesus alone to be excluded from this? They mark him out by their emphatic οὗτος, "this man," and incautiously betray in this little word the true grounds of their malignant conclusion, which they would not have arrived at in the case of any other man, and which wilfully forgets all that their own eyes must have seen in his conduct and character. "*This man*, who is contrary to us now and is everywhere in our way (ch. xiii. 18) who receiveth not, and doth not acknowledge *us*, who doth alienate the people's hearts from our chairs of instruction, and so forth. This man, whose claims we also will not admit, and whom we will not hear, turns on that account to the rabble; it is plain, therefore, that we are quite justified in our action concerning him, for he *eateth* wherever he can eat, without making any inquiry about the company" (Matt. xi. 19; Luke vii. 34). They omit now any reference to the *drinking*, because fellowship with the table of the unclean was sufficiently defined and characterised without it, in their accustomed way of speaking—see Acts xi. 3. And all this comes to their minds and their lips, because they know nothing by their own experience of the work of God in calling sinners, and have no illustration in their own hearts of the coming to repentance of those who are called. If they had they would have recognised the great foundation of all Divine revelation from the forfeiture of paradise downwards—that "*God* receiveth sinners!" and their allegation against the hated οὗτος (like Matt. ix. 3, somewhat more intelligently than here) would have condemned only His presumption in doing what was solely the work of God? But then arose the question, Is it solely and immediately the work of God? Were they not expressly appointed to seek and invite sinners to come to God for acceptance? Ah! if they had known themselves and the heart of God, the grace which preceded and pervaded even the law in the Old Testament, they would have known that the holier a man was, and the more like God, the more gracious and condescending must he be towards sinners. If they had understood the prophecies concerning the Messiah, they would have recognised Jesus by this distinctive token of his Messiahship, and would have hailed him with another οὗτος—Yea, *this man* is He! See Isa. xlii. 3, l. 4, etc.

Thus the fundamental idea from which our Lord's entire and ample answer—seizing and uprooting their wilful error in its essential principle—proceeds, is no other than this: "What is a *sinner?* How stands it, how does it go, with him in his sin, and in his *repentance* in order to God's acceptance of him? Are ye then altogether ignorant as to this? Ye are yourselves truly sinners like these—now these suffer themselves to be sought and found—but is it otherwise with you? Then woe unto you in your impenitence!" Thus the reply given to them is, in its full completeness, to be exhibited under two aspects. On the one hand, *penitent* sinners are *justified* in their approach; they are shown to be literally *received*, even as their

objection ran; they are then further instructed for their after discipline. But, on the other hand, it *warns* sinners who are *impenitent* in their murmuring pride; but in such a manner as to show them that the love, which arrays before them the *punishment* threatened, *does yet seek them* still, if peradventure they may accept instruction and escape from condemnation. This gives us the substance of the whole, down to the final parable concerning the rich man in torment, and further Abraham's lesson of *believing!* The central theme is this—*The sinner's repentance or doom*, by which he is either gained and saved, or left and lost; so depicted as to show that the *seeking love of God* persists despite the stiff-necked opposition of the sinner, and *still invites* even after the first outbreak of punishment. First, the sinner's repentance. And here it is exhibited to the self-righteous Pharisees, blindly rushing to their own doom—in order to the justification of his own conduct, and if possible to awaken shame in their own hearts—that the grace of the Three-One God *seeks* to retrieve lost sinners, *receives* back again the penitent, *bears with* the perverse, and thereby *still seeks them* likewise. These are the *three* parables of ch. xv. Then, as the transitional middle-term between the great alternative before presented—the sinner's *prudent wisdom in avoiding punishment.* There we find it declared—in the hearing of the Pharisees—to the new disciples, and especially to those who had been publicans, for their encouragement as well as for their necessary warning, that the superabundant grace of God not only *permits* to the sinner, absolved in the reckoning with Him, the use of the worldly goods which had been the mammon of unrighteousness for all purposes of brotherly kindness, but absolutely requires it; and that *fidelity* in the dispensation of this love will be rewarded, while the opposite *unfaithfulness* will only involve and draw after it a *new punishment.* This we have in ch. xvi. 1–13, a parable of contrast, derived from the prudence of the children of this world, and which therefore the Lord, to obviate all possible misunderstanding, has himself expressly interpreted.* Finally, the sinner's *punishment*, which falls upon him in the kingdom of the dead when he has persisted in scorning the love of God, which down to the last sought his soul; after he has thereby hardened his heart into unbelief of the extant word of God, and into all unmercifulness against his neighbor. Thus it is once more exhibited to the Pharisees, for their conviction and warning, that *presumptuous practical unbelief* in God's revelation brings upon self-righteous and hypocritical sinners these *torments*, which may be the only remaining way—though a severe one—still, if it were possible, *to win them.* Thus is the last of these parables, placed, as we may hope, in its own clear light; and the express and instructive *preparatory* address (vers. 15–18), to those who are aimed at, is a kind of index to the true interpretation, just as the previous parable received its explanation at its conclusion, vers. 10–13.

THE SEEKING OF THE LOST, THE JOY OVER THE FOUND: THE LOST SHEEP, AND THE WOMAN'S PIECE OF SILVER.

(Luke xv. 4–10 [Matt. xviii. 12, 13].)

Before we enter more minutely into the exposition of the first two parallel parables, in their significant juxtaposition, we must apprehend the full meaning of the *trilogy* of the lost and the found again. But first of all we must notice the dichotomy which pervades the whole (and which Luke makes evident in ver. 11): the *seeking* of the lost comes forward in the two former parables which have a more directly figurative character, though expressly interpreted for us; the *acceptance* of the penitent, whose coming has been prompted indeed by the seeking, and in conjunction with this the *long-suffering forbearance* towards the stiff-necked (who is still *sought* by that forbearance) appear together in the third parable, which is followed by no interpretation, since parable and interpretation almost entirely coincide.* To the penitent "publican and sinner" is opposed the self-righteous Pharisee as a *worse sinner* than he—making it in the end very plain who the "ninety and nine just persons" are.

But now for the *threefold* series, and the distinction, also, between the first and the second. Bengel's words, which so profoundly penetrate

* In the two former parables the prominent personality is the seeking love of him who had lost, in the third the sinner himself, as submitting to be found and repenting. Thus it is speaking too indefinitely, to dispatch the two former parables as the mere "introduction to the affecting history of the prodigal son."

* And yet how many have failed to perceive even this, and still more its true connection with what precedes, and with what follows, as the middle point between them. It is by no means the mere "transition from the dogmatic to the moral" (as Ebrard says, and Olshausen too, describing them as "parables concerning the benevolent love of man"), as if the point of connection was the condemnation in a final parable of "a hard-hearted indifference to our neighbor." The deeper fundamental idea is repentance unto new life and new love in faith, in order to escaping from eternal misery and need.

the meaning of the whole, say all that is necessary; we have only to develop and exhibit on all sides his concise hints. "Ovis, drachma, filius perditus: peccator stupidus, sui plane nescius, sciens et voluntarius" (the sheep, the piece of money, the lost son: the stupid sinner, clearly ignorant of himself, knowing and willing). We might take it for granted, in our Lord's discourses, that the two former parables, with all their analogy, are not intended to teach simply the same thing; but that they bear somewhat the same relation to each other as the grain of mustard seed and the leaven, the hid treasure and the pearls, in Matt. xiii. Olshausen, as if he had not on this occasion consulted Bengel, sees the truth afar off, but speaks doubtfully—"The second parable is *obscure*. For I cannot persuade myself that it contributes no new feature to the general picture presented by the three parables; and that consequently the contrast between *γυνή* and *ἄνθρωπος*, between *δέκα* and *ἑκατόν* is merely accidental. Yet I have nothing positive to say as to the true explanation, and therefore leave it to those who are more keen-sighted." He then makes a timid reference to the comparison of the kneading woman, Matt. xiii. 33 (the virgins, chap. xxv. 1, are not in point), on which we also took occasion to refer to the present passage. We shall see how well-grounded is the analogy of interpretation between the woman there and the woman here; and how securely we may rely upon Bengel's explanation of the entire trilogy, as we shall develop it, with the consequent distinctive significance of its middle member. Can we suppose that the first and the third would have so distinctive a reference, but the second be without it? Can we regard the Lord as almost repeating, unnecessarily, the very same thing? Be it far from us to think so!

The distinction in *that which is lost* is so far indicated by Bengel, as to show that such a distinction exists. Consequently we may be assured that there is also a corresponding distinction in the *seeker* of the several instances. But the person seeking must be God in Christ, that which is lost must be man in his condition as a sinner. In seeking ourselves the contrasts between the lost and the seeker we must first mark the *threefold* personality of the latter, the reference of which to the Trinity Bengel has also perceived. The *woman* cannot be primarily and absolutely the church, as in Matt. xiii. For this is itself only a recovered sheep, a piece of silver found. The Lord apprehends *the sinner* (this was our starting-point) under the threefold aspect of his sin. He first regards him as in the midst of his actual and present course of sin, from that benignant point of view under which he is viewed by the grace which is resolute not to give him up, and in which he is regarded in that inexhaustible normal passage, Isa. liii. 6; then he appears as a foolish and wandering sheep, straying shepherdless in the ways of perdition, *peccator stupidus*. The Lord afterwards descends and ascends to the *result* and the *first principle* of such a condition. The sheep continuing to stray is regarded in the one case as a treasure perfectly lost; and, in the other, the beginning of his error is exhibited, as that of a child consciously and deliberately revolting against his father. The *foolish, wandering sheep* (as opposed to whom those who *know* the way might be termed just, *if* they knew it aright, and walked in it accordingly), are sought again and found by the *Son*, who is himself the calling *word*, the wisdom, and the way: hence we see the sheep and its *shepherd*, whose voice the publicans and sinners even now *hear!* The *sinner lying in the dust*, who has, alas! reached the first goal of his evil way (having, however, still the stamp of God upon him, as he once belonged to God's treasured possession—glancing forward to the third)—*sui plane nescius*, in the עָפָר of *φθορά* and of *θάνατος*, the dust of corruption and death (while, on the other hand, a sheep has at least some instinct of pasture, and a kind of remembrance of the shepherd's voice)—is sought again and found by the *Spirit*, who is the *energy* of the life and light of God, the breath of life which first removes the dust, the light which dispels the darkness (John i. 4). The Spirit is indeed presented in Scripture, from Gen. i. 1, 2, downwards, as feminine and motherly; but it is as he works, enlightens, and sweeps, by the instrumentality of the church of God upon earth. Thus there is some truth in the observation of Luther, who understands here "the Christian church;" but this *woman* is not the church in herself, but the Holy Spirit in the church, or the church as the organ of the Spirit. She is, as the bride in humanity, so the mother in God. The Spirit and the Bride say Come!—to the Lord. But the Spirit and the mother speak in invitation to every hearer of their voice—Come and join with us! Rev. xxii. 17. Finally, *whence* originated this wandering of the sinner, and this lying in the dust? He is, indeed, no sheep, nor is he a piece of money, but he is of divine original. In the beginning of his sin, he can be regarded only as a *peccator sciens et voluntarius*, a conscious and voluntary sinner. The *apostate sinner*—such in the origin and in the permanent internal principle of his sin—is first left in his liberty by the *Father*, the *true Creator*, the eternal *will of love* (the ultimate principle in God's relation to us); then borne with by the long suffering which foresees the misery that will drive him back; and, if he, *sciens et voluntarius*, consciously and voluntarily, returns, graciously *received again*.

Thus in the first parable are properly opposed the ninety and nine so-called just persons, who ask not for the way, who hearken not to the word, who do not draw near to the Saviour or the Shepherd to hear him—it might be supposed because they are in the right way, but that a doubt arises on account of their very ungodly murmuring against God and the joy of all the angels. In the second parable they are preliminarily left out of the question,* but

* "The two former parables ended in such a

in the third the abhorred picture of these supposed just ones is exhibited in full by the character of the elder son.

Verses 4–7. Thus Christ presents himself as the good shepherd, who seeks the lost sheep—according to his humanity assumed to that end; and brings it home when found, with the universal sympathy of the joy of heaven—according to his divinity glorified in the ascension. The subjoined interpretation of ver. 7 with its οὕτως, "so," concurs with the ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, "in heaven," and the distinctive future of ἔσται, "shall be," to lead us at once to such an explanation of the whole; nor could the Pharisees and Scribes fail to discern, as the Lord proceeded and ended his words, this ulterior meaning in parables which had their starting-point in simple human relations. The figure of the good *Shepherd*, faithfully seeking his lost sheep, which our Lord was well-pleased to recur to again and again, is taken from the centre of the Old Testament, where not only is Jehovah so exhibited in his relations to the people and to individuals, but the future manifestation of his fullness of grace in the *Messiah* is especially presented in imagery of this kind. We know how he appears there as the one shepherd who is to be raised up, the true David, and so forth; we have already had occasion, upon Matt. xviii.,* to point out the allusions in Ezek. xxxiv.—see vers. 6, 11, 12, 16, and, at the same time, vers. 7–10. Thus does the Lord say plainly to these murmurers: "This, for which you blame me, is my great work, the work of the Messiah; it should also be yours, but ye have shamefully neglected it, and I must supply among the multitudes of the lost in Israel your lack of service, restoring what ye have ruined! Let it be observed, further, how the Lord God who himself was to come in the person of the Messiah, speaks in Ezekiel continually of "*my* sheep;" and this will help us to feel the profound emphasis of the "*having*" and "if *he lose*" as they fall now from our Lord's lips. First of all, it seems to say—What *man* among *you* would not do the same? This is not so much—Ye are men yourselves, and will ye in your uncharitableness refuse to trouble yourselves about the lost and the wretched? But we must regard it as the common argument from a poor needy animal to a man (as in the Sabbath-healings); and, more than that, as pointing to natural *self-interestedness*, influenced by which the covetous man would not *lose* even one of his hundred sheep.† Thus does the Lord place his own divine, incarnate, and unparalleled action in the most condescending comparison with the most ordinary conduct of men; and there is in that comparison a certain profound truth which must be understood, and before which human folly is repelled. But the words most assuredly penetrate much deeper than that; for, the affectionate *shepherd-feeling* of ver. 5 indicates much more than the mere care of its own property. In the centre of all lies the profound thought, that in God and Christ love is one with self-interest, and self-interest is one with love; no such contrariety existing between them as is found in the case of man. God loveth men, and all his creatures, for the sake of his own glory which should be reflected in them; but this, again, is no other than pure self-renouncing love, for he who hath not merely a hundred, but ten thousand times ten thousand sheep, and can always create others unlimitedly, nevertheless is unwilling to find one wanting, and counts that as *lost*, in itself, which he cannot feed, and bless, and save for ever. And so, in a lower degree, but with the mind of God, should the shepherds of Israel, as the servants of God, count the sheep as their own: see John x. 12.

The Lord does not expressly say—"That which I now do, should *ye* have already done;" nor, on the other hand—"What else doth *God* with regard to his people, and all mankind?" But he rather says, and more expressively—"I thus indeed act as *man*, as the *Son of Man;* and *what man* in like case (although in another sense than that in which I act) *would not do the same?*" For the rest, it is plain that the *sheep* of the Lord Jesus do not here designate, in the sense of the discourses in John, those who are foreseen as believers and elect; although many thus perversely interpret his meaning, and hence find themselves altogether at a loss to account for the ninety and nine. It may be said (with Richter) that all Israel is primarily to be understood; we think, however, that the hundred sheep extend much further than that, and intimate—"All men are my sheep, and therefore even ye unfaithful shepherds are such." Christ is "the Man, whose all men are." Still occupied by his gracious intercourse with the publicans and sinners who had drawn near to hear him, he takes the gentlest view of the apostasy of all mankind from God and from himself; contemplating them under that gracious aspect which has also its truth. "They are indeed wretched and wandering sheep—but ye are (as ye think) in the right way; may I not, then, *leave you?* This ye willingly consent to; then let me seek the lost, receive those who draw near to me, save those who hear me and repent, though you need it not." It could not be but that this most gracious beginning should immediately assume a tone of gentle or severe irony as it regards these perverse hearers. He does not actually leave any flock without a shepherd in the wilderness, while he goes to seek the one

manner, that they could not allege that they were designed to taunt themselves; *meanwhile their indignation might somewhat abate*" (*Berlenb. Bibel*).

* Olshausen, however, speaks of this parable having its original place, not in Matt. xviii., but here in Luke xv.—as if it could only have been spoken once. When will the hypothesis, which so much abhors repetitions in the Gospels, disappear from evangelical criticism?

† Lange pursues this thought, and emphasizes it too much; for the idea of the shepherd's solicitude for the completeness of the round number of a hundred is only a subordinate feature in the parable itself; and so of the woman's scanty *ten* pieces Or must we refer to *Anselm's* full number?

stray sheep (as Eliab blamed David, 1 Sam. xvii. 28); though the parable in its limitation does not extend to that, nor does the Lord's immediate answer involve that necessity.

But now let us observe in ver. 5 the graciousness of the Shepherd, who is not indeed influenced by the common selfishness of man, but by tender love to the sheep themselves. We would not press the allusion, with Melancthon, who says—"Est suavis significatio inserta *passionis* Christi; ovem inventam ponit in humeros suos, *i.e.*, ipse onus nostrum transfert in seipsum, fit victima pro nobis," (a gentle allusion to the *passion* of Christ is introduced; he places the found sheep on his own shoulders, *i.e.*, he transfers our burden to himself, becomes a victim for us): for, the passion of our Lord is rather involved already in the *going after*, till he find the objects of his love; the retrieved ones are already atoned for. But this figure of the Shepherd with his sheep upon his shoulder, which the early Christians so much delighted in portraying, does most expressively paint the tender and assiduous love which the sinner experiences on his first return by repentance. Oh that poor penitent converts found always such gentle treatment from the proud world, or even from some proud saints! The great and good Shepherd, in the fulness of his love and joy, does not hand over the poor sheep to a servant, who would hurry it home in his hireling way: no, he beareth it himself (see Isa. xl. 11), reminding us of the leading or *bringing in* of chap. xiv. 21, which falls immeasurably short, and is assigned to the servant. No chastisement for the running away, no driving or whipping back—the poor sheep is weary and *languishing* enough by reason of its wanderings (Matt. ix. 36); the great object is solicitously to warn and to shelter it against new dangers—"that I may not again lose thee, my beloved and peculiar treasure, which it rejoices me to have found again!"

The *coming home* of the shepherd precisely corresponds to his *going forth*, πορεύεσθαι. It was not, indeed, literally said *in the parable* that there was such a going forth from home (the parallel is καταλείπειν, "leaveth"); but it was actually intended, nevertheless, to indicate the whole human life of our Lord with its great aim, and is therefore to be interpreted by Matt. xviii. 11, comp. Luke xix. 10, where the Son of Man is said to have *come* to seek and to save that which was lost. Thus he goeth after it, *until* he find it; that is, not merely (according to Bengel) seeking the sinner even at the table where he sits in his sins, but in the essential truth of his words, seeking *till* the death of the cross; seeking us by penetrating the depths of our misery and our curse, since only there and only thus we might be found. Consequently, the *coming home* of the Son of Man, who had gone forth to seek and save the lost children of men, must indicate his return to his own proper house as the Son of God; to the heaven whither he carries back his saved ones. All this is most plainly declared, as we have already said, in the literal words of ver. 7, *Likewise—in heaven*, and most significantly the ἔσται, "shall be," pointing to futurity. This man, this shepherd, is thus at the same time the Lord from heaven, so transcendently high in himself, yet so condescending towards the objects of his gracious seeking. It is a still further condescension of the great proprietor that he summons others to share his joy; for he who thus speaks to others, places them, as it were, on a level with himself. The *joy* is in itself so great, that it is as if he is not sufficient for it himself, but increases his gladness and the complacency of his love by the sympathy of others. What depth of divine συγκατάβασις (condescension) in the real truth which is undeniably involved in such figures as these! The man in the parable has friends and neighbors around him, who are his fellows—thus deals the Lord with those who are with him *in heaven!* Looking at the profound difference between the two parables, we very much doubt whether here also, as in ver. 10, the angels of God *only* are to be understood. Meyer observes—Among the angels and the blessed; Bengel understands here in the first instance only the spirits of the just made perfect (comparing Rev. xviii. 20), but this is opposed by the circumstance that the φίλοι καὶ γείτονες, "friends and neighbors," are obviously not themselves πρόβατα, *sheep*. Συγκαλεῖν, "to call together," is the specific expression for an invitation to a *feast*, and hence the "friends and neighbors" are only parabolically so designated—see ch. xiv. 12. (For the poor and the maimed cannot be invited in heaven.) Moreover, we should not seek a profounder distinction (with Bengel) between the friends in sentiment and will, and the neighbors in dwelling and locality. Such thoughts may very easily be pushed too far, as, for example, the edifying observation—What joy will then arise, when the sinner is brought safely home at last! (Is there joy in heaven at thy conversion, and will there be none at thy glorification? Baxter.) For the Lord regards the converted man here as already fully saved and brought home; embracing all in one comprehensive figure. Oh how graciously does his saying proceed—"*My* sheep—which was *lost—that which* was so known to you, the inhabitants of heaven, as well as to me, in whose fate ye share my interest, so that I may call upon you for your sympathy and joy!" The fulness of the meaning of each word has an inexhaustible influence for the heart, even after we have clearly expounded it to our minds. Just as according to that low analogy, which the Lord does not disdain to use, the tenderness of the shepherd-feeling may be exhibited in man as a shepherd towards the animal creation—so does the Lord of heaven look down upon the wretched objects of his compassion upon earth. Just as we ourselves rejoice over the fortunate *finding* of what it has cost us pains to seek, however trivial a thing it may be in itself—even so is there joy in heaven in the presence of God and his angels, even such is the rejoicing of the Son of God who returneth home with the precious thing that he hath retrieved.

We must not pass over, in our familiarity with the formula, the majestic *I say unto you!* which forms the sublime transition to the interpretation of this most condescending parable. "I am that Shepherd, and this I say unto *you*, shepherds of Israel; to you who murmur and blame me I speak, the Son of Man who am come from heaven, and will soon return to heaven again as my home; I, who know full well what passes there (as afterwards, chap. xvi. 23, what passes in hell)—I say unto you that joy shall be in heaven over that which causeth you offence upon earth. Joy, not over the sinner in his sin, but over his repentance; though ye, in your heartless presumption, allow no validity to that repentance, and would not that I should receive such a sinner. I say unto you, that he will be more than *received* above, whatever ye may vainly say against it. Over *one* shall there be the joy of all heaven; and even if all who hear me did not repent, if only one of them repented, the joy of finding him would repay all the toil of seeking him. Ye reject all sinners alike in mass; to me every one, for his own sake and for the sake of my love, is inestimably precious and dear." We have already shown on Matt. xviii. that the Saviour's joy in recovering the sinner refutes the notion of any irresistible grace. Not that the sheep seeks the shepherd; unless he were sought and called he would continue lost. But, on the other hand, he may oppose instead of following the recognised voice of the shepherd; not, therefore, all who are lost are found again, or yield themselves to be saved, and this is the reason of the joy which is felt over that one which is recovered. The *μετανοεῖν*, repentance, is effected by the seeking love of God; but it does not consist entirely and alone in the energy of that love. This is perfectly exemplified in those others who are now brought into contrast; the designation of whom in the parable as "*not* lost" is now qualified by a tone of lamentation and complaint in the interpretation of the parable. A sinner who repenteth is a sinner no longer, he becometh truly righteous—but what of the ninety and nine just persons? Their true characterisation has been given upon Matt. ix. 12, 13. The gracious severity of the words set out with the assumption that their righteousness was valid; but when they murmur where the inhabitants of heaven rejoice, the question naturally arises whether their righteousness can be genuine.* This is the second condemnation of the Pharisees which is hinted at; the first having been already directed against their neglect of their pastoral duty. This closing sentence, further (which coincides with ch. v. 32), proves assuredly that the one sheep cannot be, in the sense of this parable, the human race as requiring redemption; for the ninety and nine *ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*, "in the wilderness," are neither the angels nor the just made perfect in heaven. He who lists may, however, *go beyond* the limits of the parable, and regard the Lord as having one great flock throughout the universe, to which the human race, lost till he goes after it, is related as the one saved sinner is related to all the others, as the one to the ninety and nine.*

Verses 8–10. We have already exhibited the essential point of this second parable, which alas! is in most sermons and expositions lightly despatched as dependent upon the former, or left altogether unnoticed. It is not the Holy Ghost, as he is a hypostasis in the depths of the Godhead, but as he has built for himself a *house* upon earth, and obtained for himself a *possession*. The *church* as a whole and individual *churches*—both are, in a certain sense, the same. The *Spirit* in the *church*, as the true mother of that *house* which the great Proprietor possesses not only in heaven but also upon earth, seeks, in like manner, the lost piece of silver, and similarly rejoices over it amid the sympathies of all angels and good spirits. Thus the meaning of our Lord's words, spoken for futurity (Matt. xxiv. 35), goes here, as it often, or, we may say, always does, far beyond the sense which those who heard them first were then capable of putting upon them. Nevertheless, even then an attentive and thoughtful scribe might have been led by the symbolical seeking *woman* to think of the congregation of the people of God, of the קָהָל (congregation) or עֵדָה (assembly) of the Lord; in the name and as the servant and representative of which, he himself should also have sought the lost. But let it be observed *now* that the house built upon earth is not introduced till *after* he who came is gone home again to his house in heaven (ver. 7.) The substitution of the piece of silver as

* The Lord recognizes no just persons who never needed, or even who no longer need, repentance—and every application which involves this is a perversion. Braune, *e.g.*, speaks of the "innocent, who have not yet experienced or become conscious of evil, and who in the simplicity of their hearts are just in the sight of God," as contrasted with "sinners who have passed beyond the line of innocence;" but the former could only be the *angels*, who however occupy their own quite different place in vers. 7, 10, and are never called just in Scripture, but always holy ones. This would issue in making our Lord preach the doubtful doctrine that "virtue transcends innocence," against which we cannot be too much on our guard, as grazing the confines of the view that man's fall into sin is his line of progress towards maturity. Righteousness in scriptural phraseology is never mere innocence, nor untried and unconfirmed virtue; and as the "just persons" in ver. 7 are upon *earth* (for should not the angels in heaven rejoice over themselves as righteous?) it follows that it is here only a *preliminary hypothesis* which is assumed, with an underlying tone of irony.

* "Should not that great and glorious shepherd whose millions of bright sheep fill the universe, leave these millions in order to seek the slightest, poorest, most infirm of those who need his care, and without that care would utterly perish; does not his boundless love require him to go after it?" (Kurz, *Bibel u. Astronomie*, p. 220). This is a thought quite permissible in itself, but as an exposition of what eternal wisdom has spoken it is not valid.

designating the sinner, gives us, in addition to the important meaning which we indicated above, the idea of a progression *in his value:* a lost animal, a lost piece of money, and finally, a lost *son*.* For, the more closely we regard and realise the sinner's final misery and his first apostasy as leading to it, the more impressively does his value in himself assert itself. The number hence becomes smaller: at first a hundred, now ten, afterwards reduced to two. This is not designed simply to teach that the enumeration in itself is not to be interpreted; but the *ten* pieces of silver indicate in passing that the woman is not so rich as to be indifferent to the loss of even *one* piece; that is, one soul is estimated by the Spirit in the church, not in the proportion which one piece would bear to the hoard of a man with millions, but in its proportion to a scanty store of such a woman as this. The church counts her possessions carefully, is unwilling to give up anything as lost, and speaks of it when lost with all the more emphasis as—*my* piece! As the Lord also on Matt. xxii. 20, 21 compares man with a piece of money, referring by the *image and superscription* to the impress of God primarily on Israel, and then generally on humanity in general, so must we not altogether exclude an analogous side-glance in our present passage. The piece of silver lying under the dust in its corner retains its own essential value, but it would remain *dead* and *lost* as to purposes of possession (as we speak of dead and useless capital), if it should remain unsought and unfound.† In a more restricted reference the Lord especially intends those who have already belonged to the church and fallen in it; because *in them* the loss and the ruin is exibited in its most impressive point of view: the discourse afterwards takes a deeper and more retrospective view, and regards every sinner as having been once in the house of God, in the heaven or paradise of innocence —of which more anon.

Lighting, sweeping, seeking: three critical points which are not without significance, and which point to the true signification of the γυνή or woman. We cannot *seek* in the dark, because we cannot *see*. Then the lamp of preaching must first be kindled in the Gospel; and the voice of preaching is the voice, continued upon earth, of him who is gone into heaven: it is the Spirit who testifies in that preaching; but yet the church lights these lamps, by selecting and appointing her own true witnesses, chosen from her midst, and exercising their functions in her name. As to individual churches, this light may in some cases altogether disappear, but in *the church* never; she, that is, the Holy Spirit in her, continues ever to kindle them anew. However much the disguising *dust*, in its various kinds, may itself glisten or shine—it is, and can be no other than darkness and death; the true light must shine upon, and disperse it utterly. For with *this* light is associated, and in absolutely necessary union, the *sweeping* of the house in all the further ordinances and regulations of the ecclesiastical economy, administration of discipline, and exercise of supervision; the removal out of the way of all hindrances and offences, of all hypocritical pretexts and concealments, so as to leave no corner unvisited by the light, and nothing hidden in the dust: and all this is done by the true energy of life accompanying the true light. This sweeping does indeed at first seem to create dust where dust was not before, *exciting* it throughout the house for the sake of the object lost; and even so this work of the Spirit in the church is complained against as unpleasantly disturbing the deceitful course of death, and interfering with the false peace and amenity of the house. Finally, the end and aim of all this lighting and sweeping is the real and thorough *seeking* for souls. We may further say that the first is preëminently assigned to the minister of the word as such, the second to his helpers and elders, and the coöperation in the great work of seeking to the whole church generally. When this proceeds in all its vigor, the church is filled with life; and, thus living, will not indolently suffer her treasures to be lost, but seeking and finding them will edify herself in the Holy Ghost.

Nothing is said here in ver. 9 of coming home, for the woman who seeks is already in her own house: the Spirit abides in the church. Hence also in ver. 10 (though this is generally overlooked) not the "angels *in heaven*" are mentioned; any more than the Future ἔσται, "shall be," which now becomes the Present γίνεται, "is." The angels of God, although they always behold the face of the Father in heaven, are at the same time coöperant upon earth in the seeking and preservation of those who are to be, and are, the heirs of salvation; they are present in the church (1 Cor. xi. 10); everywhere, and here especially, there is a close connection and fellowship between heaven and earth. The friends and the neighbors who run together after the manner of women (very much as if to rejoice over the birth of a child, see Ruth iv. 14, 17; Luke i. 58), must not be regarded simply as a necessary appendage of the figure; for, in this wondrous series of parables, there is not the slightest touch which does not yield its meaning. Bengel's remark upon the distinction between the angels as "foris, habitu virili, bellis apto," (abroad—in male attire, adapted to warfare); and "domi, habitu pacifico et feminino," (at home—in pacific and feminine attire), may be justly deemed far-fetched; but it will much better correspond with the truth if we refer to the hosts, or, as it were the congrega-

* Not therefore conversely in anti-climax, as we find in Stein—Not only a sheep, which has a sensitive enjoyment of its life, but even an insignificant piece of money. The tenth part of her little store is not insignificant to the woman.

† This view, which is quite in harmony with our present passage, and with the comparison between man and the tribute money, has no affinity with the strange and inappropriate question of Back—"What makes the money *false* or *genuine*? Not the external brilliance, or the stamp upon it, but the false or genuine metal of its substance."

tion of spirits.* Suffice it, that in each case there is *joy* in the presence of the angels of God when a sinner begins his conversion, and opens his heart for the birth of his Saviour, even as there was angel's joy in Bethlehem; yea, there is joy over the beginning of every new creation, like that first joy over creation when the light sprung forth from the darkness (Job xxxviii. 7. See Eph. iii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 12). This world is the nursery of that world; and every little plant is greeted as a new accession to the glory of God, to the joy of all who are saved in him, and to his joy, as the Saviour, in them.

THE SEEKING, RECEIVING, FORBEARING LOVE OF THE FATHER TOWARDS THE PENITENT AND THE SELF-WILLED, THE OPEN AND THE CONCEALED SINNER: THE TWO SONS.

(Luke xv. 11–32.)

If it were allowable to introduce here the distinctions applicable to human things, we might term this parable the crown and the pearl of all our Lord's parables. How many words would it require to express all the feelings of reverent astonishment with which we ever contemplate and study it! How simple, yet how profound; how transparently artless as a chapter of human life, and yet how full of mystery as a revelation of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven; how perfectly natural is the picture as a whole, and yet how full of significance down to the slightest and minutest features and touches; how eternally riveted on the memory are the words, how inexhaustibly to be explored their ever new evolutions of meaning; with what dramatic life is all related, so that every fresh clause suggests in itself a whole history, which each one is involuntarily constrained to pursue for himself; and, again, with what force does every word arrest the conscience, and point to the parabolical application of the whole; in short, to sum all in one word, how *divinely human* is this parable of the God-man! So individually characteristic is it, that no other is its fellow; while so universally comprehensive, that "*we* all must find ourselves reproduced in this parable in some sense, either as we have become, or as we have ever been, or as we are hoping and endeavoring to be!"† And we cannot but remark how the blessed Lord, almost in opposition to his usual manner, speaks and points so *movingly* to the sentiment and feelings; as if his affectionate love aims to affect and to break, if that might be, even the hardest hearts. That this parable, which Lange beautifully terms "a gospel within the Gospel," this universal text for preaching about the lost and recovered sons of our heavenly Father (and the first-born hopelessly lost in the midst of the rich possessions of the house), should be wanting in the pericopæ of the Sunday calendar, is an omission which is utterly unjustifiable on any ground whatever; it is not compensated by the insertion of the previous similitudes, and it is of itself ample reason for that reformation of the calendar which Palmer desires.

We shall not repeat what has been already said as to the position and significance of this parable in connection with the whole, but proceed to develop its individual meaning. We are called to regard the Lord's complete answer to the Pharisees, in the double picture so impressively contrasted, and which yet preaches the one love of God—how the *manifestly apostate* sinner (with honesty, at least, in his sin), coming in *penitence*, is *received* again; how the *secretly apostate* sinner (to which is added hypocrisy), even while he is wilfully revolting against his father and his brother, is *borne with* in mercy, is graciously intreated, and even *still sought!*

Verse 11. A hundred sheep—ten pieces of silver—and now *two* sons: this last introduces a *having* of a very different kind, and consequently, a very different, and now first perfect joy, in the recovery after *losing!* The limitation in number to *two* concentrates the attention upon the contrast, exhibited in vers. 7 and 10, between the lost and what was preliminarily assumed to be not lost; bringing out that contrast now into sharp prominence, as a main element in all these parables. A certain man had two *sons*, that is, he was the *father* of both! To understand Christ himself as this father, is contrary to the sacred propriety of all his habitual speech, whether parabolical or otherwise, in which he never forgets that he himself is the true *Son;* and, as we have said, is decisively confuted by a profounder investigation of the whole. *God*, as the Father or great Creator, has *sons*, self-conscious, endowed with will, begotten in his likeness—and these are not so much all intelligent creatures, though this is sometimes assumed, as men created in Adam after the image of God; for, "Adam was the son of God," ch. iii. 38. To say that God is originally the "Father of all his intelligent creatures," presents us only with a half-truth; but to say that he is and remains the Father of men, even in their apostasy, is a whole truth, James ii. 9; Acts xvii. 28, 29·

* Let it be remembered that the collective idea in Hebrew is expressed by the feminine.

† Nitzsch, in his sermons (first selection, Bonn 1833), constructed for academical and educated hearers, but full of the very marrow of exegesis—from which we shall take leave to extract much more.

Eph. iii. 15.* Every "sinner" was once, in his first beginning and going forth from God (even if only in Adam), a child in the house (created in the *Son*); every "righteous person," who comes forward into contrast as thinking himself such, will also in that house declare and prove himself to be a yet greater sinner himself. The universal paternal grace extends to the vilest as consequent upon that first essential birth, while the universal ruin of sin extends to the most honorable as consequent upon actual birth in time; thus the two parties are exhibited in these two sons, whose history is now depicted, and to whom the Lord now speaks, as being originally and fundamentally alike before God.

Now first is the so-called *sinner* placed in the true light which divine love sheds upon him; and we have here depicted to us: his *sin*, vers. 12 to 16; his *repentance*, vers. 17–20; his *reception back again*, vers. 20–24. We have now, more definitely than in the two former parables, "the grades of development in the departure from God, and the return to him by repentance and faith;" the profoundest and inmost beginning and end both of sin and of return, with all that in both cases lies intermediate. First of all, and this is the distinctive starting point of the parable, we have *sin* as such and in its essential self—its *origin* (ver. 12), *development* or process (ver. 13, in the way indicated by the lost sheep), and *consummation* (also ver. 13, having reached the goal indicated by the lost money). But then is immediately adjoined the *misery* which follows on sin, and is inseparably one with it; this also is viewed in its threefold critical aspect: the beginning of want, ver. 14, which is the first consciousness and realization of distance and estrangement; the recourse to false help, ver. 15, which is only the continuation and confirmation of apostasy; and finally the aggravated and intenser want, ver. 16, which lays bare the whole depth of the misery which it has drawn after it.

Verses 12, 13. It is because the Lord will preserve to this "righteous" one in the figure the preëminence of the prerogative of the firstborn, that the *younger* is introduced as the unfilial and lost son; nor need we look for any other reason—such as a relative apology for his folly in his youth, which was also in its time true of the other also. By this figure of a grown-up son, who will be a "young man before his time, and will not endure and wait for his inheritance till his father dies," who is furiously urged by the lust for freedom, the Lord's wisdom, which always contemplates the fundamental principles below the surface, would exhibit to us the innermost essence of all sin in its original source. The son breaks loose from his father; is no longer satisfied with the common enjoyment of all his goods, because he cannot longer tolerate the fellowship of his righteous father, whose authority had so long constrained him to obedience; his will is to live independently and *for himself*, to carry away his *own* goods as a spoil, to seek his miserable happiness by infatuated wisdom of his own in the enjoyments of a free life: and in this we see the *punctum saliens* in all our apostasy from the living God, our Creator, and our Father. His own good things in unholy appropriation preponderate, in the mind of this son, over the favor of his father enjoyed in filial love; he confronts that father with a selfish demand, which seems to possess reason, yet is in reality utterly without it: and in this we see the speedily resulting, and apparently entire death and extinction of all filial sentiment, the root of all and every sin, more exceeding sinful in this its albeit secret and deeply latent principle than in all the subsequent wanderings and riotous abandonment to evil which necessarily springs from it. And even if we go no further than the external possessions of which chap. xvi. 1–13 will speak (though the words go much deeper), yet we must regard the Lord as explaining and condemning prospectively the root of *ἀδικία*, or *unrighteousness*, which clings to all mammon—the improper appropriation of that which should be alien to us, in contempt of our true possessions in the fellowship of God. Δός μοι, "give me"—seems, indeed, to be the supplication of the son as following the Πάτερ, "Father," of invocation; but the μοί, "me," itself presents him as making a demand, and it is followed by a juristical formula which seems to regard himself and his father as equal persons, with equal rights. Τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος, "the portion that falleth to me," is genuine Greek (as Grotius shows), and is used also with reference to inheritance in Tob. vi. 12, as also to the taxes imposed on a dependent people, 1 Macc. x. 30. The son stands upon his right, therefore, just as men think that they have a right as creatures to expect from the Creator an ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος, "daily bread" (and forsooth, the whole befitting μέρος, or "portion," which their ordinary life requires); yet is he constrained, at the outset of his wandering, to pay an involuntary tribute to the truth, for his prayer is—*Give* me now that which will *one day* be my just portion (as if the father had not the right, *as long as he lived*, to disinherit disobedient children!). "I ask that my portion be given me"—in which the demand at the close preponderates over the petition at the beginning.* But this is not the sudden im-

* On this last passage, comp. my *Epheserbrief*, especially vol. i. p. 497.

* The Lord exhibits here in its ground and beginning that which, however, is immeasurably surpassed in its subsequent developments in the world at large, when the proud sinners of the last times demand from their so-called God, now and in this life, all that they care nothing about in another. Yet the Lord speaks prophetically for this last secular manifestation of the evil principles of that apostate, selfish sin which would wrest all that the future has for the present time. Communism lyingly speaks about equal distribution among many brethren: we know full well that such liberalism means all for self in reality, and in any case goes far beyond the ἐπιβάλλον μέρος in its demands.

pulse of desire in an evil hour, which might be reasoned with; it is the resolved and steadfast disposition which the father had seen growing till the period of this outbreak, and which itself silently proclaimed the sad severance of the internal bond. *Therefore* the *father* does not place himself in opposition, resting upon his rightful prerogative; he does not become to this unfilial child a despotic and restraining master, but remains his *father* still: for a father even among men is unwilling to find a *servant* in a *son* (comp. ver. 19 afterwards), and would rather let that son take his freedom, when he knows that all his representations and prayers would be fruitless in keeping his *child*. That our heavenly Father dismisses us with our freedom, when we would depart from him, is the result at once of his *holy righteousness* (averse from all merely external compulsion), and of that mercy also which does not *leave* us, but ever seeks our return. For while, on the one hand, he bestows upon the son who forsakes his house an actual inheritance, it is foreseen, on the other, that in his estrangement it will be consumed, and that distress must in due time recall the wanderer. He who suffers us to go our way has already taken care that it shall be hedged in with thorns (Hos. ii. 6). Thus, if this third parable makes it *appear* at first (as Roos says), "that the father took no more thought about his lost son," that semblance is soon all the more impressively removed.

And he divided unto them the inheritance. In the parable, primarily, the elder (as firstborn) obtained, or was secured in the prerogative of the landed possession, the proper paternal *inheritance;* while the younger had in compensation his *μέρος*, or "portion," dealt out to him. Thus, all else that belonged to the father remained to the elder; yet as a son in the house *with his father*, so that he could yet dispose of it at his pleasure, ver. 31. It might have appeared, indeed, that he who was emancipated according to his own desire had more enjoyment of freedom; but that was only a delusion of the unfilial mind. And let the distinction—never sufficiently noted—between the *οὐσία, substance*, and *βίος, living*, be carefully observed; for the Evangelist, under the direction of the Holy Ghost, gives every little word its distinct and accurate place. The idea of the former goes deeper than that of the latter. The son will have the very *substantia* of his estate, that which properly belonged to his essential personality and existence; without knowing that his words involve (according to the moral relation between personality and possession) something very different from that which a man may eat and drink, spend and consume: of the father it is only said that he gave up *τὸν βίον* (as far, consequently, as the son wished) to his discretion to be wasted. *That* was to this foolish spendthrift *his οὐσία* (ver. 13); and it was this which he squandered utterly, after having converted it *all* into money, and *gathered all together* into a compact transportable form (as Prov. xxiii. 21 xxi. 17, pave the way for our parable): but we shall see that something very different remained for him in the depths of his father's heart. Indeed, no sooner has this fool obtained his own, than he makes haste to show why he had demanded it: *μετ' οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας*, "not many days after," he appropriates all, and goes to another land (properly, into a certain other country), into his own freedom and the freedom of his own, to become a young master on his own account, anything so as to be out of his father's house and beyond his discipline And if the *μακράν*, "far," here belongs to the *χώραν*, "country" (comp. chap. xix. 12, Prov. vii. 19), and does not as in ver. 20 stand adverbially, then it adds an emphasis of its own—as far as possible away! In this emphatic and most pregnant *μακράν*, which significantly combines with the last hypocritical *πάτερ*, "father" (used by the younger as by the elder son), the spirit of apostasy and departure from God is exhibited as the full consummation of sin. The neighborhood of the father is irksome to the fallen child and urges him to widen his distance, until Augustin's word seems to be fulfilled: "regio longinqua est *oblivio* Dei" (the far country is forgetfulness of God). Now *lives* the sinner in that land a life which he thinks worthy of the name; but then begins and is consummated his death, for his father must bewail him as dead; he lives *ἀσώτως*, that is, a self-destroying life, without salvation or help—and hence this intense word became the chosen expression to indicate all kinds of external debauchery and recklessness of riot.* The *χώρα ἐκείνη*, "that land," is wherever such erring children have wandered from their *Father*, wherever they are *dwelling* afar from him, wherever they vainly attempt to build a city, like Cain in Nod, the land of unsteady wandering from the face of God, apart from which there is neither life nor salvation. All creature-possession consumes itself in the using (Col. ii. 22); and all wealth must ever turn to poverty, either by its actual dissipation, or in consequence of the folly of covetousness which, the more mammon increases, is the less satisfied by it. Thus man in his sin consumes first of all his earthly goods, so that he can no more find his satisfaction and comfort in them; but then, alas! the true and real possessions which his heavenly Father communicated to him are also consumed, the life derived from God dies out in alienation (Eph. iv. 18)—unless a seasonable repentance saves its last spark. So in the primitive world the first race of men squandered away in mass the original prerogatives of natural possession, as well as the consciousness and heritage of fellowship with God; such, when viewed in its profoundest principle, is the way of every individual soul; thus

* Ἄσωτος, *ὁ δὶ αὐτὸν ἀπολλύμενος* (Aristot. *Eth.* iv. 1). This history is everywhere and perpetually finding its external realization in the lives of the slaves of lust (Eph. iv. 22). When people are "lords of their means, but not lords of their desires"—waste, poverty, and ruin must follow (Zeller).

was it, more particularly (and this lying midway between the two may be regarded as the most immediate application of the parable), with the chosen people of God in their apostasy. Out of an innocent child (whose first creation by God is reflected, at least, in a certain relative guiltlessness), out of a baptized and confirmed Christian, there comes forth one who draws near to say farewell to his Father as in ver. 12; an independent, that is, an apostate, self-destroying, and lost son—such is the whole history of sin! But when the Father first of all punishes this unholy desire by granting it, as at the graves of lust in the wilderness, he nevertheless deals with our inborn freedom in long-suffering as wise as it is merciful; that increate principle of freedom he regards in his children even in its wanderings with a divine paternity which infinitely transcends any figure by which it may be illustrated.

Verses 14–16. As lightly and swiftly *as all had been gathered together* is *all scattered again*, wasted, spent*—such is the general picture here given of the folly which thinks life long, and never regards its end. The misery of want now begins, treading closely on the heels of lawless riot. This keen and pressing want of hunger marks a critical point of the similitude, wherein it must fail adequately to illustrate the truths which were intended; but the Lord so incorporates the expression in the parable that it preserves its appropriate relation to the narrative, while suggesting to the thoughtful mind the deeper truth which it fails entirely to set forth. For, most assuredly, that hunger which is the destitution of the true and only satisfying bread, must be regarded as always existing in *that land* (as it is twice defined most significantly, after its first mention in ver. 13, and then in the ὧδε of ver. 17 exhibited in its most impressive contrast—as alienated and far from the father's house); but that destitution becomes a necessity or a longing, a manifest λιμός or *famine*, only when it is keenly felt in the soul. The Lord here goes beyond the parable as revolving round this one son, and obliquely intimates how the ruling grace of God sends visitations of general calamity into the domain of this sinful world, which make the misery felt and salvation an object of desire (comp. Amos viii. 11). This great truth, however is only grazed upon in the broad κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἐκείνην, "in that land;" and the Lord, for his immediate object's sake, places the famine of the land generally in striking connection by its ἐγένετο, "there arose," with the consummated squandering of the substance of him who had wandered into it, as if it had been the simple consequence of his reckless waste. And so it seems as if we are no further to think of this λιμός, *famine*, than as it respects the spendthrift's participation in it, and impending starvation. How much is shadowed forth, again, in this ὑστερεῖσθαι, "to be in want," as to the deep internal progress of the history of the sinner! To every one this time must come, especially to every one—as in the point of view (of this parable)—who has fallen into the gross wilfulness of outward sin. The time passes merrily for a while, but the pleasure of life soon dies out, the possessions and the strength are lavished away, the relishes of mad joy which once befooled the heart are now untasted—suffice it that that heart, the still existent ἔσω ἄνθρωπος or "inner man," begins now to be in want, to feel the fearful horror of its most bitter emptiness and distress. No matter whether viewed as external or internal—for it must always come at last to the sense of inward want. Thus we can understand the further description of the ensuing misery. Slavery, instead of the independence so madly chosen; detestable humiliation even among the associates of apostasy in this wicked world; and finally, the last vain endeavor to find the sustenance of life in resources which degrade to the level or below the level of the brutes. The colors are strong, laid on unsparingly, but in perfect truth. The heathen land indicated by the swine, signified to the Jews the region of sin and impurity, in the foul shame of which this son of a very different household must sink into a swineherd. The land, indeed, is full of such as he (sinners are many upon earth)—that is the first intimation. But the strong expression which speaks of the *citizens* of that land means still more, and involves an evident contrast with the immigrant who had not yet become a citizen therein. Those in whom the last filial feeling (ver. 17) is extinct, and who think no longer of any former better home, are the true citizens of this evil world; such as would still return like this son in the parable, are the scattered children of God in their midst (John xi. 52).

First of all, the wretched one *beginning* to be in want, seeks to help himself, in perverse and blindly persistent apostasy; turning to resources which can only issue in his own worse misery, and thus drive him against his own purposes to that conversion which is the design of God's grace. His heart does not yet and at once say—I will up and go to my father! but before that there is to be another πορευθείς, "he went." Many interpret the ἐκολλήθη, "joined himself," of humble and urgent *begging*, which fastens itself upon another and will not be gainsayed—Give me something, make me something, even though it be a keeper of swine, only let me not starve and perish! But this seems an incorrect anticipation of the stages of humiliation, as they are stated with precision; this κολλᾶσθαι gives us rather the twofold commencement of misery, as resulting from foolish recourse to self for help. He enters into stricter fellowship with the heathen and sinners of the place (which he had in a sense avoided before, from the remains of shame in him); but this fellowship of attachment of itself can only result in *dependence*, he gives himself up to bondage, pledges himself wholly to the world. This, then, is the abasement, in which the wretched wages of sin must become loathsome to him as swine's food, while

* Διεσκόρπισε is obviously in ironical contrast with συναγαγών; and then πάντα points again to the previous ἅπαντα, while δαπανᾶν yet more ironically reprobates the *spending all*—for nothing!

he remembers the bread of heaven. The world, and every one of its citizens, is a hard master, in whose services the most pitiable wages are given, yea, not even food to eat; well for every prodigal who is constrained to realise this, and does realise it! The *κεράτια*, which Luther has quite correctly popularised into *husks*,* indicate, according to the predominant reference which the parable involves to sinners of the grossest degree, the last defilement, the bestial turpitude of the foulest fleshy lust—although even this may assume various forms, admits of many degrees, and may be disguised under specious aspects. What the beast is to man, that the carnal man, the natural man generally with his pleasures and needs, is to the nobler part of himself, the spirit to be awakened in conversion; it is not, therefore, an external change, the alteration in objects and manner of life simply, which is needed to turn into husks what before was so sweet and pleasant (Prov. ix. 17, xx. 17). For if the sinner has once reached the point at which the parable here exhibits him, he is constrained by experience to confess the worthlessness and the utter disgracefulness of his sinful life; yet this is so far from being the voluntary conversion of his will, that he might even in this depth despise the call of the living God, and exhort his soul to eat and drink as if at the most excellent table;† and thus, if his most outrageous desires were gratified, arrive at a point in which he should take his place among the other thriving citizens. We see, in this normal type of a penitent sinner, that even he at least for a while *desires* only to be fed with these husks! The common translation, however, and that which Luther has retained, is incorrect; our feeling would never allow us to admit—And no man gave *them* unto him! As if, had only the swine's food been supplied to him, he would *not* have gone back to his father! a feature this which would derange and distort the harmony of the whole picture. It is indeed said in regard to this prevalent interpretation, that in the time of dearth his swine were more important to the citizen than their keeper (but we may ask whether the herdsmen was not necessary *for them!*), but such a notion introduces an incongruous extravagance quite foreign to the measured character of the whole parable. And further—who could have prevented the swineherd from taking some portion for himself in connection with the animals, on which supposition alone the *giving* to him would have been needful.‡

The general *οὐδείς*, "no man," does not suit this view; nor his experience, already alluded to, that these *κεράτια*, which the swine might *eat* as their natural and fitting nourishment, could only *fill* without nourishing and satisfying his hungering belly.* This is, once more, a piercing truth—the pleasures of sin, as those who delight in them must find, fill, but never satisfy; comp. Luke vi. 25; John iv. 13; Eccles. i. 8, and, in the same words as here, Psa. xvii. 14. And here what sin would do, becomes its punishment—the debauched and riotous liver had before filled his belly, while no animal, no swine, eats more than enough, overstepping the limits of nature. In the similar application in Luke xvi. 21, it is supposed that many crumbs fell to Lazarus from the rich man's table, the *ἐπιθυμῶν*, "desiring," indicating his pious contentment—and here also we must understand that the poor swineherd ate readily of the husks, seized them with avidity, *for* (as *καί* often signifies), *no man* troubled himself about his case, or *gave* him a just sufficiency for his maintenance; and this *absolute* use of *δίδωμι* Alford lays stress upon, concurrently with myself. Thus it is—No man *gave him* anything else, any human nourishment, any *bread*. This immediately leads to the *περισσεύειν ἄρτον*, "bread to spare," in the father's house, of which he at last thinks with a true *ἐπιθυμεῖν* or desire; and this is said also, in passing, to the hard "just ones," who would with like scorn leave the "publicans and sinners" to their trough, instead of feeling compassion for their trouble.

Verses 17–20. The *penitent* sinner now stands revealed before our eyes! *Penitence*, in its fullest meaning, or the voluntary following out of the *purpose* into the great *act*, is the actual arising and *coming* to the father; but before this comes the resolution of *repentance*, which is developed here with almost systematic completeness as proceeding from the inmost soul. For Jesus explains in *this* parable how far penitence must, like sin, proceed *voluntarily*: and in this there is a contrast with the sheep, wandering in stupidity, and in stupidity not coming back of itself; and still more with the lost piece of money. Yet both sides of the question are equally true. Repentance, as a resolution, thus develops itself: in its origin as a return into self and remembrance of the father—in its most essential process as a consciousness of misery, and that as the judicial consequence of sin—and finally in its consummation as a turning round, a confession, and a vow. Or, transferred into systematic phraseology, Repentance is first knowledge and conviction of sin, and then resolution (although in that first knowledge the latent *will* must coöperate; for it is the inmost principle and root, as of the act so also of the self-knowledge in repentance); but

---

* St. John's bread, or goat's horn, the hulls of a leguminous plant which in the East is the food of cattle and swine, and often the nourishment of the poorest in times of distress. The Syr. has חרובא, which corresponds with the Talmudical חָרוּבָא, חֲרוּבָא for the same fruit.

† We cannot but think of that verse of the great poet—"Uns ist ganz kannibalisch wohl, als wie fünfhundert Saüen!"

‡ Though the answer has been devised—that he would have to prepare them by cooking for himself!

* The contrast expressly established in the text between *γεμίσαι τὴν κοιλίαν* and *ἤσθιον*, confutes the application which Braune makes—He might *not even like* the swine satisfy himself. There is no *not even* in the description.

knowledge of misery, as also of the guilt and sin which has produced it—resolution not only to return but to confess. As it respects the third critical point, the promise of work and new obedience, we shall afterwards find something which requires cautious handling in that.

It is well expressed in the translation—*When he came to himself*—thus not before, but now at last! Thus far was it necessary that it should go with him. This is the rule which has its external exemplification in multitudes of cases. How many must first go on to the most shameful excesses of sin before they come to know that sin! How many find not out their misery until after they have sought their consolation and help in the world by the profoundest humiliation of devotion to it! After they have been sent, as it were, to the swine, the long unheard and overpowered voice within them breaks out—Thou seekest it in the world to no purpose, it is *in thyself*, thou art a lost son, but still the *son* of a *father!* He *came* to himself—this is more accurate than Luther's popular "in sich schlagen," which incorrectly connects the subsequent act (ch. xviii. 13) with this simple beginning, thereby deranging the delicate connection of the text, as well as losing sight of a reference which it contains to Old Testament phraseology. When he *begins* to be in want, he *goes* and joins himself to a citizen; when his want reaches the point of extremest outward need, he *goes* that better way into himself, there finds he the right πορεύσομαι, "I will go." See in Deut. xxx. 1 the same intimation—When thou shalt call to mind or go into thy heart (תְּשִׁבְתָּ אֶל־לְבָבֶךָ, comp. 1 Kings viii. 47, Isa. xlvi. 8). When the sinner truly goes into himself, he discerns himself by a yet remaining remembrance to be in the deepest reality an apostate son before God. Thus previously and in his sin, he was *out of* himself, had never contemplated and known himself in the simple truth of his condition and relations. And let the intimation in this similitude for the other and equally true aspect of the matter, be also observed. The voluntary sinner was not altogether and absolutely a voluntary agent (there was in his case a blinding deceitfulness of sin and Satan, by which he had lost the power of entering into self); and further, his repentance was not altogether voluntary, but induced by the grace which sought him through the pressure of need. The first utterance of his heart is an awakening right remembrance of the forsaken father's house. We may for a moment hesitate how to interpret the mention of the *hired servants*, which the Lord, primarily in conformity with the literal similitude, connects with this remembrance; for we cannot suppose that any feature in the parable is indifferent and without its own proper allusion. We might rest in the general interpretation—How many people *still faithfully* serving him, industrious laborers, has my father! These would then be "the multitudes of saints whom the Lord of blessedness had received to blessedness, poor sinners whom he had already graciously and hospitably admitted."* But there must still be a difference between such and the μισθίους, "hired servants," here. For while this lost son is occupied in thinking—"There no man suffers want; even the hired servants, such as I am here, are better cared for than I, most miserable μίσθιος without μισθός, yea, even without food, which the meanest hireling is worthy of:" while he is thus meekly instituting comparison with his own present condition, he cannot but bring also into contrast (for he remembers his *father* as such!) his ἐγώ δέ, "and *I*," as the *son* having an original prerogative! To understand the matter aright, we must remember too that no one parable can express everything which is involved in its meaning; and that *remembrance* which here seems to well up naturally in the penitent's soul, is in the corresponding reality awakened by the call of God, which goes out through all that land not only in the voice of scarcity, but in open and direct *preaching*—Return again, ye who have revolted! But that preaching exerts its influence only where it excites and kindles the still existing spark—and *this* is the point of view which we must take in order to understand what is here said—this explains the sinner's understanding that appeal. Thus it is not as if this sinner had now other converted sinners before his eyes; but his reflection signifies—How many orderly men (in comparison of me a reprobate) receive temporal happiness from God!† And here it is undeniable (as in the χώρα and the λιμός), that the parable extends beyond its own limits, that is, arises itself to press towards its interpretation. The hired servants are now before the eyes of the son, even as the father's house is not removed from him by any distance of space.

And I, his son, perish with hunger, am dying the most frightful death! If this ἀπόλλυμαι, *perish*, becomes a consciousness to the soul, then is there life enough in it to seek and to find the bread of life. Now first is the external turned to an internal wretchedness, and is in contrast *felt* as misery by the soul. The ὧδε,

---

* Paulus, *Kind-Worte, wodurch man selig werden kann, in fünf Predigten über den verlornen Sohn* (Cannstadt, by Richter, 1839). Impressive and awakening sermons, which, however, labor under the defect of neglecting the individualising exposition of the text, and caring only about the ecclesiastical and systematic theology to be evolved from it.

† It were going too far to make the premature distinction—How many merely *legally* faithful righteous servants, not yet children of God, are fed by his bounty, are more contented and happy than I! Such thoughts have no place here. But the interpretation of Von Gerlach is essentially incorrect, who speaks of "the lower creation of God" contrasted with which "only sinful *man* feels himself in his restless sin empty and miserable"—thus making "the contemplation of God's *creation* awaken to *repentance!*" This is a notion quite alien to the parable, and untrue in itself; for the *father's house* does not include the animal world and the lower creation, and *man* does not come to repentance in any other way than by coming to *himself.*

here, which is unfortunately omitted by Luther (as by the Vulg.), and to the emphasis of which we have already referred, is certainly genuine, and has a distinctive significance in the spirit of the penitent's words—And I, the apostate son, perish *here*, because I by my own fault am here and not with my father, because I have chosen to leave him! *This* is my sin and my misery! The experience of misery led first from without inwardly to the knowledge of sin; but now conversely this knowledge speaks first and last of sin as the only cause of misery. Wherefore am I, wherefore *remain I here?* Thus from this ὧδε springs immediately that transcendently important and impressive Ἀναστὰς πορεύσομαι, "I will arise and go." The ground-tone is—I *will* arise! for here we have the English distinction—the future *I will* and not *I shall*. But there is mingled with this an immediate resolution of instant decision which admits not of being translated—I will do it! for there is no mere θέλω, *I will* (wish), expressed. In the ἀναστάς (which primarily signifies the rallying from a state of impotent wretched despondency, though not without a gracious though slight pre-intimation of the resurrection of the dead one, ver. 24) Bengel sees the *primordia pœnitentiæ, accurate indicata;* but we should more accurately look for the true primordia in the earlier ἐλθὼν εἰς ἑαυτόν, "when he came to himself." The *arising* and the *going* are again two stages, hence repeated significantly in ver. 20. There is no despair, which would rest in the ἀπόλλυμαι—"All is lost with me, my salvation is impossible, I *can* no more return to my father!" When now the sinner—in a better sense than before in ver. 13—gathers all together that he has in himself, all that remains in him of the grace of creation, as well as all the influence of awakening, preventing grace already received—then can he do what he will. But he must also in act *go*, and actually go *to* the father. How many find this grievous; how many prefer to go to some other citizen of the country who may promise fairer and give more than the former! But in this *going* to the father there follows of itself the true *saying* unto him—even if that is only the language of *coming* itself, which often speaks most loudly.

Even in this "Pater, peccavi"—as popular use has translated our Lord's expression of the sinner's heart's cry to the heart of the all-merciful Father—His shepherd-voice goes out after the wandering sheep, putting that language into the lips of sinful man. And what a word is this single ἥμαρτον, "I have sinned," in this place, the heart-breaking fullness of which the Holy Spirit teaches every penitent sinner from age to age to pour forth in many words! Impossible is it at first to set before God all the details of our life of sinfulness; but this one word is enough for him, if it springs from the depths of earnestness, without any abatement of reservation or apology. The son in the parable alleges nothing in his own justification (youthful inconsideration, false counsellors, or the like), and is far from Adam's ancient defence, Gen. iii. 12, comp. Job xxxi. 33. How fundamental and thorough the meaning of his ἥμαρτον, is shown in the addition, without any unfolding, as it were, of his sin—"I know what that is, I have sinned against *heaven* and before *thee!*" Is this to be put to the account of the parable simply, so that the son here may be said to distinguish between heaven and his *human* father? Primarily it may be so—and, for the purpose of the figure, it may run—"Against *God*, crying to heaven, has my sin been committed, while I have been offending before thee, and against thee my *father;* not merely the offence against thee do I feel and confess, but above and before all the *sin* before God" (comp. Matt. xxi. 25; Ezra ix. 6; 2 Chron. xxviii. 9). But this twofold expression has its distinctive meaning in the interpretation of the parable, inverting the sense just given—"I have sinned against the right and order of *heaven*, against the obedience of the kingdom of spirits subjected in obedience to law (a supplementary note for ver. 7), in that I have sinned against *thee*, my Father, and the Father of all spirits!" And so, further—"*Not merely* before all the angels and holy inhabitants of thy house, preëminently, and first of all *in thy sight*. I stand here a confessed, and convicted sinner! But I dare to come, and stand before thy holy face." The two sentences—I *will* arise! I *have* sinned! were unconditional and decided; but the third follows as hypothetical, and carrying with it the latent spark of something not yet lost. Judas and Cain at once are ready to have nothing more to do with God; but this poor prodigal son has twice in his penitence spoken of his *father*, ver. 18 (and a third time, if we include ver. 17); and even the *being called* son, which he could not hope in reply* from him whom he yet ventures to address as "father," has in its undertone the timid and poignant suggestion—Although I *am* thy son, was once rightly so called. This evidently lies in the backward glance of οὐκέτι, "no more." The prayer descends from the tone of its first confession of absolute guilt, in a way which is as artless as it is justifiable, and uses a μείωσις (meiosis) which expresses the outgoing of the heart of a child towards the heart of a father. Instead of continuing, and prosecuting into all its detail, the ἥμαρτον which he had confessed—"I deserve to be banished from heaven and from thee, to be punished with the severest condemnation!" he takes courage to say no more than—"I am *no more* worthy to be called thy son;" although this indeed silently says—"Anything rather than this has been my desert!" Had his words ended there they would have been a perfect model for all such sons so coming as he; his appeal would have been such as the "*father!*" which he had first spoken might have said in its own solitary and profound significance; the conclusion correspond-

* It is only this first unrejecting acceptance that he ventures to think upon, or that he is capable of thinking upon. His thoughts do not go on to that consummation of which Matt. v. 9 speaks.

ing to that would have been the fitting and permitted supplication of a returning child, more self-abased than words would express—"But *father!* I *pray* thee, *receive* thy penitent son again, call me son once more!"

This repentance dares to hope for, but not to expect, forgiveness; hence scarcely has the son drawn involuntarily so near, than he falls back again in anxiety, ventures not to complete his petition, nor to close it in the way which we have indicated. Nitzsch therefore says too much, if we take him literally, when he preaches on this text of "an arising and coming with the whole trust of repentance, and with the entire repentance of trust." Profound and beautiful, but true only in a further stage, beyond this first return. "My whole spirit cries out—Father, make me anew, I am no more thy son!" But thus does not the son speak as yet; it is another ποίησόν με, "make me," which he brings, of which anon. He *feels after* acceptance, forgiveness, renewal, but at the same time with a contradiction: this and no more can the natural reason and power attain to—*entire* confidence is as much an effect of grace received as *entire* repentance.* The conclusion of reason from natural postulates and premises, the heart's wish and the heart's hope of the contrite sinner returning to a better life, approves the *possibility* of forgiveness of sins with God, but *only* the possibility—"*not* the fact and the actuality, since even the most correct perception of the paternal gracious character does not warrant the lost son to expect forgiveness with perfect assurance, before the wiser father declares himself. If, then, he thus goes, repents and confesses, yet must he ever stand in doubt whether forgiveness will actually be the result. Yea, the same reason (which deemed it possible on many grounds) may deem it now on other grounds altogether uncertain whether it may or can be so—a paradox this! No sooner does God forgive sin than the converted man comes into a new condition of blessedness, rest and peace, as if he had never sinned; the remembrance of the sinful condition is effaced, and it *appears* as if he had been placed on a level with the holy, sinless creature which had never transgressed God's commandment. Now if the condition of these two is the same, notwithstanding that the *reformed* sinner must ever be one who has been an *actual* sinner—then our natural faculties cannot reconcile the forgiveness of sins with justice, that is, with the strictly proportionate goodness of God. Even the Christian who knows and believes in his heart that there will be more joy in heaven over the repenting sinner (Luke xv. 7)—stumbles at this saying if he applies to it his mere reason, and is tempted to attribute to God some sort of *injustice* against more pious spirits and races of unsinning intelligences. He thinks (viewing the matter merely with his reason), that these may, like the elder son, have some cause to complain against God. And so—it remains to reason at the least an insoluble problem, how God can pardon sinners on repentance simply and yet remain righteous towards the unsinning, placing those on a level with these."* We may here see, by way of anticipation, how the error with its subjective truth of the penitent son's humility has already done justice to the proud pre-eminence of the righteous one, even before he had begun his murmuring.

But what is this error of humility with its *subjective* truth, the exhibition of which was so needful to the *objective* truth of this anthropological delineation? No other than the intended petition with which the son would close his appeal to his father, and which is seldom understood in all its depth of meaning. We have good grounds for admitting that "in this awakening return there is a *spark* of *confidence* towards the injured father; and thus penitence and *faith* together concur in that first faint feeling which now respects the formerly despised paternal character" (*Berlenb. Bib.*). But if in this son awakening to a return, there had been more than this slight spark of confidence in grace; if he had at once thought of being accepted as a son who had never sinned, or had asked for and expected this at the first, then would his penitential humility have been inwardly untrue; and the Saviour would not have been able to describe penitence (as he here however does), in *that* aspect which presents it as springing from man's capability and determination; it would be in that case a penitence which prematurely anticipates the influence of the positive assurance of grace. The returning son almost dares to put his request, but at the same time retracts it: it is impossible for him to anticipate the reception of ver. 20, still less that which follows in ver. 22; this, however, although right when looked at humanly, is wrong before God. *Make me as one of thy hired servants!* This is by no means, as well-meaning expositors have unthinkingly said, the appropriate *promise or pledge of a new obedience*—as if, in omitting it, ver. 21, "his shame had led him astray, and made him forget, like petitioners too often, the best part of his resolution!" It is an error which accompanies his truth, but such an error as seems justified in the reality of man's circumstances and relations, until the Father's superabounding grace removes its grounds. It is of no avail to urge the observation that ποιεῖν ὡς, "to make as," is used as *tractare* tanquam; the son's ποίησον means more than this, the ὡς used with it has *almost* (if not, in this conflicting sentence, vibrating between hope and fear, between the trust in mercy and the abasement before justice, altogether) the force of—*Make* me a hired

* The repetition of the confession, ver. 20, after the father's embrace, is somewhat thus to be viewed.

* Thus spoke some time ago an upright Christian Kantian, whose practical reason approached much nearer to revelation than that of the notorious Hegelians of our time, who will have nothing to do with *repentance* and with—*sin*. See *Immanuel, ein Buch für Christen und Juden* (Berlin, 1805), p. 183

servant! (which would be the perfect antithesis to the above quoted precipitate—Make me anew thy son!) On the one hand this might be regarded as the expression of his humility, of the utmost he can think of; for he means to say that even *that* is grace, to be regarded as one of the least of thy hired servants—"for I am not a reputable stranger who offers himself to thy service, but a vagabond who deserves not the beggar's penny, a worthless son whom the father's rod should meet at the door." But on the other hand he exhibits here in the background the residual ineradicable self-righteousness, the existence of which no reasoning can deny in the vilest sinner, and which cannot be persuaded that its own efforts must not retrieve the past. "And I will show thee, O father, how I thy sometime son will *work* as a servant; will *merit* my morsel of bread (without περισσόν), and it may be in coming years win back my right to the name of son!" It is the same thing which we have found on another occasion in Matt. xviii. 26. So that *here* lies the concealed transition (in their likeness before God) from the younger to the elder son: in this his most praiseworthy appeal the younger becomes too much like the elder (who had never served but as a servant); and if the fullness of grace, which alone suffices, had not taken away this feeling, he might have developed with time into a proud elder son himself. All this is described by our Lord according to the simple truth of that which is in human nature: it is painted, however, by his sacred gentleness in such a manner as to abate without extenuating the great guilt of self-righteous pride, as it is only the full consummation of that delusion which exists in both and in all sons of the Father; to wit, that between father and son a mutual obligation exists—the same delusion with which the *demand* of ver. 12 commenced.

And he arose and came to his father: this is the best and most blessed "Said and done!" that can be in heaven and upon earth. For, alas! between this *saying*, "I should—I might—I will—and again I will," and the actual *doing* of it, there is in the case of many a long standing still, great thoughts of heart (Judg. v. 15, Heb.); and, in the case of too many, room for irresolution and turning back again.* Take no counsel with thyself, poor sinner, vacillate not! Come, only come, then wilt thou find in thy Father the thoughts of thy heart, concerning thy being son and being made servant, surpassed beyond all thine imaginings and prayers. He *came*, like the ἐγγίζοντες (those that "drew near") of ver. 1, and this is the pendant and complement of the being sought and found simply, in ver. 4. He came *to his father!* Most gracious prolepsis of the reception which ensued: he had rightly said (and more rightly than his final words show him to have understood himself), I will arise and go *to my father!* Oh that every one, in whom there is the germ of this resolution, would put it into instant execution, and become, instead of a *stranger* in the world, a *pilgrim* unto God! (1 Pet. ii. 11).

Verses 20–24. He who comes is not cast out, but received with the full joy of his father's heart. And here we have, first, the *taking back again* of the penitent sinner in itself, as the result of that love in the omniscient and all-merciful God which comes forth to meet his approach, ver. 20. Then this is more specifically detailed: in the son's confession (without any pledge), ver. 21; in the Father's gracious gifts; in the son's justification, full acceptance, and sanctification, being his answer in act to the penitent's appeal, ver. 22; finally, in the joy of the Father's whole household, or heaven, vers. 23, 24. If any one should say: *Such* a gracious and loving reception, so instant and so full, I never experienced, with all my repentance; we have only to reply—Then must the fault have been with thyself, thou hast not with entire determination of purpose arisen; thy repentance must have been lacking in something, else would the same grace have met thee in the way. Compare such sayings of the Old and New Testament as Jer. iii. 12; James iv. 8. The *expression* of the grace of God appears here twofold: coming to meet, and consolation; but the *ground* on which this rests, or the principle from which it springs, is exhibited as combined omniscience and mercy. The ἔτι μακράν,* "yet a great way off," reaches very far back, though this could not be clearly introduced in the case of the figurative human father—not only to the first good resolution of the son, but actually to that first μακράν, ver. 13, which this latter seems to echo. We must push our interpretation beyond the parable, and regard it as being said that the Father had seen the son in all his wanderings and at his utmost distance, having accompanied him everywhere by his unwearied grace. The *seeing* expresses also the *knowing* all about his misery and the full earnestness of his return, so far as that feeling was possible in a miserable sinner—what is lacking in it the Father reckons in that wretchedness over which his *compassion* yearns. It is not impossible that the son might even now, when near his father's house, have remained *afar off*, without any courage to approach it, if his father had not come forth to meet him. The marvellous *seeing* of the Father is a *drawing* too: it excited in this poor son's mind the thought—He sees me, and regards me, as a father! It was as if the atmosphere of paternal love already began to compass him about. Had his father kept stern silence when the son drew near to him—what would then have been the consequence? Might he not have been terrified, have gone away again, or been thrown

* "For it is one thing to come *to one's self*, and another to come *to the Father*" (Zeller, in the *Monatsblatt*).

* Instead of which Bahrdt surreptitiously read an οὐκέτι οὐ μακράν: "when he was *no longer far* from the place, his father saw him coming—and when he saw him now *near*, and marked in his pale face," etc. *That* would have been the record, merely as a human narrative, but the exact opposite is the far-reaching scope of the parable.

into despair, or what else we may imagine? But he is a merciful, and fatherly father! Although it was only *need* that drove back the runaway, although he is far from coming back with a perfect *filial* trust—with neither of these things does grace upbraid him. The father's heart in the σπλάγχνοις οἰκτιρμοῦ, "bowels of compassion" (Col. iii. 12; Luke i. 78) cries over this son—"He is punished enough, he has punished himself sufficiently, let me run to him and heartily console him!" But this first consolation does not say, or does not yet say, My *son!* (as afterwards, ver. 24); but first there is the embrace between father and child (as in Gen. xlvi. 29, and 2 Sam. xiv. 33), afterwards the words of explanation. This true and loving father—for we may thus extract the pathetic pith of the parable—does not recoil from the swiny reek, does not draw back with dignity from the tattered or naked beggar, and is not restrained by anything from embracing him in the public way. It is altogether as if he had ever been the most loving child, and had never sinned; and therein without any words *all is given* in this first outpouring of grace; there have we the full and ineffable answer to the approaching penitent—I regard thee as my dearest and most faithful son! And thus, what the son would say, is anticipated and prevented. The well-meaning efforts which are made to explain the absence of reference to the mediating *propitiation* of the Son of God, in this instant exhibition of the *Father's mercy*, are altogether needless; they rest fundamentally upon false dogmatic views of this propitiation, as if there were not existing in the Father's being the same love which is expressed in the Son, as if the Father needed abstractly to be propitiated in order to entertain this love. We are not to seek *Christ himself* as mediator in the person of this father; nor (though Melancthon has strangely ventured to affirm it), afterwards in the fatted calf, as sacrificially slain. *His* place here is rather to be sought in his thus authoritatively testifying of the Father's mercy. As Nitzsch excellently says: "If he seems to conceal himself here, he is all the more manifest there, where the Shepherd seeks the lost sheep. For *the* Son, who is neither an *elder* nor a *younger*, the *eternal* Son of the Father, one with him, his eye and his heart towards the lost, is come into this world, although invisible and unnamed in the parable, to reveal the Father where he had been ever invisible and where no man knew him; and he is, to the children of the law and the curse, not only a living herald of the propitiable—we would rather say, of the already propitiated—Father, but the (that is, *our*) propitiation itself, and the way whereby every one of us may come back to God." The mediation of Christ is no more denied by this silence, than the seduction by Satan was denied in the sinner's apostasy at the beginning of the parable. We may also say with Von Gerlach, that "the coming out of the father to meet his son here figuratively exhibits the sending of the Son"—and in this coming out to meet him, when fully understood, nothing is said of a "necessary propitiation of his wrath. For *God was* in Christ *reconciling*—2 Cor. v. 19."

The son, received with grace transcending all his thought, fetched home, like an invited guest, through that final portion of the way which would have been so grievous, receives the embrace and the kiss with the profoundest astonishment, his deep reverence forbidding him to refuse them. *Now* he knows, as he never knew before, what a *father* is, and what *such* a father! So much the more piercing becomes the sincere earnestness of his repentance. He does not now begin to think: "Ah, since the good old man takes it so kindly, I might well have spared myself all my anguish and anxiety! Let us avoid for the time to come the folly of plaguing ourselves," etc. Earthly fathers have often, alas! sons who come back to begin again with more cunning their course of extravagance; man in his sinful estate is indeed capable of apostasy, but to turn *at once* to licentiousness the first full outpouring of grace, would be a Satanic element, in the midst of the human repentance, which involves a direct contradiction. That which the penitent designed, in the trembling resolution of feebly hopeful anxiety, to say to his father, the graciously received son now says in its fullest truth; now first has he experienced a pure repentance and the entire abandonment of himself to naught but grace, and hence his unwise offer of himself to hired service is withheld. This omission of the concluding words of his intended confession, is a feature of the highest significance. Meyer's note—"The father prevented his continuing," is correct only when it is rightly understood. We are not to suppose that between vers. 21 and 22 there intervened an interruption on the part of the father; and that the son in that father's presence still retained the servant in his heart, and still contemplated "some atonement and reinstatement of his own righteousness;"* the father had already, ver. 20, set his *heart* right upon this matter, and so stopped his mouth that he himself omits the words, as contradictory to his father's kiss of forgiveness.

Thus much for the first scene between father and son; the narrative now concisely hastens with both to the house, where the personages increase around them. The servants of this house, the δοῦλοι, are more than μίσθιοι, or *hired* servants, as the words of one of them, ver. 27, participating in the Master's sentiments, make plain; we may and we should assuredly think of the angels once more of ver. 10, for they are summoned to sympathetic rejoicing here as well as in vers. 6 and 9. They approve themselves consistently in this interpretation as the doers and ministers of the divine will. This heavenly Father has in the present case (without disparagement to the independent meaning of that type) *not* merely one blessing, like Isaac, Gen. xxvii. 38, for the faithful son; but the riches of his mercy and of his wisdom providently laid

* As Stein now rightly interprets.

up the second and the best blessing for the son recovered after being lost. "In vers. 22 and 23 every word defines a portion of the plan of salvation and the order of grace" (Richter). The three gifts which the father causes to be brought to the recovered and accepted son, have received almost universally the same interpretation, which is therefore assuredly the right one; they give collectively the second, and perfect answer indeed to the prayer of the son. I still call thee son, thou art and remainest such, thou becomest my son again, thou receivest here all that is wanting to that position: *behold*, thus make I thee no hired servant, but invest thee before all my servants with thy full honor as my son, and they shall serve thee at my command. In detail, the *robe* brought for the poor naked one corresponds to the primary justification (Isa. lxi. 10; Rev. iii. 18); the *ring* (as token of the eminent man, James ii. 2; Gen. xli. 42; that is of one *free* in contradistinction to slaves) indicates with yet fuller acknowledgment, the Spirit of adoption, sonship and freedom;* the *shoes*, so strikingly introduced at the close (wanting as a rule to slaves), point most significantly to their spiritual interpretation, as meaning the grace and power of a new life and obedience so absolutely needful in order to an entire restoration. "I will provide for it that thou shalt not walk in the new-found paths of my household with the steps of a slave—thou needest not trouble thyself for that!" Yea, the converted son receives *all* at once; under the condition, unexpressed in the first superabounding assurance that he will now from henceforth sustain these honors aright and fully meet their obligations. As it had been specifically said—*τὴν στολὴν τὴν πρώτην*, that is, the well-known, the best robe of honor;† so similarly *τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτευτόν*, "the fatted calf," (comp. Judg. vi. 25, Sept.), expressly repeated in vers. 27 and 30, that which had been prepared and reserved for a special festivity.‡ By the calf (the significance of which is more than the mere first refreshment of the *hunger-suffering* son, as Roos thinks) we are to understand no other than the heavenly-material substratum, the *expression* of household joy corresponding to such an earthly *δαπάνη, a feast*. With this is connected the most condescendingly communicative invitation to all the servants and dwellers in the house, in strict parallel with vers. 6 and 9—*εὐφρανθῶμεν*, "let us rejoice." The Vulg. translates this by *epulari, to feast*, and is not far wrong, since *εὐφραίνεσθαι* had become the usual expression for this, with which not only does ch. xvi. 19 well agree, but parallels also in this chapter, *εὐφρανθῶ* in ver. 29, with the express addition of *χαρῆναι* in ver. 32. But the great *festal hymn* the father himself intones in the sublime psalm strain of ver. 24. This is the *joy of God* over one of his sinful creatures—the full declaration of that supreme love in the Son's loftiest announcement, following and transcending the indefinite expressions—in heaven, and in the presence of the angles of God! Here are the two former parables condensed into one; for the piece of silver in the dust was as *dead* (as we there rightly interpreted), and the wandering sheep was as *lost*. But this beggar (so scornfully regarded by many a lately hired servant) was no other than a *son* to his father's eye; and to the *οὗτος*, "this," which points him out there is immediately appended the renewed diploma of his prerogative—*ὁ υἱός μου*, "my son," —which, spoken at the very outset, would secure the prodigal from any future scorn. But because his supreme grace does not act arbitrarily, and because this Father of the household condescends to make known to his *servants* as his *friends* (ver. 6) the sacred well-grounded *right* (the *ὅτι*) of his act, that they may *know* and sympathise with the joy of their Lord (John xv. 15)—therefore follows the great word, which, in the record here given by the highest authority of the history of a penitent sinner, loses the remembrance of his former sin in his present repentance and its reinstating consequences, and makes the grand result to the father of such a son a greater and altogether unmingled joy.* "Dead" signifies primarily in the similitude—As my son no better than dead to me his father, being no more with me; and the "lost" which follows is then an epexegetical parallel. But any pious father would in such a case carry his thoughts further; and we must also understand the interpretation of this *νεκρός*, dead, in the full and profound sense which it bears elsewhere in Scripture (Eph. ii. 1, 5). It then places the strongest expression first in this anticlimax—He had ruined and lost *himself*, thrown away his true *οὐσία*, or living, in that he had *sinned!* But I *forgive*, and reckon that as only having been a sad *loss* of my son. And the latter expression presupposes a truth which modifies the concentrated scriptural truth of the former; viz., that the dead son was, notwithstanding, not utterly dead, for he might yet live again. And they *began* to be merry—what an *ἤρξαντο* is this, after the former *ἤρξατο ὑστερεῖσθαι*, including this lost son in the joy! With a heart how full of the highest joy springing out of his deepest abasement does the son now sit in his

* Does it signify at the same time as a *seal-ring* (Gen. xxxviii. 18; Esth. iii. 12) the Spirit as the confirming pledge and seal of grace? Scarcely, for the possession of the Spirit already contains this assurance.

† Not literally (as the *Berlen. Bib.* fables; to say nothing of its taking the calf to the old man, the animal, which must die) the *first* or *former* robe of righteousness which he had thrown away through his sin! If we *need* go any further, we should think of the robe of honor hitherto reserved for the first-born—and this would then be an impressive prolepsis exhibiting the father as already penetrating the heart of the elder son.

‡ "It is as if the calf had been fattened for his coming; he has the best kept for him" (Lange).

* But not to the son that too bold sentiment—O *beata* culpa (quæ talem *meruisti* redemtorem), "O *happy* fault (that hast *deserved* such a redeemer!)" to which there is nothing analogous in all Scripture.

place of honor as king of the feast in his father's presence!

Verses 25–28. The third narrative might here have ended with the same conclusion as the two former: but it had promised in the commencing words, ver. 11, something more; and the other of the two sons must now come forward. The Pharisees had said at ver. 7, at least in their hearts, "These ninety and nine just persons are *ourselves*, however!" And again, while hearing of the lost son, "This does *not* assuredly point to us!" Another mirror is now held up before them—"But here see yourselves!" Apart indeed from any such design, the continuation of the second part is the fit supplement to the narrative of the converted sinner; showing the "reception which the retrieved soul meets with from his fellow-men" in contrast with his reception by the Father; and further, how that gracious Father vindicates *his* son from their scorn. So far this second part tells those publicans and sinners—Expect nothing else as the result of your conversion; but let your consolation be the love of God, which will be confirmed to you despite all their murmurings! But we still think that, in the scope and cast of the entire parable, our Lord's main design is to make prominent the entreaty as addressed to those proud righteous ones, who as worse sinners are also *sought* if possible with still greater love. This second word of grace to the secretly and perversely apostate sinners who enviously clamor against his righteousness, is addressed to them as an invitation to repentance, or, since as a rule this result is not to be expected, as a most earnest *warning* to such as despise it. We behold once more in the clearest light of the truth which the Pharisees perverted, the *sin* of man (now *theirs*) and the *grace* of God as rigidly contrasted. The *sin* of the elder son *before the father* (as ver. 18), although hypocritically concealed, suddenly betrays itself, and more than that, assumes its highest manifestation in his anger at his brother's reception. His first inquiry, vers. 25, 26, is most unseasonably *unfilial*, and the simple correct reply in a clear statement of the circumstances of the case, ver. 27, only provokes his haughty wrath! Then does the father's grace bear long-sufferingly with the outbreaking *pride* of this sinner too (such as made him, in the worst sense, like the foolish sheep), and seeks to overcome him by love. Mark the *anticipating* and condescending love which in this case is once more shown (ver. 28); and the pride of the son, which is now by this provoked to the uttermost, putting into his mouth complaints of the neglect shown to himself (ver. 29), and of the favor which his brother had received (ver. 30). Mark, finally, the father's answer, which places all in its last and clearest light, and gives the *final lesson*, by which the father *seeks* to convince and win even him (and Jesus the Pharisees)—however certain that he will fail!

The elder son was *in the field*—does this mean that he was among the servants diligently at work, as his δουλεύω, "I serve," ver. 29, proclaims? It was possibly so intended, but, possibly, it signifies only (or rather probably) as Nitzsch interprets—Those supercilious righteous ones "are not themselves personally at hand when the lost sinner is recovered." Assuredly there is lightly hinted a distance from the father's house and the father's face; in which the laborer (or stroller?), in this ἀγρός, or "field," of his father, is in danger of furnishing a parallel with that other ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς, "in the fields," of the far country. "Now his *elder* son:" this new starting-point of the narrative connects itself immediately with ver. 22, "*the father*"—just as this ὁ πατήρ again referred back to the beginning, ver. 11. The *father* of these *two* sons, the father of the one as well as of the other—this is an immovable principle lying at the base of the whole history. Yet must we observe, again, the commencing *contrast* of the elder son with the ο ὑ τ ο ς ὁ υἱός μου, "*this* my son," ver. 24, in which lies concealed the father's grievous trouble about *that* son, over whom he could not so rejoice. It is only because such is the state of his mind, and the father well knows it, that the elder son is not asked, not simply to his father's councils—that might have been too much—but not even to an expression of sympathy before the εὐφραίνεσθαι or merry-making proceeds. There would have been no interchange of sympathy, but a wicked reception of the prodigal which his father would spare him. If that elder son had been differently minded, the idea of sympathy would have been more appropriate in connection with him than with the servants in a less near relation; but—he is away in the field, and there the father leaves him in his isolation and selfishness. At the punctual meal time he comes back to the house, but hears on this occasion something unusual—music and dancing (or dance-music), for thus without the article as appended by Luther must we interpret it.* He curiously inquires what it is. "This is a very strange incident with us, and something special must be going on! How is it that I know nothing about it? Ah! had this feast been given *to me*—but to whom else, then, can it have been given?" His vexation because such things go on in the house without him, is the reason why he does not go in and naturally gather the reason for himself; remaining without as an uninvited guest, and summoning imperiously a servant to explain it to him, instead of going at once to his father, the only head of the house. There is no ground whatever for detecting in the servant's reply an evil

* A note for the Pietists! The Lord speaks just as he had often seen and heard in the dwellings of Galilee; and in adopting this image of joy he does not absolutely condemn festal music as the expression of man's pleasure. He does not make it sin in itself, though its concomitants and ends too often make it such (Exod. xxxii. 18). That *gladness* which God gives the Gentiles (Acts xiv. 17), and to the natural man who knows of no better, is a pure type of a higher joy. The landlord who utterly abolished ("*relata refero*") all light music from his village, would prevent the young people from understanding this parable.

design;* it is rather in perfect accordance with the father's words, standing between his former and latter declaration, vers. 24 and 32. Nor can we imagine how Lange could discern an invidious spirit in this simple narration of fact, which twice gives the reason with ὅτι (as ver. 24 commenced) for the festal merriment; or describe it as a "faulty and superficial report which would foster the elder brother's unhappy humor." *Thy brother* cannot mean—The runaway and reprobate, thou knowest who, is come back again in full state, and so forth. No, the solemn reinstatement into his filial place and prerogative from the father's own lips has taught this servant how he should speak; and hence to the elder son he says—Thy brother. "He *is come*—*how* he came is not the question now, that is over, it is joy enough that he is here at all. Thus thinks *thy* father and *his*, thus does he greet this thy brother, joyful that he is yet *alive!* (which ὑγιαίνων here indicates—happily and nothing amiss, being alive after all; the servant has no reference to soundness of soul, and his expressions are more common and less comprehensively profound than the father's). Therefore thy father hath caused the fatted calf to be killed (this, again, to the servant's mind is a sufficient notification for the whole feast)—is not that as it should be, for is not the matter one of great joy to all of us in common with our good old master? Or is thy mind as the elder not at one with *thy brother* and *thy father* in this matter?" Thus does the servant himself seem to propitiate the bad feeling which the harsh question of his young master had manifested—whose temper and spirit he may have had many opportunities of witnessing in his dealing with the servants in his father's absence. Out of a servant's mouth this blinded son must first hear his reproof, before his gracious father administers it; to his servant, as to any *stranger* who might ask what was going on, the simple truth that here was indeed an ἔδει χαρῆναι, "*it was meet* that he should make merry," needed no confirmation or proof. But the brother and son, made blind and unfeeling by pride, is only made wrathful by it, and refuses to go in and occupy his own reserved seat: and *this* remaining without exhibits yet more strongly the likeness between him and his once wandering brother.

Verses 28-30. The essential and wicked *anger* of selfishness and hatred exists only among us; in God our heavenly Father there is only the principle of sunlike love, which (as Zinzendorff says) shines all the more brightly and cheeringly upon the most miserable and unworthy of its creatures and children—until this very love *must* become to the wilfully obdurate the fire of divine wrath. The father comes out, interrupting his great joy over the one son for the sake of the other, and just as he had before gone forth to meet the lost one: he does not neglect the misapprehension of the one son while holding fast the other—both deeply concern his soul—*both* are his *sons!* (Hence here, as in ver. 20—*his father.*) The benignant father *goes out*, because the proud son will not *go in;* the father entreats the murmuring son, by exhortation and gracious persuasion (see ver. 31, τέκνον): by divine grace there may be *human* examples of this, though rare; ordinarily no man as a father would do *this.* But thus does the heavenly Father act, he thus acted at this very time through the gracious preaching of the Son,* through this parable which fell from his lips. And when thou standest in the place of God as his preacher and ambassador, thou must "know how to apply thyself strenuously to *entreaty* with men of all kinds, until they come to feel the things of grace"†—and more than that, with men who never come to that feeling!

But what of the son who was so overpoweringly solicited of his father? His anger is the more incensed, and breaks through all the bounds of past restraint in his father's presence. Or was this not the first time that he thus wickedly presumed, must other similar scenes be presupposed as having been wont to occur? We think that, conformably with the spirit of the parable, this was a sudden throwing off of the hypocritical mask, occasioned by this circumstance, and his own anger thereon. Suffice that this son (emboldened by his father's entreaty—what hardness of heart!) expostulates with his father as a servant with a master, to say the least; indeed, he reckons like a hired servant, and yet rebukes like that servant's master. We see plainly at once that in his father's house he has utterly lost the filial feeling, even as his brother far away had retained some measure of it: he therefore is, so to speak, the real and more entirely *lost* son. His father had doubtless called him τέκνον, "son," at the beginning as he now does at the close; but he does not answer with πάτερ, "father;" that word is not uttered before his wrathful and complaining—ἰδού—*see* what great injustice thou hast inflicted on me! Nitzsch refers to the apparently reasonable complaint which the mere reason of the elder son would urge (let us recall the words of the Kantian in a former page); and he does this in harmony with the Spirit of Christ, through whose voice the heavenly Father would graciously persuade the erring sinner; but the severe truth is soon revealed by the proud son's own words, who reveals and condemns himself, without needing any further testimony. *I serve thee!* There stands disclosed the perfect Pharisee, the slave concealed in the son betrays himself in this un-

* *Berlenb. Bib.:* "This is the devil's craft to send in a man's way such as will pour out the right oil upon the fire, and stir up envy and all passions. This is the effect of all such oblique relations, and hence the servant shares in the guilt of the elder son." Most assuredly incorrect, and not so striking in its error as the plain remark made before—"He may have often heard music before, but this heavenly music makes the bear growl!"

* See on Matt. xxi. 37 seq.

† Richter's *Hausbibel* on this passage.

filial, because upbraiding δουλεύω; the slave who through τοσαῦτα ἔτη, "these many years," has plagued himself, with what wearisome and harsh service! Not—As I, alas! have been obliged; but as if it had been an *opus supererogationis* which merited a special reward. "I have remained, although the first-born, and of adult age, under thy paternal control; and have served thee diligently and usefully as thy over-servant in thy house (ordered and driven thy idle servants, and so forth). Could I not have demanded my emancipation like this pure brother; and wouldst thou not have been obliged to give me mine inheritance? Even now thus late am I still diligently employed without in thy service—*see* that I am so!" A *son*, who can speak in this slavish style, instead of entering into his commandment of love—Give me, my son, thy *heart!* is on that very account worse than any μίσθιος or hireling serving for bread: but we are all the two *sons* of God, the one kind as well as the other. "Neither transgressed I at any time (in so many years!) *any one commandment* of thine:" here does the Pharisee still more strikingly appear in the mirror which he himself unconsciously holds up.* Not, as Luther gives it—*Thy commandment* generally; this is very different: this righteous one only knows the multitude of *individual* ἐντολαί or commands which he here upbraidingly refers to; and before performing any of them it was first necessary that it should be expressly imposed upon him as a duty. In any case in which his father did not positively give his *command*, there was nothing in the son's heart which would prompt him to go beyond the δουλεύειν or service. "I have not by one false step transgressed, or pretermitted:" thus does his blind and rash self-condemnation run on at the very moment when he is giving proof that the one ἐντολή or command for sons is utterly disregarded by him, when he is at once transgressing the two laws—Thou shalt honor thy father, Thou shalt love thy brother! "I have not *at any time* transgressed one of thy commandments: thou hast never *at any time* given me a little joy:" was not this a fearful sound, as if the father was a sinner and a debtor standing before his son and lord with a long and evil reckoning against him? Now are we pushing the interpretation too far; all is thus literally as we read it. If the Lord were disposed for a good reason, and in the most patient benignity, to admit a good sense in this boasting (God's service without transgression from youth up), *it would be of no avail;* for these holy ones themselves poison all by their murmuring against poor sinners, who receive mercy, and the God who shows it, by their *envy* and their *pride*, which convert all their pretensions into crimes, and betray the evil heart that pervades all their apparent good works. But he must describe and paint them *as they are.* And he does no more than this; the blindest of these blind could not complain and say—This picture does us no justice! What then was wrong in it to them? That the others are *received? Wherefore* then not? Because *their own* glory, prerogative and pre-eminence are detracted from thereby? And what does this show? That their whole excellence and righteousness rests upon no actual foundation of truth (else would the increase of the number of the saints be joy to them as it is to God); that their sole glorying over others, is their condemnation. "They would have a Heathenism side by side with their holy Judaism, that so their innate hereditary sanctity might shine all the more brightly by contrast" —or there must be reprobate and rejected sinners, that so the righteous ones might *appear* all the more conspicuously righteous. "Thus are they essentially untrue; thus they lie in the very face of the law, the fulfilment of which is love; they deny the God of grace, both by their own self-justification, and by the condemnation of their brethren; and unconsciously enter into a league with unconverted sinners against him who repents." And why is all this, and whither does it lead? They believe in no conversion, because they themselves have never experienced it; they mock and traduce the gracious joy of the pardoned sinner, because they, by their own fault and incapacity, have never tasted and felt it themselves.

"Thou never *gavest* anything *to me*," might seem to mean but yet cannot—"And I was contented to have it so, willingly continued my unpaid service." For this present upbraiding *reproach* throws a dark shade over all his lustrous virtue. This word, spoken by the elder, entirely corresponds to the "give me!" of the younger son: in both cases the regard is fixed upon the bestowment of good things alone, instead of upon the father's favor, love, and fellowship. This brother, then, is first of all like the former prodigal; but inasmuch as he has restrained himself, concealed his secret spirit, and played the hypocrite for the sake of the whole inheritance, he is much worse than he; this systematic hypocrisy has so hardened and blinded him that he now retrospectively complains of his father as it regards the distribution, which the other had only made matter of request. "Thou never *gavest*"—ah, had he but come as a son and in a becoming manner to ask anything his father had! What gave he not? "Not a single kid, that I might *make merry with my friends:*" does not this make the case worse and worse? Thus the serving his father and being with his father had been no joy to him; all that he had done was a harsh constrained villenage, and the reward which he had lusted for was to enjoy himself in some permitted by-pleasures (inexpressible perverseness!) without his father. Of the joy of forgiveness, such as converted sinners know, he knows nothing; nor any more of the pleasure of keeping the commandments from the spontaneous impulse of love (Psa. xix. 12). And who are the *friends*, whose society he relishes

* We are very doubtful whether "a Pharisee of a *better sort*," as Neander says. The common evil belonging to the character of all, even the best, is disclosed, and exhibited in its internal principle.

apart from his father? The same love of sinful pleasure which drove his brother into outward excesses, gave him this suspicious love of *independent merriment*, and made him feel the want of his forbidden commerce with his proper comrades. These "friends" are opposed to the "harlots" whom he afterwards assigns to his brother; but, under a more decorous name, are no better than they.

And now comes the positive injustice of the father in receiving his brother in addition to the negative injustice towards himself—expressed in bitter contrasts. "So many years do I serve in vain"—but *now* great gifts are ready for him *who has come*. "And who is *this*"—the proudest scorn betrays itself in this finger-pointing, in such unconscious contrast with the sublime word of the father, in ver. 24—"and what is he in comparison with myself? Thou mayest acknowledge him as *thy son;* but I will take care never to say of such an unclean one—*my brother*. He is *come*, indeed—but *how?* Constrained by distress, because he has transformed himself into a miserable beggar." (It is not—is *come back*, returned again; he has no idea or feeling *of that*.) He will not even recognise the legitimate distribution of ver. 12 (which had then greatly vexed him), but now retrospectively protests against it. Σοῦ τὸν βίον, "*thy* living," (the right reading), is an ironical continuation of ὁ υἱός σου, "*thy* son"—though the narrative admitted that he wasted *his own* substance. This is the same harsh, and still more harshly pressed, position of *right* which had been assumed in the younger brother's demand; not now, however, laid claim to for himself, but turned against his brother and his father—"*Thou*, foolish father, didst then give up *thy* goods to be wasted! He hath devoured it *with harlots*" (Prov. xxix. 3; Ecclus. ix. 6)—intensifying the ζῆν ἀσώτως in his own affectionate and brotherly gratuitous assumption. How came he to know that so well? The servant had not told him so, but his own heart tells him what he would have done in his brother's place. "And for *him* thou hast at once killed the fatted calf, while I never had a little kid which I might slay: thus thou hast not merely made him *equal with me* (Matt. xx. 12), though that would of itself be against all justice, but thou hast *preferred* him before me! He is the dear child, and I the neglected and forgotten one; even as now all things are going on without me." Indeed, the wretched returning one should not have turned to his father without his earnest brother's intercession; and the father should not have admitted him without permission of the son and younger master in the house! What would, what will, indeed, this noble brother say, when he sees the robe of honor and all its other appurtenances? He *seemed* to be for so many years a true and diligent son—but what a *brother* is he now; consequently what a *son* before the Father of that brother! *In this it is made manifest*, (1 John iii. 10), that is, by the lack of brotherly love, that in him there is also no love of God. His conduct ought to have been very different, if not for his brother's yet for his *father's* sake, whose kindness due respect should have taught him not to malign, and whose joy it should have been his joy as a son not to disturb but to increase by sympathy. Could we suppose him capable of pushing his hypocrisy yet further, and of embracing his brother with a simulated pleasure for the sake of appearances before the father of both? *Thus far* we are not to suppose human nature even in the Pharisaic character to go; any more than we could suppose, a few verses back, the once profligate sinner able at once to turn to licentiousness the grace which had just redeemed him from the profoundest misery.

Verses 31, 32. The Pharisee, in disclosing, has condemned himself; nevertheless the *father*, in the similitude, whose closing words coincide with the reality of the true Father's words in Christ, does not yet judge his petulant son, but goes on in gracious exhortation to teach and humble him, if peradventure he might yet be accessible to instruction. Thus does the Father, and he alone, interpose in the great and permanent quarrel between his two sons throughout all the world; yet *we* also, as his servants and ambassadors, should learn of him those words of patient love, should know from his example how in meekness to instruct those that oppose themselves (2 Tim. ii. 24, 25). The words of the father are uttered in the gentleness of perfect truth: "As it regards *thee*, my son, all that I have is, as it ever has been, in my fatherly kindness made common to thee, despite that most unchildlike selfish habitual disguisement of feeling which I have long known, and thou hast now avowed. But as it regards *this thy brother* (such he is and must be, for he is my son, the justifying οὗτος, 'this,' of my love prevails against the contemptuous οὗτος which thou hast let fall), *it was meet* on most incontrovertible grounds of holy right that all in my house should rejoice over him; it *shall* be so therefore, and if it please thee not, go without once more and remain without, for only as his brother canst thou continue my son." (And thus the parable as a great whole returns conclusively into its commencement with the *two sons*.) The affectionate τέκνον, "son," at the outset is not merely the expression of a yet remaining paternal love, moved by his son's foolish words to complaint and supplication, even as an earthly father, half angry and half grieved, might cry—*Child*, what have I to endure from thee, how canst thou dare to speak to thy father thus? But with our Father, all anthropopathical tenderness of love must be regarded as one with the supreme dignity of righteous truth; hence the final and conclusive reply here given combines *strict instruction* with all its moving, awakening and humble appeal. Let this be carefully noted, then, in this first mild τέκνον, "son," which responds to the haughty ἰδού, "lo!" of the son. He did not say *father*, and yet is called in tender rebuke *son:* that is, speaking to the depths of his heart—"Speakest thou now as son? Think, O my son, *come to thyself!* Hast thou served me as a son through

all these years?" Then follow piercing and convincing contrasts with the spirit and words of his unfilial allegation of such service. "*Thou*, set aside as thou thinkest, sittest nevertheless in thy prerogative of birthright; and hast enjoyed through my long-suffering the constant recognition of thy supposed fidelity. Πάντοτε, "ever" —in opposition to thy οὐδέποτε, "never"—art thou *with me!* and I am thy father; hast thou ever been other than a son, was not and is not that more than any of the *gifts* which thou hast found wanting? Am I not better to thee than ten friends, and a hundred kids? Wherefore hast thou coveted merriment apart from me? Are *thy friends* nearer to thy heart than thy father? Or seekest thou my goods instead of my grace, mine and not me—now *all* that is mine is thine! What have thy services had to do with this? Why shouldst thou speak of a *kid*, if this be so? (Is that instead of the *husks* to thee?)"

But here arises the much contested question of the expositors: how could this most incomprehensible πάντα τὰ ἐμὰ σά ἐστιν, "all that I have is thine," be applied in good earnest to *this* hypocrite? However much contested, nothing is more true, in every respect, than this word. The first full meaning which presents itself is this: all is *thy* ἐπιβάλλον, is due to thee as an inheritance. In this word, as in the τέκνον, "son," before, the pure truth would assume to his evil conscience a tone of keen and reproachful irony. This son *was* still his father's child through his father's long-suffering, and yet was no longer such in his own heart; his being called so, though unworthy, is a token of all the richer grace. Just so all the paternal goods were his, and yet were *not* his. "Thou servest me in thy sordidness of spirit for the sake of *all that is mine*—and I have not hitherto disinherited thee!" Thus, secondly, and in direct earnestness: "Even now all is and shall be actually thine, if thou amendest thy thought and becomest my child in the best sense, responding to my waiting patience. Have not *all things always* been open and free to thy desire; couldst thou not, wert thou not permitted to *ask me for* any good gift?" This exhibits the fatherly long-suffering as not yet exhausted; this dissembler is still tolerated in the house, and his right to everything not yet finally withdrawn. But at the same time the τὰ ἐμά, "that is mine," which precedes this, and which, as long as the father lives, holds good, impresses the great truth—there is nothing for thee but the *gift* of my paternal hand and favor, nothing to be yielded at thy demand.* *Finally* —though this is unspoken, left to the inference of his own conscience, as it is the evil which he himself challenges—finally, there impends over the wilful sinner the danger of being disinherited and cast out, in contrast with the voluntary departure of the other who was at least honest in his sin. For this Father *dies not.* The rebel, secret or open, against the supreme will of God's love waits in vain till the Ancient of days (whose existence he must feel while essaying to deny it), till the great Creator of all spirits, but especially of the spirits of Adam's race, shall decease, and give license to the mad heirs of all his universal possessions. At the utmost distance from him, as in his immediate presence; in the depths of the abyss, where devils murmur, as in the heavenly home where all rejoice with God and his angels over grace—everywhere and for ever all creature existence abideth in his hand and power; nor can any with impunity invade his supreme prerogative.

But thou *shouldst* be kindly and merry—such is Luther's inadequate version of the text; for the father does not expressly utter any complaint or command, he does not retort the upbraiding which *he* had a thousandfold reason for; all *this* is latently addressed to his son's conscience. He does not say anything further to qualify the unretracted acknowledgment of ver. 31. Only in the ὁ ἀδελφός σου, "thy brother," there is a slight tone of reproachful appeal—"Thou shouldst have been glad concerning him in common with myself."* But, properly speaking, the simple and elevated ἔδει, *it was meet*, thus was it right in this house—while it overturns all opposition, contains, as it were, a justification (from the father before his son!)—an *apology for what had transpired*, as the εὐφρανθῆναι or merry-making placed first seems to indicate.† Ver. 32 replies to the complaint of ver. 30, as ver. 31 to that of ver. 29. The great festal hymn of rejoicing—ὅτι οὗτος νεκρὸς ἦν, κ.τ.λ., "*for* this—was dead," etc., sounds out once more undisturbed; the brother ought to and must *hear* it at least from his father's own mouth, in a richer and purer strain than from that of the servant. The glorious ἔδει, "it was meet," of his incontrovertible ὅτι, "for," reaches to the depths of the rectitude of divine mercy and love, having just based itself upon the convincing illustration of the human parable. It is, as it were, that first question repeated—What *man* is there among you, who as a *father* would not do the same over a lost and recovered son? This, therefore, is the conclusive word to the Pharisees: "That which ye blame in me, is the love, the paternal love of God; that which *the Father doeth*, that doeth also *the Son*, as the good Shepherd before your eyes; that will the Spirit do in his church when he is gone home—even as ye should have done it among the people and in the house of God."

A sound exposition thus sets at rest the concluding question, with which only a perverted expositor would *set out—Who is this elder son?*

---

*Thus containing an oblique denunciation of envy at a brother's good, as Calvin expresses it: Nulla est irascendi causa primogenito, dum *absque suo damno* fratrem humaniter accipi videt. Nothing is taken away from thee, nothing given to him but the calf of the feast, and the *joy*.

* To this points the striking observation of Nitzsch to these murmurers: "What dost thou lose, if there be more joy communicated than that which is in thee? Might it not tend to the furtherance of thine own?"

† The Peshito expresses it: וְבָא הוּא לָךְ, for *us*.

Every man who is what he was. First of all, the Pharisees of that time in contradistinction from the penitent and converted publicans and sinners of Israel. Then, according to the never-failing wider outlook, the self-righteous and proud Jews in contrast with the Gentiles received into the kingdom of God—Rom. ix. 4, 5, being the explanation of the father's word in ver. 31. And is there any application beyond? If we only hold fast the fundamental ideas, we can make applications enough for ourselves of a more restricted historical bearing (as Keil does, contrasting the Jews with the *Samaritans*)—or taking into account the circumstances of our own time (as Petersen, *e.g.*, sees Roman Catholicism and Protestantism in the two sons, *Lehre von der Kirche*, ii. 244). There is a most marvellous conceit which founds upon the mystery of this parable, the notion of an elder son in heaven, who thus Satanically murmurs at the restoration of the human race as exhibited in the younger son's history! But should it not be—*once* murmured, since Satan fell before Adam, and cannot murmur there again?* That the sons of God, apart from Adam's race, *might* seize upon a certain principle of right in their complaint, if *their* reason were as ours, we have admitted above; but they are more rational than we. The *holy* angels (whose holiness is not "righteousness" essentially before God, and they are not the just persons who need no repentance), the servants of the great Lord in his many mansions, who reckon as his friends and neighbors, murmur not, but rejoice over his grace to sinners; and the Lord himself thus obviated by his own introductory words every such idle supposition. But instead of these we may, if still seeking further the elder son, think of *Christians* who pride themselves on a Judaic right; and, indeed, we must so apply the record, for it is not a history adapted to that time only, but spoken to *us all*.† When we preach to the called but not chosen, who still retain their pride and self-righteousness, we may hold up to them the mirror of vers. 29–31, to give them the knowledge of these three fearful truths: that we may think ourselves to be keeping all the commandments of God, while keeping in our hearts the principle of all transgression; that we may boast of our own righteousness, while committing in the very boast the heaviest sins; that we may live among all the gifts of grace in their actual offer and seeming possession—and yet not possess or receive them at all.

Finally—we have not *yet* reached the end—let no man forget himself and the probable Pharisee still extant in his own heart, while preaching thus to others; nor forget the laborers in the vineyard. Here we may mention the touching incident (now first printed) connected with the eccentric but most devout and genuine Daniel Krummacher of Elberfield. Being once asked in an assembly of his brethren, discussing this question, who was, in his view, the elder son, he solemnly said—I well know now, for I learned it yesterday. Being asked further, he laconically said—*Myself!* and then confessed that yesterday it had fretted his heart to find that a very ill-conditioned person had suddenly been enriched with a remarkable visitation of grace. So deep is our corruption; so long, even in the younger son after all his experience of grace, does that evil principle which prompted him to offer himself to hired service, adhere to his soul and reappear in the similitude at least of the elder brother. It is easily stated and laid down in the theory, but hardly reduced to actual practice and established in full experience: "The *childlike, believing* men may apply their tests to the reprobate returned; may, especially if they have never sinned in like manner and to such a degree, stand mute in thankful astonishment that God has done so great a thing to him; but they cannot *count it strange* that such should desire to go on with them to the same higher, blessed, and acceptable life; *offended* they cannot be" (Nitzsch). Take heed, therefore, ye servants in God's house; let the figure of the elder son administer to you often a wholesome fear! *Such* people must, however, remain without; for even if the all-merciful God would construct a special heaven for them and "their friends" (when satiated with the longed-for kid, the swine with which no stern Moses should any longer forbid, instead of their husks, that they might enjoy themselves)—whence could their blessedness, which makes it heaven, come, without the filial and pure adoration of eternal love and grace? *Their* εὐφραίνεσθαι, "making merry," *must* instantly, at the very threshold of eternity, be exchanged for a miserable ὑστερεῖσθαι, "being in want."

The parable breaks off, the admonished son replies no further to his father, and his conversion is not announced. So in the great fulfilment of the parable it is also wanting in actual life; if thou wouldst be an exception, and remain always with thy Father, enjoying and retaining all that is his—then *come* first to him in the deepest penitence, and pray, "Father, I was called but was not thy son, I have been much less deserving of the name than my brother—*make thou me* from a shameful hired servant an honorable child—make me in thy highest grace *what my brother is!*"

* Or will there be a general restoration of the human race, and then a new fall of Satan, stumbling over that stumbling-block? Those who advocate the simple and pure recovery of men and devils are wiser than that. We marvel that Theremin, in a sermon otherwise so beautiful, should graze on the borders of a doctrine which involves such consequences (*Predigten*, vol. iii., 1823, No. 9).

† It will be perfectly *reversed* in the last days, when corrupt Christendom will be the elder son, and converted Israel the younger.

THE CONVERTED SINNER'S PRUDENCE IN ESCAPING FROM PUNISHMENT, WHICH YET THREATENS EVEN HIM: THE UNJUST STEWARD; TRUE FIDELITY IN THE USE OF WORLDLY GOODS.

(Luke xvi. 1–13.)

It cannot be expected of us to unravel the fearfully tangled perplexities of the comments which, from the most ancient times down to our own day—with theological or untheological craftiness, with more or less of arrogance, on the one hand, pretending to extract its only true meaning, or, on the other, with the limitation of ability giving it up altogether—have darkened and perplexed and confused this parable of our Lord, so plain in itself and in its fundamental theme. We shall not be expected to do any more than give positive reasons for our own understanding of the subject, with merely an explanatory reference to such *misunderstandings* as have a foundation of truth in them, and therefore cannot be classed among the ridiculous theories of crack-brained men.* We can regard only those systems of exposition as having any claim to our attention, which are really in earnest in endeavoring to discover the true meaning of our Lord; and we must particularly bear with those which are not led astray by mere superficiality and incapacity to understand exegesis at all, but by an excusable lack of right perception where a false application on the one side or the other is so easily made.

Our exposition can do no more than confirm the traditional *predominant interpretation* of the church, the rejection of which by so many expositors may be somewhat excused, partly from the fact that the ecclesiastical tradition does not always stand its ground before maturer knowledge even in the domain of exegetics, and partly, by the lack of any exhibition of the fundamental connection of thought, which for the most part pervades the interpretation handed down by antiquity. The grand and profound, though subtle, *connection* which subsists between chaps. xv. and xvi. has either been altogether denied (thus closing the door beforehand against a right apprehension), or the right connection has not been discerned—we cannot avoid saying, because it has not been sought with sufficient simplicity of mind. *The sinner's repentance or punishment.* Such is our simple acceptation of the theme of the two chapters, as they set before us the prodigal son and the rich man in opposition at the beginning and end. And the meaning of that which lies between must naturally be sought between those two points, and will be—The *prudence* (ver. 8) of the sinner, absolved from the first great punishment, converted and received into favor, in avoiding the *ruin* which may yet impend; his wisdom, as being not dismissed and rejected, but reinstated, in dealing as a *faithful* steward in the affairs of his own salvation. That the discourse treats specifically of the administration of *worldly goods*, the possessions already acquired even as a mammon of unrighteousness, is simply to be explained by the condition and circumstances of the *Publicans*, with whom the Lord has especially to do, in contradistinction to the Pharisees. But the connection of the previous chapter with the present does not consist in this, that in the former faith in the mercy of God, but in the latter the *love of our neighbor*,* is treated of; the former teaching what the Father doeth for us, and the latter what we should do to our neighbor; but that *prudence* which, by the gracious permission of God, uses even the ἐλάχιστον, ἀλλότριον, ἄδικον, *least, another's, unrighteous*, as the materials for the exhibition of *fidelity*, in order to lay up in eternity the reward of grace—that and nothing else, according to the plain words of vers. 8–12, is the fundamental precept of the parable. How Neander can make the theme the "blending of *simplicity* and prudence" we cannot discover.

But the *unjust* steward! Can his unjust and overreaching craft be a pattern for us? Here rises the second reason which has prompted men to adopt other methods of explaining the parable—the excusable, and in itself laudable objection to the assumption that the children of the world are represented as putting to shame the children of light, which, however, stands *disertis verbis* in ver. 8. A parable can surely never design to inculcate its opposite—it was scarcely necessary for D. Schulz to demonstrate this so argumentatively and to assert it so earnestly. But as certainly as the Lord does not (according to Julian's presumptuous mockery) place the unrighteousness of this steward before us as a pattern, so certainly does he exhibit for our example his prudence as such, apart from his injustice—and this is not the opposite of the parable. It seems so obvious to every unprejudiced mind that (as Heubner says), "much

* In which last class we must reckon that of a certain expositor (whose name we would rather not mention, after the description in the text) who refers the parable to Judas Iscariot—while another is not wanting, who discovers in it Pontius Pilate!

* According to Von Gerlach, we have in chap. xvi. compassion towards men, active charity, that love of our neighbor which necessarily results from the love of God. According to Lange—Imparting love, as the first fundamental characteristic of a developing salvation. But the giving or not giving is certainly not the leading idea in either parable.

profit may be derived from the most wicked examples, they may often be directly translated from evil to good;" and Luther's good sense has enriched this parable with so many pertinent examples of this, that all these useless objections should have long ago been laid aside.* Moreover, it is admitted that the Lord Jesus has elsewhere given us parables analogous, which no exegesis can explain away. He compares the freely-giving Father in heaven, ever ready to hear, with the friend who, not for friendship's sake, but only because of shameless importunity, gave his friend what he asked; and even with the *unjust* judge, who at last concedes the poor widow's claim only for his own comfort's sake, and simply to get rid of her: now those instances are much stronger than this, which merely teaches us poor sinners to learn of a thrifty and prudent worldling, and exhorts us as children of light to practise prudence in a good cause, and to be at least as sagacious in prosecuting our religious advantage as the children of the world are in seeking their earthly good. To the *πόσῳ μᾶλλον*, "how much more," of the former instance the *κἀγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω*, "and I say unto you," of this parable perfectly corresponds; and not only so, this express explanation of the Lord gives a further ground for the adjusting of all difficulties, inasmuch as in the application of the parable he takes that very thing which constituted the iniquity of the steward's prudence, and makes it an essential duty of all God's stewards; that which was infamous fraud in him becomes to Christ's *stewards* the distribution of God's possessions in the name of the *All-Holy* Proprietor of them all. Thus both the unity and the contrast between the parable and its interpretation are precisely preserved. It is sufficiently plain, as C. H. Rieger observes, that this doctrine of our Lord "was not addressed to people of the world, who are always inclined to put a base and shameless construction upon his requirements; but for disciples who had already attained to the gracious beginning of good desires, who had received the assurance of joy in heaven over their penitence upon earth, and having opened their hearts to this gracious truth, were now disposed to disburden themselves of earthly joys and cares, and to lay up their treasures in heavenly habitations."

Consequently that "certain uneasy feeling," of which Pastor Brauns (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1842, 4) admits that his mind was conscious, preventing his yielding to the common and correct interpretation, and which he too boldly attributes to the church generally, has no foundation, and is such a fastidious nicety as the accommodation to heavenly kings in those other parables of the Friend and the Judge should have altogether dispelled. The same Brauns makes the Pharisees come forward and object—"Thou preachest a strange morality; such arch-knavery to be viewed as thoughtful provision for the future, is too crude, and will tend rather to help out the Publicans' case, than to edify their souls"—and we think that their *ἐκμυκτηρίζειν* or *murmuring* may very well suggest that such thoughts were in their evil hearts, but that they never had the courage to utter such base thoughts aloud. It will be the endeavor of our exposition to show the baselessness of all such imaginations.

The critical Schleiermacher is not disturbed by any such fine moral perception, but understands here an actual counsel given to the Publicans to appropriate the mammon of *the Roman power* to the utmost possible advantage of the Jewish people; led to this opposite extreme by the dogmatic bluntness of feeling which—in accordance with the fundamental deficiency of all his theology and exegesis—induced him to look for the everlasting habitations in the temporal kingdom of the Messiah. "Ye good Publicans, favor as much as ye can the people as against their capricious and despotic masters, in those matters which ye have in your own province; that so they also may favor you when a new state of things arises." The relation of the Publicans being somewhat unlimited and undefined, as is generally the case with indirect imposts which are farmed, Christ did not charge them to do anything actually unjust, but only to exercise their discretionary latitude of power to the best advantage for the Jewish people. "If ye thus wisely and prudently manage your matters, ye will not be cast out of Israel, when the kingdom of Messiah is introduced." Alas, how *political* is this—and therefore how far from the meaning of our Lord, who is speaking here to these sinners of a very different continuance, and of a very different reception into abiding habitations! Nevertheless, we cannot deny that this carnal misapprehension connects itself with a fundamental principle of truth; many at that time might so have understood him, discerning something of the meaning of his words, but unable to free themselves from the carnal notions of the Old Testament typical system. But the fundamental deficiency in this view is twofold: in not marking, first, that the *αἰώνιοι σκηναί*, "everlasting habitations," point to the same future *after death* (the most essential *ἐκλείπειν*) which the *following* parable discloses; and then in not discerning that the parabolical lord of the steward can only be, in the *contrasting* application, the great God whose is all our substance, since in *γάκώ*, "*and I*," ver. 9, Christ requires that to be done righteously, which the *κύριος* or Lord of the steward was constrained to commend as wisdom.

Olshausen is open to the same charge, for his interpretation (after his fundamental character as a spiritualist), properly speaking, only *spiritualises* that of Schleiermacher, placing in the stead of the Roman Cæsar the *κόσμος* or *ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*,* the "world" or its "prince."

* It is not, as Weisse thinks, an "*oblique* parable which does no honor to Christ's wisdom as a Teacher —a style of instruction which would not be tolerated in a village schoolmaster." Alas! these low-minded, little masters; would they but read and learn themselves!

* Lange adopts the above view, and finds in the

"Such an overreaching of the κόσμος or the devil, as Jesus here teaches, is the way to render back to God what rightly belong to him!" Here there must be two Lords in contrast with one another, and the expositor speciously (and it is the only plausible point in this exposition) refers to ver. 13—"he who thus wisely was διασκορπίζων τὰ ὑπάρχοντα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πλουσίου, *wasting the goods of the rich man*, truly served the true Lord; he despises the one to belong wholly to the other, and with the possessions of the one labors for the objects of the other." Pity, however, for this exposition that there is nowhere a trace in the parable of that *other* true Lord, in whose service and for whose ends the steward favored the debtors; pity that when this other Lord does actually enter in and speak, he does not say—Serve me! but—"Make *yourselves* friends, who will receive *you!* Be ye equally *wise* as that steward in his care for himself, but let your wise care be for eternity. Then will I *also* commend you for doing wisely, even as that lord did." Where is there in all this a single trace of two opposite and contrasted lords? Finally, does the κόσμος or ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου *commend* the craft which takes away his possessions for the service of God? Is it then the spirit and temper of this world thus to deceive the Prince of this world? Nothing but confusion arises from this, if the word is read just as it stands. The lord in the parable is indeed himself a child of this world, but not on that account in the application the Prince of this world; but in the *contrasting* application Christ himself incontrovertibly takes his place with his—"*I* say *also* unto you."

And who are the *stewards* over the mammon, that which is least and another man's, which the glorious Lord over all leaves in their hands, overlooking the unrighteousness which still cleaves to it, that they may use it aright in love, that being alone the true use of it for him and for ourselves, that being alone its profitable employment? These we are all; but now *first* the Lord spoke to the publicans who turned to him, as Luke intimates in the first verse—overlooking this we must go astray throughout. Zyro revives the old interpretation of Vitringa, which regards the *Pharisees* here described as being appropriators to themselves of the saving elements of the Jewish faith entrusted to them by God, and as being exhorted rather to deal kindly and dutifully with the poor debtors of the Lord, *in specie* the Publicans; but this, in common with every *direct* application of the parable to the administration of *spiritual* gifts and possessions, is excluded by the simple consideration that in his own solution of it, vers. 9–13, the Lord adheres simply and expressly to the *mammon* proper, and its wise, discreet, and faithful dispensation. There is thus much truth underlying all this, however, that our Lord does actually include the covetous Pharisees as the objects of his address (ver. 14); and knew well from the beginning that they, if they came with the Publicans to him as his disciples, might thus use and apply his instructions.

But let this suffice for the prelusory polemics: let us now approach the text ourselves, first giving our own general view of its simple contents.

I. The parable itself exhibits to us an unjust steward, and in a threefold point of view: first, the *account* which is demanded of him; then his *prudence* in extricating himself out of this embarrassment (of such a kind, however, that he is still the unjust steward); and finally the *commendation* of this prudence, as it is enforced from his similarly unrighteous and selfish lord. But it is here taken for granted, as the teaching of the former parable, that in this threatened reckoning the grace *of God* absolves the penitents who confess *their* sins, that they are by no means dismissed and cast away, but rather, as impoverished, are endowed with a new dispensation of goods; and here we may note the transition to that style of *contrast* in which the parable enforces its teaching. Similarly it is presumed, that the prudence of *this* steward, thus directed towards God and divine things, is the precise counterpart of chap. xv. 18, 19. Finally, while the commendation of his prudence, bestowed reluctantly by his lord, forms the distinctive close of the whole parable, and without any reference to the involved injustice, our Lord immediately adjoins (as a *transition* to its interpretation) a corrective estimate of the meaning and value of that praise—"*For the* children of this world," etc. This he brings into distinct prominence, by his *tertium comparationis*, the *contrast* which enters into the application of the parable.

II. The express explanation, which he himself goes on to give, contains, first, the proper *interpretation* in ver. 9, followed by a further explanatory continuation, to obviate all misunderstanding, of all the fundamental ideas of the parable. This latter goes over naturally and necessarily into a solemn *warning* against an impending second condemnation, if they who were absolved in the first reckoning should not use the gracious permission and obey the rigorous command, to use the mammon left in their keeping for the good of their souls, faithfully and charitably and prudently employing it as good stewards. First: *this* fidelity in giving away (the honest prudence of the children of light), such an administration of the lesser earthly goods as is well-pleasing to the true Lord is now a discipline, preparation, and approval for the dispensation and enjoyment of the higher possessions. For fidelity or unfaith-

---

rich man "Mammon himself, the allegorical Plutus, the Spirit of gold, the genius of money, the demon of avarice." Most ludicrous, then, is the interpretation of the calling to account and the dismissal—that is, the disagreement arising between the new principles and the old covetous nature, etc. Most strange, however, is the explanation that "Jesus terms this unfaithfulness of the pious as it regards mammon fidelity in that which is least, that is, that this is the *least thing* which should be expected from a Christian!" The thoughts of Jesus are here utterly perverted; on this view, vers. 9–12 cannot possibly have any fair interpretation.

fulness (mark now the plain and undisguised contrast!) in little things and in great, coincide and are one in their internal principle (ver. 10); the use of earthly property is thus the standard—regulating the *entrusting* of the greater, essential good, that which is the true riches, even in the present life (ver. 11), and the final *bestowment* of the same as the original inheritance and actual possession in the next world (ver. 12). In this it is at the same time *hinted*, that the true riches as merely entrusted may be taken away again, as another man's, from those who are untrue, and unfaithful. Thus the discourse speaks plainly of two kinds of *goods;* and now, *secondly*, ver. 13, two *masters* are also introduced for the first time—for this fidelity requires an undivided heart for God alone, which *serves God* in the use of his gifts, and turns those earthly goods to his service in the salvation of the soul which idolatry turns into a God instead of using aright.

Verses 1, 2. The ἔλεγε δὲ καί, "and he said also," is elsewhere a general connecting formula, but in this place it is manifest from the process of thought, and especially from the continuation in ch. xvi. 14, 15, of the scene opened up in ch. xv., that a direct sequel to the preceding is here intended. This is so manifest that Zyro, to whom this connection does not approve itself, is obliged critically to set aside both the remark of the Evangelist in ver. 1, and the φιλάργυροι ὑπάρχοντες, "who were covetous," in ver. 14. Our internal criticism, on the contrary, shows us that the καί, "and," in ver. 1 and ver. 14 clearly correspond, and that πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς, "unto his disciples," stands related to πρὸς αὐτούς, "unto them," ch. xv. 3, consequently the μαθηταί, "disciples," are not this time the Apostles and all the disciples in common, but those newly received, the Publicans who were drawing near and hearing his words, who indeed form the opposite party, in the present concourse of hearers, to the Pharisees. It is a further argument for this, that in ver. 9 these "disciples" are supposed to have worldly goods, and indeed such as were in some way connected with previous unrighteousness: but this is altogether inapplicable to the Apostles who had left all and followed the Lord. It is obvious, however, that the teaching of the parable applied to all his other disciples, so far as they were the possessors of property; as well as that it was designed to pierce the consciences of the *covetous* Pharisees who heard it (as we remarked before and as ver. 14 shows); the Publicans, however, who must, like Zaccheus, after their conversion have felt the question stirring in their souls as to what they must do with their acquired possessions, were especially referred to in this discourse. Thus, as he had already been graciously justifying the Publicans, speaking in their favor; so now, as Bengel remarks, he solemnly teaches them their new duties as his disciples, after they had through repentance been admitted to mercy. The table at which the Saviour of sinners eateth with them, is not always spread; the feast of rejoicing which celebrated the Prodigal's return must end, and give place to the new duties of a noble fidelity. The ὑπάρχοντα, or "goods," however, which the steward possesses are by no means the same as the goods which the prodigal son had wasted; that parable referred to the resources of life, bodily and spiritual in common; but this, according to our Lord's express explanation, vers. 9–13, gives prominence to *Mammon* (which involves more than mere money). And with regard *to that* every man is God's *steward*, and these Publicans are regarded as under obligation of fidelity in its use, not only to the Roman Cæsar, but to the Great Proprietor of all. What in ch. xv. 31 was said under another point of view, holds good of *every man* in the great house of the Father, in the inverted sense—All that thou hast, is mine!

But the contrasting *parable* brings before us, first of all, a narrative of *this world*, just as things are accustomed to go in it: an unfaithful steward, a lord who as a rich man appears to be very zealous for the conservation and increase of what he has, finally a discovery of the fraud by information. There are never wanting in the world unjust stewards, nor spies and informants, as they are well designated by the indefinite διεβλήθη, "was accused"—for διαβάλλειν does not signify the falsely accusing or slandering, but simply is distinguished, as a secret, envious information, from the open and honorable κατηγορεῖν. "Men always complain against the unjust steward; but just because he is of such notorious ill fame, no one is willing to be the man" (G. R. Rieger). The accusation of others against this one, which in the narrative may be supposed to have originated, after the fashion of the world, in the desire to get his place and do just as he had done, is an intimation and remembrancer to us that in like manner all unfaithfulness is surely known and condemned before God. Ὡς διασκορπίζων, "that he had wasted," is not as the Vulg. has it, "*quasi* dissipasset," but more correctly with Erasmus—"*ut qui* dissiparet," he was informed against as now wasting*—which in the German (als hätte er durchgebracht—that he had wasted) does not come into sufficient prominence. The complaint is true; all the expositors who will redeem the steward's honorable character, strangely forget that the man himself on the first notice, ver. 2, of a reckoning being exacted, admits the guilt in his conscience, and resigns himself hopelessly—My lord taketh from me the stewardship! The complaint is literally true as to his διασκορπίζων, for this hitherto reckless and foolish spender,† because necessity made him

* Comp. Xenoph. *Hellen.* ii. 3, 23, διέβαλλον ὡς λυμαινόμενον τὴν πολιτείαν.

† The διασκορπίζειν is indeed an echo of ch. xv. 13, but the wasting of the goods here is viewed in a different and more restricted aspect. As the deep undertone of its meaning rises the thought, that we scatter our goods, so far as they are God's, when we do not husband them for *his* purposes.

thrifty and cunning, had actually laid by nothing for himself, but had lived from day to day in unthinking extravagance of good living—he thinks of himself as a beggar, if he must give up his office. He has not been totally immethodical and lawless, for there are at least *γράμματα*, acknowledgments of debt, afterwards forthcoming, though not registered according to strict rules of bookkeeping, and certainly not with their amounts recorded; thus he is a dishonorable man of the middle class—there is a little method and sense of responsibility preserved; for the rest he is thoughtless, and imprudent in his present selfishness, *without care for the future.* And now his lord, having his attention aroused by many reports, suddenly says to the steward, summoned into his presence—*τί τοῦτο ἀκούω περὶ σοῦ*; that is, probably, *not*—Wherefore do I hear? (*τί* for *διατί*), but—a construction which seems much more pertinent—"What kind of thing (*τί* and *τοῦτο* emphatically together) is this which I am obliged to *hear* of *thee*, my steward? Is it true, or canst thou clear thyself from this imputation? I did not, when I made thee *οἰκόνομος*, and have not had reason while I have continued thee in office, to think that thou wert a *διασκορπίζων*; but I hear it now from all sides, answer me, whether I have heard aright or not." It is not his lord's purpose *in any case* to dismiss him, thus making the account demanded merely a *surrender:* this has been gratuitously inferred, and an impropriety argued from it, in his lord's removing the steward on the evidence of a secret information and without any examination, thus justifying him in the conduct which he afterwards pursued. It is this very *investigation* which is intended by the *ἀπόδος τὸν λόγον*: Lay before me thy accounts! We will see—then with a tone of warning on account of the accusation, and with an eager, selfish fear for his endangered property—*if they do not agree, if I find* that I have heard aright, thou wilt be no longer my steward. (The reading *δύνῃ* instead of *δυνήσῃ* has also this meaning).

Verses 3, 4. Now the inconsiderate fool becomes suddenly *cunning* and wise—this is a significant crisis in the parable which many misapprehend: The children of the world are unrighteous and unfaithful from the beginning, they become crafty when need urges them; certainly, however, then! This sudden, and after its kind, laudable prudence of the steward in forming his *decision*, is described to us in the three stages of his soliloquy. First, the clear perception of the necessity of his case, the expulsion being inevitable, in which the question becomes—*What* shall I do? Then the pondering of the various methods of extrication, which only made the case worse—The one I cannot, the other I will not! Finally, the crafty expedient—*Now I know* (*ἔγνων*) what I will do, to help myself! Then follows, as an essential part of this shrewd wisdom, the *execution* of his project, *ταχέως*, without much delay, vers. 5-7.

The nature of their relations itself requires us to understand, without any express mention in the narrative, that time was allowed the poor man to arrange his account, and that time of course includes the whole account from the third to the seventh verse. When God announces to us our dismissal, whether the final or one preliminary; when the decree goes forth upon us—Thou mayest be no longer steward! Thou must die! there is yet given us ordinarily a time of grace, with the stern though gracious exhortation—Set thine house in order! If the merciful God says—Come and let us reckon with one another, let us settle our account! he yet hears the supplication, and lets mercy triumph over judgment. His hearers must have thought of that, with the history of the prodigal son still echoing in their ears if not moving their hearts, when a similar predicament thus opens before them. But here there is no father and son, here is nothing which could immediately portray the true relation between God and man: this narrative teaches and intimates its warnings by sheer contrasts. Instead of coming truly *to himself* (as ch. xv. 17, *εἰς ἑαυτόν*) the steward speaks *ἐν ἑαυτῷ, in himself*, remains with all his thinking and deliberation the same idle, presumptuous, dishonest man as he was: his straits only teach him to add cunning to his unfaithfulness, or awaken the cunning which was latent in his nature. He declares it twice, at the beginning and at the close, that the lord taketh away from him his office, and with it his livelihood, and that his dismissal is an inexorable resolution. He knows "*his lord*," and his lord's care of self well enough, to prevent the entertainment of any vain hope; he knew that there would be no room for confession and pleading, and he has no satisfactory accounts to bring. Thus it is scarcely right to interpose here a preaching of condemnation against this man because he does not contemplate a third method in addition to the two which he rejects, that the true *tertium datur* of acknowledgment and supplication does not occur to his mind amid his evil imaginations. Such thoughts are right in the further application to ourselves—Thou, poor sinner, hast indeed to do with God, with whom there is plentiful forgiveness! Scarcely, however, has he fairly looked steadily at his hard fate, than he sees (with that full and unvarying hardness which we already see to be the wicked ground of his natural cunning), that everything after all is not irretrievably lost. He has heard from his Lord's lips nothing worse than *οὐ δυνήσῃ ἔτι οἰκονομεῖν*, "thou mayest be no longer steward," nothing about punishment or imprisonment. I am yet then left with a *τί ποιήσω*; "What shall I do?" and it is for me to devise the answer.* Two prospects rise before him—*digging* or *begging;* that is, either to begin now honorably to earn his bread by hard labor, or with a sudden self-abasement to ask it

* This is the reason of the *milder* expression afterwards, with which he comforts himself—*ὅταν μεταστασθῶ*, comp. Acts xiii. 22. As it were only—*transferred* to another situation or *οἰκονομία*. The aorist for the presentiated future.

at people's doors. The one he *cannot*, the other he *will not*:* the idleness of the effeminate good liver forbade the one; the pride of the great man, who had been hitherto a considerable householder and played the rich lord himself, forbade the other. He might have done the one with honor and decency, but the idleness of the sound man says instantly—I *cannot* do that, I have never learned to work heartily! As Grotius quotes from Aristophanes, *Av.* 1432 —*σκάπτειν γὰρ οὐκ ἐπίσταμαι* (for I know not how to dig)—in which the digging is used proverbially for the most common and menial daily labor: and we may cite as more obviously to the purpose Faust's words—"Ich kann mich nicht bequemen, Den Spaten in die Hand zu nehmen" (I cannot condescend, To take the spade in hand). Then as to the *begging?* Of this the sometime administrator is altogether *ashamed*—not with "nimiâ modestiâ" [excessive modesty] (as Bengel says), and not as we have seen in Ecclus. xl. 29–31, from a right principle and honorable feeling—but the whole gives us a finished picture of a child of this world, as he is to be seen everywhere in his thrifty cunning. "Nothing corresponding to the particulars of this pondering consideration can be pointed out in the application, but it is simply part of the parable," says the *Schullehrerbibel* of Brandt; this time correctly. If, going beyond the parable, we anticipate the application, and spiritualise or generalise this particular feature, then may we say with Jensen (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1829, 4) that the impossible labor is the helping of self, which, in the case of a man from whom is taken that which he had, appears to be out of the question; and the abhorred begging is the passive dejection in such most miserable circumstances, like the sinner's self-abandonment to ruin and reprobation. Thus may we, in harmony with the Lord's design, further interpret the parabolical words of this man, which, however, in itself is generally an apt proverb, suiting his present condition.

On the other hand, we must regard as impertinent, and as a *πάρεργον*, (incidental thing) beyond the requirement of strict exegesis, all the endless homilies about *working* and *praying* which have been founded upon these words; and all the protests, however good and ingenious in themselves, against the idle and proud refusal of the natural man to put forth his energies for himself, or to abase himself unto prayer. They are impertinent, inasmuch as the application to prayer would require that the dismissed man should have pleaded with his lord, and not have thought of begging at his neighbors' doors; and, further, because *in the parable* this *οὐκ ἰσχύω*, "I cannot," and *αἰσχύνομαι*, "I am ashamed," are admitted to be valid, and placed to the account of the man's *crafty prudence* which is commended: consequently, upon this application, there would be recommended the laying aside of all labor and prayer, and instead of them the dubious performance of good works towards our neighbors, so far as that might be possible. Again, however striking in itself, it is exegetically inadmissible to place this steward in parallel with the prodigal son, such a parallel, to wit, as G. R. Rieger draws, exhibiting the fundamental contrast between penitence and impenitence: "Both came in trouble and need, both seek to help themselves. The one uses right means, humbles himself, applies himself to prayer, and offers himself to the work of a servant. The other hangs upon his former repute, is ashamed to beg, and thinks himself too weak to labor." This and all similar well-meant *preaching* is part of that system of inexact and confused realisation of its main points which has more or less perverted even the traditional and correct interpretation; for he who forgets the tendency of the whole in the exposition of the details, must bear the blame if the commendation of shrewdness and wisdom which comes afterwards is found to be obscure and inharmonious.* It is an ingenious use of this isolated expression, though no exposition of it, to make it describe the unwillingness and impotence of the natural man to labor (in a spiritual sense) and to pray: as for example, the Princess Galitzin speaks of the "speculative understanding," as saying—I cannot explore it, and I am ashamed to pray (in the right place!) for what I cannot attain. This, however, has a real point of connection, and falls in at least with the interpretation given to the parable by our Lord, which finds in this helplessness of the steward the *ἐκλείπειν*, "failing," ver. 9, of death, no time being then left for good works in order to the attainment of everlasting habitations—"where he who could not dig falls himself into the grave, and in the general need all prayer (as Matt. xxv. 8) avails no more.†

No sooner has the man in his straits realised his entire situation, than his suddenly wakening craft discovers a plan—*ἔγνων τί ποιήσω*, "I am resolved (lit. *I know.*) what to do." In his joyful haste, and with the speed which he knew to be necessary, he does not wait to propose to himself, or state to us, the resulting decision of his cogitation, but we discover it afterwards in the actual *φρονίμως ποιεῖν* or "doing wisely."‡ Craft is essentially practical as we

* Luther's *mag* in the old form, that is, *vermag*, is misleading as our usage now goes.

* Similarly we read in H. Müller's *Erquickstunden*, to give one more example out of many: "If thou wilt choose, then choose the first two means! (*not* the third, which the Lord also recommends?) Beg and dig, pray and work, open mouth, hand ready. Prayer is thy heaven-carriage, labor thy earth-carriage, both bring much blessing to thy house, if they are driven well."

† Thus the artless Hiller, whose life of our Lord Jesus in verse carries out Bengel's exegesis, and will always be well worthy of being read on account of its many ingenious thoughts and turns of expression.

‡ Clearly and accurately (according to Alford) *ἔγνων* is distinguished from *ἔγνωκα*. The latter would be—I know, am well aware; but the *ἔγνων*

here see—it asks simply what is *to be done*, does not disguise its emergency from itself, ponders all possible means of extrication, selects the best, and sets to work at once upon that. All this is *formally* and relatively laudable; else, and in its true character, the craft of this worldling is as unspeakably infatuated in its forgetfulness of eternity, as that τοῦτο ποιήσω, "this will I do," of the ἄφρων or *fool* (chap. xii. 18). The ἵνα, "that," and ὅταν, "when," of his self-complacent ἔγνων goes not beyond this life, thinks nothing about that other daily impending and quite different μεταστα θῆναι τῆς οἰκονομίας, "being put out of the stewardship." He thinks that he has hit it well—ἵνα δέξωνταί με, ut *sint* qui me recipiant—or, looking back upon his own thoughts—"that the people, at whose doors I must otherwise have begged, may be glad to receive me into *their houses*, which is far better!" Or, as he is now speaking with full consciousness of his plan, he keeps the debtors in view—"that *they*, whom I will craftily make my friends, may take care of me—I will provide for myself hospitable homes!" To defraud his lord, even now at the last, and to prosecute his injustice even now that it is condemned, does not cause him *shame:* this, at least, he *can* do. It is altogether in vain to attempt with all kinds of subtlety to justify this wise οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας ("unjust steward") *in himself;* all whose cunning εἰς τὴν γενεὰν ἑαυτοῦ, "in his generation," goes only to this, how he may in some way or other carry on his habituated easy life; whose blind infatuation only thinks of man and of this world, yea, whose baseness finds its consummation in this, that he in his sly selfishness reckons upon the return of gratitude, not altogether failing, on the part of others.

Verses 5–7. It is not improbable that he had shown the same kind of good-nature towards poor wretches before, in the squandering of his master's goods; so that it was a very natural expedient—the children of the world at least do thus act towards one another with all their ἀδικία, or *injustice*. Nothing can be more forced than the misinterpretation which Brauns put so confidently forward, according to which all that is related from ver. 2 to ver. 8 took place on the spur of the moment, rather like an enchanted dream than actual life, and in flat opposition to the scope of all our Lord's parables. "Instantly, and before he left his lord's eye, he conceived his design, had the debtors summoned into his master's presence, paid the accounts thus rewritten *out of his own funds*, thus with most excellent φρόνησις (wisdom) uniting both restitution and benevolence by one stroke—restitution, inasmuch as the debtors never could have been able to pay anything themselves; and benevolence, inasmuch as these poor people were extricated from great embarrassment. Thus both creditor and debtor were touched to the heart, and their sympathies enlisted in his favor!" This is, in very deed, a master-stroke in the art of reading the direct opposite of what is written. If the steward were then so rich, what made him think of being reduced to beg? where then is the ἐκλείπειν or "failing" which the Lord indicates in ver. 9? and let every unprejudiced person think of all the other rank inconsistencies in this view. This would have been no compensation to his lord, but a mystification in his very presence, which must have excited his anger all the more. We must admit what Niemeyer, Schleiermacher, D. Schulz, Von Gerlach, and others have maintained, that such a reduction of the debts was within the prerogative of an οἰκονόμος or "steward," such as he was at that time—else would the reconstructed bills not have been valid. But this does not assuredly extend to the *justification* of the steward's conduct. It was in his power and option to do so, as we see, but not in his *righteous* power; what he here does to his lord's prejudice must always be counted unjust, and is only a continuation in his old practices of this sensualised οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας.

The χρεωφειλέται are not simply *contractors* (as B. Stein and Grossmann think) whose contracts the lord had already looked into, but *debtors* for produce furnished and unpaid for. He *asks* them craftily about the amount of their obligation, though he may be supposed in most cases to have known it already; his object being to stimulate their gratitude for the remission of so much of their debt—Is it not true that thou are rightly indebted for so much? He says boldly, condemning thereby himself—"Owest thou *my lord*," not *me;* so that he might not on his own responsibility remit any part of the debt. "*Take thy* bill, which I now restore to thee—see how merciful I am, much more than my lord, about whom, between ourselves, we need ask no questions—*quickly* (ταχέως, raptim, furtim, which intimates, too, the lord's absence—before he comes and sees it!) subscribe with thine own hand a lesser amount?" These debtors, like all others, are nothing loth to write a less amount, but, like children of this world, very soon take the share of this advantageous piece of villany. Two examples are recorded, which include, under oil and wheat, all kinds of liquid and dry productions of the soil; and at the end, ver. 7, we may suppose—*and thus onwards* through all the debtors; for ver. 5 mentions ἕνα ἕκαστον, *every one*. Nor does he speak to every one apart, but has them altogether at the same desk, as it is critically noted in the σὺ δέ, "and thou," of the second instance. And why so? Because these poor people, in one another's presence, were abashed, and would be terrified into complaisance by the idea of a general settlement of accounts. Why does he not remit to any one the whole debt? Partly, because the lord, when he came to know that this man or that was one of his debtors, might find an account apparently right at hand; and partly, because he would keep the people in a humble frame of mind still, since, if all their debt had been discharged, they would have become puffed up, and forgotten to be thankful.*

implies,—I have just arrived at the knowledge, an idea has just struck me, as it were, εὕρηκα—as we had also remarked above.

*The crafty man expects *gratitude* of itself; it is

ly, on the same principle he remits to the one fifty out of the hundred, and to the other twenty—not (as Olshausen infelicitously here incorporates) for the sake of the application "to a discreet distribution of our benefits according to the present need of their objects;" nor (as Lange says, imputing too much good to the steward) "that he first achieved the most desperate stroke, and then gave way to something like *moral prudence*." But the man is altogether and throughout *wise*, he acts with a *crafty discretion* and *arbitrariness*, which somewhat propitiates his own *pride* on being dismissed; thus keeping their obligations in the minds of the debtors—"The great man could do with us as he listed, but he *gave* everybody something, at least." We should note that he selects cunningly the *good-natured*, not so cunning as himself, whom he may "*despatch*, one after the other, with the utmost possible haste."* And it is just from these that he reckons upon an unstipulated gratitude.

Verse 8. It ought never to have been matter of misapprehension, that the narrative of the parable is still going on, and that the commending *κύριος*, "lord" is not Jesus himself,† but he who had been thus described by the steward in vers. 3 and 5 as his lord. Our lord continues to speak in all that follows down to *ἤκουον ταῦτα πάντα*, "heard all these things," ver. 14. If *the Evangelist* were now suddenly interrupting the narrative, how comes it that *κἀγὼ λέγω* "and I say unto you," so directly follows; and whence the *ὅτι*, "that," similarly in strict connection—for the only other supposition, that it is an intermediate reflection of Luke, is surely out of the question. It is the I say unto you *also*—which distinguishes our Lord from the lord of the parable, in whose place Jesus himself now enters. Without such a *conclusion* one main characteristic in the parable would be wanting, the answer, namely, to the question—What said his lord to such a stroke of artifice? Was it divulged, or not? This last knavery also became known and notorious—the supposition of that was necessary to the tendency and scope of the whole, and to the winding up of the entire parable, and it is merely hinted at as being understood of itself. While the Lord reports the commendation which was bestowed upon the steward, he at the same time, to obviate all misconception, *condemns* utterly the spirit and fundamental character of this steward, for he calls him again and in a marked way the *unjust* steward. (To construe *ἐπήνεσεν* with *τῆς ἀδικίας*,* as other knavish people have done, is most assuredly incorrect, for the most external glance at the mere phraseology must show that *οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας* is one phrase, just as in ver. 9 *μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας*, and in chap. xviii. 6, *κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας*.) It is altogether monstrous, and opposed to the whole current even of this world's life, which the parable is portraying, that his lord should commend the knavery which had been practised upon himself, the injustice *as* injustice; enough that he now leaves the *ἀδικία* out of the question, since he finds, even in this knavery, one object of commendation, which is clearly defined—*ὅτι φρονίμως ἐποίησεν*, "*because* he had done wisely." We have pointed out the total consistency of the *ἀδικία* of this man, in opposition to all the forced endeavors to justify or apologise for him which directly contradict the express declaration of our Lord—what then was there to *commend* in him? Was it that he did not add murder to his knavery, and kill his lord instead of allowing himself to be dismissed? Then would it be matter of commendation in every sinner, that he is not yet a devil, and has not courage and power to sin worse than he does! Was it that he had some slight method in his business, so that at least *γράμματα*, "bills," were forthcoming in the case of the debtors? That would be in direct contradiction to the admitted *διασκορπίζειν*, or, "wasting." Or was it that he had not in past times thought of and provided for himself? So much the worse was the recklessness of his mad administration! Was it that he did not go and act with the debtors as that other wicked servant did in Matt. xviii. 28, in order to scrape together as much as he could? But that would have helped him but little, since the deficit was too great to be made up, and his dismissal was already certain; this knave knows that very well, is far from desirous to show any mercy towards them, and thinks only, as his soliloquy showed us, *of helping himself*. Thus it is *this*, and the cunning necessary to it, which, apart from all else, is the subject of commendation. Jesus now relates that his outwitted lord (when he, sooner or later, found it out too late) praised him for *that*—this appears strange enough in itself, but is quite consistent with the world's ways. *For* to the children of the world the coming of selfishness triumphs over right; the main thing, and the chief glory of a man is to extricate himself from embarrassment, no matter how; so that in the contemplation of successful and preëminent villany, its injury to their own personal interests may well be for a moment forgotten. Hence the Lord in this case cannot refrain from saying (in his heart or to others,

needless to interpose (as Bahrdt does) any stipulation—"For this, as long as I live, let me have the half."

*But not "deceive" as Stein expresses it. He inserts also the stipulation that they should receive him into their dwellings, and explains that now these easy-minded people find themselves out of their reckoning. "It should have been a question to them whether the entertainment of this steward, who had been used to high living, would not cost them more in the long run than the amount he had remitted!" But we should not push our calculating exposition *so far!*

†It has been said that Luke always uses this word in relation to Jesus. A very strange remark, and worth nothing in this case; against which Stein, however, has very needlessly and unskilfully referred to chap. xii. 46, xiv. 23.

*Even Schleiermacher thinks that we must necessarily accept this, and leave the *honest* οἰκονόμος without an epithet!

not necessarily as beholding the knave)—"The deceiver has at last gone off craftily enough; that was not a bad stroke; I should probably have *done* the same myself, if I could have had the wit to *think upon it* so suddenly."

In all this it is taken for granted as evident, that the commended ἐποίησεν, "he had done," is the last stroke of policy with the debtors—apart from the proper historical matter of the parable, and what the steward *had done* in the situation in which vers. 1 and 2 find him. Every child would so read and understand the text, and yet the craft of exposition has not seldom taken a view exactly opposite. In particular, we would refer to a certain recent work of an anonymous author* devoted especially to the subject, which has made the parable of the steward the subject of a long examination, in connection with other high and deep matters that pertain to the doubtful questions of exegesis. This writer cannot, at the outset, regard it as otherwise than impossible, that a master in this world would praise as prudent an act of treachery practiced upon himself, and proceeds to give his own judgment and view. He then felicitously makes it appear that the steward gained his end, that is, perfectly satisfied his lord by his accounts, and earned the commendation—"Thou art a wise and honorable man, these slanderers have done thee grievous injustice!" and that *this* is the meaning of φρονίμως ἐποίησεν, "done wisely." Our Lord praised also, over and above, the unjust man, the knave! Then ver. 9 is perverted, in order to make it accordant, ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ being made to mean—*independently of mammon*, in another way and not by its aid; another interpretation is put upon the documents, and everything done to torment away the old exposition, and to establish one utterly contradictory: how all this was done may be matter of marvel, but it is actually to be read; giving us one more example of the facility with which ingenious men go astray upon this parable, over which a special fatality seems to preside! It is scarcely necessary for us to say that in vers. 3, 4, not one word is said about correct accounts. The soliloquy of the steward not only shows, as Jansen admits, that his evil conscience is troubled; but that he had resigned himself to his dismissal as an inevitable calamity, having no thought of re-establishing himself in his master's confidence, and that his sole care now is to provide for himself after the loss of his office. This was his aim, and in prosecuting it he acted φρονίμως, for φρόνησις (prudence) has to do with the means to an end generally, while σοφία (wisdom) has reference to a good end, as Zyro correctly adduces what is known to every one. On the other hand, Brauns brings forward his confident assertion that φρόνιμος, *prudent* ("wise") never occurs in the New Testament in a bad sense, and consequently that the οἰκονόμος had not been guilty of any ἀδικία or *injustice* as such. But Matt. x. 16 gives us the word at least as a vocabulum μέσον (word of intermediate import), and it undoubtedly has a somewhat ironical meaning as applied to the Corinthians—1 Cor. iv. 10, x. 15; 2 Cor. xi. 19. But we first have the *vox media* afterwards when the children of the world are termed φρονιμώτεροι, "wiser;" there is no allusion to bad sense at all, for the κύριος or "lord" *praise* the prudence as something in itself good. An good it is, and must undeniably ever be, as the Lord here testifies, exhibiting the greater prudence of the wicked in compassing *their* ends as an example which shames the good: if any one has too fine a sense of morality, or too keen a critical acumen, to tolerate this, let him contradict the Lord Jesus if he pleases, but not misconstrue and pervert his plain words!

In φρονίμως and φρονιμώτεροι we have the obvious key of the whole parable; he must be blinded who does not see this. The earnest diligence with which the children of the world pursue their end, to wit, to deliver themselves from temporal calamity, may, and indeed *should* put *us* to shame, even while we have ourselves a much nobler aim; we should copy their example, not indeed in their unrighteousness, but in the diligent wisdom of the just (Luke i. 17); we should make to ourselves friends, or provide for our own reception in eternity, even as they make careful provision for their earthly life, beyond which they have no care. And is not this application perfectly just—may we not preach it in every congregation, without being troubled by any such scruples of feeling as we have referred to?

The *children of this world*, to which class all the personages of the parable belong in common, pay much regard, as a rule and in the mass, to *prudence* and crafty thrift—hence the commendation of this lord. Jesus, in adding this explanation, describes and at the same time qualifies the ambiguous character of this praise, in order to found upon it the general application—Suffer not yourselves to be surpassed and put to shame by *such* cunning! It is incorrect to assume, as Olshausen does, that the υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, "children of this world," are not quite identical with the πονηροί or *wicked*, and not absolutely hostile to the φῶς or "light," only, as it were, oscillating between the two; for we should thereby lose the sharp point of the rigorous contrast, which goes to the same issue as the exhortation to the Apostles to be wise as serpents. It is equally wrong to take υἱοὶ τοῦ φωτός, "children of light," ironically (as Braune does, understanding by them the Pharisees); the contrast has the same fulness, reality, and earnestness as in John xii. 36; 1 Thess. v. 5 (Eph. v. 8). The φῶς or *light* indicates here, *first of all*, truth and sincerity as opposed to the falseness and overreaching of this world; but much more than this is contained in it. The children of the world are children of darkness in their *self-deception*, which makes their narrow and limited prudence unutterable folly; and in this view the dullest child of light is wiser than the wisest of the children of *this*

* *Beiträge zur Beleuchtung schwebender Fragen über Geist und Welt, Glauben und Schrift, Religion und Staat* (Erfurt, 1839).

world—who only thinks of and provides for this present life. Now, this wise steward has forgotten from the very beginning that he is only a steward, and may expect a day of reckoning in the lower as well as in the higher sense; it has never occurred to him to ask—What will become of me in my injustice if I should *die* to-day or to-morrow? Rather is it his sole care to provide for himself a lodgment in the interim, till he can procure another *οἰκονομία* or office, and play the old game more wisely. Hence the Lord's saying is only true with the addition—*εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἑαυτῶν*, "in *their* generation." *Here* lies the irony directed against the wisdom of the children of the world, here is the full solution of the question how they can be a pattern to us.* Not, as has been most superficially said—they are wise and cunning *erga cœlaneos, i.e.*, invicem, inter se, unus erga alterum (mutually); but assuredly its first meaning, and that applying to both parties, is—in and after their *kind*. (For this meaning of the word, see what is said upon Matt. xxiv. 34. Erasmus: "In natione suâ" (in their nation)—for the two kinds of children are actually of a different origin, race, people, and kind. But again the *εἰς*, *to* ("in"), is to be regarded as essentially *τελικῶς* (telic), as the deep meaning of *γενεά*, "generation," actually involves—for *their* life, *their* space of time, the children of which they know themselves to be, and act as such. Thus they care for things which pertain to time, and their share of it—but let your higher prudence provide for *everlasting* habitations! They give their best attention as a whole (not reckoning individual examples of indiscretion) to the great question how, especially in time of urgent pressure, they shall get on for this life, and their zeal is in itself commendable; while ye, alas! are far from being so prudent in your preparation for death, and that eternal and real life which follows it. Pastor Flattich of Wurtemberg explained this phenomenon (the simple ground of which is that the light of true wisdom unto salvation slowly and hardly enters into our earth-bound nature, cleaving to this world) more quaintly than correctly, when he said—"to be sure, the dog is more knowing than the sheep!" This is something like the interpretation of Ebrard, who says—"since the children of light are often too much inclined, in thinking upon heavenly things, to pretermit and neglect their earthly duties, and to forget their worldly prudence." But this scarcely touches the meaning of our Lord, who does not commend to his sheep the dog's wisdom as such, and is not speaking of attention to earthly duties as such; but is exhorting us to give as much earnest diligence to the pursuit of eternal salvation as the worldling does to his temporal well-being. "*Fidelity* in earthly relations, and in the administration of earthly good," is indeed required from us, vers. 10–12, as merely our *wisdom*, but yet it is as wisdom towards the attainment of our *eternal* and abiding good; apart *from that* the children of light may forget all earthly things in their contemplation of the heavenly—which has its place, when the question is the *highest* wisdom of *simplicity*.

Verse 9. The originator of that conjectural reading—*κἀγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω· οὐ ποιήσατε, κ.τ.λ.* (But do *not* ye so!)—had not the slightest notion of the true meaning of the whole discourse. Are we then, according to his view, to retain the unrighteous mammon, spending it upon ourselves or heaping it up, supposing we have it? That is not what he means, but—we should use it for the good of our neighbor. He takes offence at this, that as the words run, the Lord seems to counsel stealing and overreaching in order to make friends for ourselves—but he simply does not read the words aright. The mammon is *assumed* to be *μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας*, "mammon *of unrighteousness*," just as the *οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας*, "unjust steward," before. It is evident of itself that we are not to imitate the *unjust* steward (that title surely was enough), and not to *acquire* the mammon in his method; and when the Lord goes on *to say to us*, what now nevertheless follows, he places himself on a parallel with the lord in the parable, and tells the Publicans who already had such mammon in their possession, and could not possibly now adjust all the individual claims of others in making specific restitution, how they shall henceforward act with regard to it. The clear and unbiassed view which we take of his lofty but condescending words is this: As that lord discovering too late the fraud, pretermitted, and, as it were, forgot it, in his consideration of the craft displayed, so I, the true Lord, in the name of my Father say unto you preliminarily—that not only does the righteousness of God *permit*, but the grace of God *requires* from you absolved sinners, the prudent use, in all good works, of that earthly property which has been in times past gathered together by unrighteousness such as cannot now be otherwise repaired; and that ye use the utmost wisdom in administering it for others, with a full faith in an eternal recompense of mercy to ensue. This gracious permission Flattich has this time somewhat better illustrated by the master who tells his maid-servant that he has fruit in his garden which she may take for herself and distribute among other people, that his fruit may raise up friends for the poor orphan.* Hiller: "God somewhat recedes from his right; press into it thyself: he gives up his goods that you may turn them to good account; make thyself by another's goods rich in good works; *it is no loss to him*," he notes it not." If a pious king places men in the situation of stewards over a charitable foundation, they should not accumulate either for him or themselves, but keep it before them as their one object to give out as much as possible in beneficence, and bring as

* For, as Beyschlag (*Rheinische Monatscrift*, März, 1850) rightly remarks, it is not a picture of life in its *innocent* realities, but a procedure of its thoroughly *unrighteous worldliness*, which the Lord here selects as the foundation of a *parable* for instruction in the things of his kingdom.

* *Süddeutsche Originalien von Barth*, pt. 1.

much satisfaction as possible to the charitable wishes of the founder: and so with God the true "rich man" whose stewards we all are in the occupation of earthly property. And indeed we have *all* been, and not only the Publicans, more or less unrighteous in the past; though in reckoning with us our repentance and conversion are accepted, and it is said to us—Ye *may* be henceforward, and ye must be, stewards, but better, more faithful and more wise, for your own salvation and my good pleasure.

The Lord, at the same time, takes the most favorable possible view of the unjust steward's selfish and earthly-prudent conduct, when he takes as the *tertium comparationis*, the expression: *Make to yourselves friends!* More prudently, indeed, and more safely, than he in the parable, who, with all his self-seeking, only reckoned upon the gratitude of men equally sinful and selfish with himself—so that indeed all his calculations might, after all, have been miscalculated. When the Lord in this condescending comparison* sets the enjoyment and advantage of this friendship before his disciples as the aim of their well-doing, it is presumed and *taken for granted*, even *because Jesus says it*, that his disciples are only to make to themselves true friends by the exercise of true friendship, and only to ensure to themselves a compensating gratitude by acts of genuine love. The φίλοι, "friends," are assuredly not (for then it would be an expression wonderfully out of harmony with the parable) "*those in heaven*, God and the angels" (as Ebrard says); but they are to be sought among our fellow-men and brethren. The covetous and hard-hearted man prepares for himself in the poor whom he does *not* help, no other than *accusers* at the eternal bar; while the benevolent man who ministers to their wants makes them, on the contrary, his friends. "Many understand well (says Zeller in the *Monatsblatt*) how with their mammon to make servants, tools, and companions, but these are not—*friends*. A man cannot buy or hire these with gold; he only makes himself friends by *what* he gives, and by the *manner* of his giving it; that is, by the *love* with which he imparts his goods. He who wins *hearts*, makes himself friends." This is not inappropriately enforced upon the Lord's words; for when *Jesus* begins to speak, he uses every word *in its only befitting and right meaning*, elevating and *illustrating* everything subordinate and common in the parable; and this is the right transition from the parable to its interpretation. Further, the receiving into everlasting habitations intimates to us *what kind of people* we before all things should make our friends, the poor children of God, the brethren of the Saviour, the heirs of the inheritance; as Zeller goes on excellently to observe, "not the people who are cast out in eternity, since they will not be able to receive guests into heaven." But, again, since we are not the searchers of hearts, and judges before the time, and cannot beforehand know who will be one day the inheritors of the kingdom, our love and benevolence must be universal; regarding every man as one called to salvation, turning away from no object of distress who may one day, as the brother of the Judge of all, witness and plead for us, or who, by our good deeds in the name of Christ, might be aided in coming to Christ and to salvation. Thus Neander is not quite right in drawing the conclusion that good deeds shown only *to the pious* are here intended; for is it not our bounden duty to distribute our benefactions with the view and in the hope of making the objects of our benevolence grateful, and thus pointing to them the way of piety?

Of *forgiveness* and *remission of debts* the discourse does not directly speak (though many, Jensen for instance, digress in that direction, supposing thus that they interpret the parabolical element); for it is said expressly, *with the mammon*—consequently the distribution and giving away of substance is enforced upon those who possess it, as such. Ἐκ του μαμωνᾶ, "*of* the mammon," may be either understood as referring to the *means* by which, the source whence, we may accomplish the making of friends; or (as Braune says, and, it may be, correctly) we may regard the ἐκ as a proper material *out of*. "Let mammon go, and make for yourselves out of it—that is, ἐν τῷ ἀφιέναι καὶ παραδιδόναι (by forgiving and bestowing)—friends."* The advisableness and *wisdom* of thus freely dispensing our mammon for our true advantage in the interest which eternity yields, is further grounded upon the fact that it is, and must ever be, a mammon of *unrighteousness*—which pregnant expression,† so much twisted about by expositors, is very probably connected with a proverbial description of it among the Jews—מָמוֹן שֶׁקֶר, according to Lightfoot. The most obvious meaning involved in this, that of an *unrighteously obtained* substance, has given much needless offence to interpreters: this certainly is the point of connection between the interpretation and the parable, where we find the steward giving away that of which he robs his master; and it precisely suits the Publicans as it answers the question which they must ask, as to what they must do, as the children of light, with that unrighteous mammon which they had acquired before their conversion. They must do no other than seek, in the manner most pleasing to God, and at the same time most truly and

* Which, indeed, stands upon the same ground as the exhibition of *fidelity* towards God as being *prudence* for ourselves (see Matt. xxiv. and xxv.), and the general phraseology of Scripture which speaks of *our* σώζεσθαι or salvation as the good pleasure of God. Is this essentially different?

* It is incorrect and artificial with Hartmann to regard μαμωνᾶς as abstractum pro concreto—*the rich*—and connecting this with ἀδικίας, to make it—the transitory, worldly rich. Make to yourselves friends of, or *among* the rich of this world, that they, in your ἐκλείπειν into poverty, or when old age requires it, may take care of you!

† Very unnecessarily and impertinently by Stein compared with μισθός τῆς ἀδικίας, Acts i. 18, which refers to something very different.

eternally profitable to themselves, "to disencumber themselves of the last farthing" (as Loskiel says in his "Etwas fürs Herz auf dem Wege zur Ewigkeit"). Of course it is supposed that they acquire no more unrighteously; and equally obvious is it—for the Lord would never teach a violation of the law of Moses (Exod. xxii. 1–4)—that unjustly gained property must be restored, when and where it is possible; but that, for the most part, is regarded as possible no longer, and then conscience itself recommends the hearty distribution to the poor—Zacchæus does both at once and together (ch. xix. 8).

But this first and more obvious meaning is very far from exhausting the depths of this word, spoken not to the Publicans *only*, but to us all, so far as we are in any wise similarly situated. Worldly substance is termed *mammon* by our Lord (as we saw on Matt. vi. 24), not as it is a creature of God, but as it is a possession *in our hand*, and more directly as it is the false good and the eagerly-coveted desire *of our hearts*, that is, as it is made an *idol: there* lies already, without its having been obtained by any unjust dealing with our neighbor, the fundamental unrighteousness which ever adheres to it. Mammon, as such, is never, in the first place, righteous; but all earthly possessions, in the second place, in their course and process through the hands of men must more or less certainly and manifestly become a mammon.* Thus most of these Publicans had already, for the sake of *mammon*, in the unrighteousness and idolatry of their hearts, become the slaves of a foreign dominion against their own people, who therefore scorned and cast them out; and so now every man whose heart is set upon retaining and accumulating the substance which, as he may suppose, has been acquired in legal and honorable ways, is only carrying on the same ἀδικία or *unrighteousness* of the heart. In sum, sin is, as matters actually are in the world, the origin and principle of all property and personal substance; selfishness and self-appropriation, indirect acquisition in the sight of God or man, idolatry and uncharitableness, adhere to it necessarily as it has come from its former possessors, as well as in the hands of those who now hold it. Is not this so? The consciences of all who are truly converted to righteousness, in the possession of much substance, must everywhere confirm this declaration. It is "either the fruit or the seed of unrighteousness and sin"—as Gossner says. Jurists seek for the security of title-deeds from something external to the possessor, and aiming to go back to the origin of all *dominium*, imagine its first beginnings either in an ideal condition of nature, or repose upon a necessitated *possessio* and its *bona fides:* but God allows no such rights to human hearts, he neither utters any *beati possidentes* of φιλαργυρία (covetousness), nor admits any bona fides for the retaining of what a man has; his *bona* fides is grounded upon his dispensing and ministering, as a steward, the manifold grace of God. "The superabundance should be common; if it is not so, but is perverted to *self* and becomes *mine*, then it becomes *unrighteous mammon*" (*Berlenb. Bibel*). As the parable, in its application to us, makes us all no other than the stewards of God, it actually abolishes the idea of *property* in its strictest sense as being ours; and all retention and accumulation of mammon for its sake it makes ἀδικία. Similarly the simple-minded Loskiel, from whom the ingenious critics might often take a hint—"The unrighteous mammon is money or money's worth, *which does not appertain to us of God or of right*, but has been *appropriated* to ourselves, nevertheless, in this or the other way." Either there adheres to it through the acquisition and possession of former owners, from whom it has been transmitted or has come into our hands, an injustice which must be rectified by ourselves; or that unrighteousness is imparted to it by our own covetous and selfish clinging to it.

Therefore is all mammon *taken again* from the temporary possessor; it is no abiding and real good, but deceives and betrays its lord, who becomes its slave (Prov. i. 19). This is not, indeed, expressed in the word itself (as Von Gerlach: Which is unrighteous *to you*, deceives and disappoints you)—for ἀδικία must have a like meaning in vers. 8 and 9. But we may and we should deduce this as a *consequence*, since that which is unrighteous can only inflict a rightful retaliation of unrighteousness; and, as such, this thought is the profound under-tone of the whole discourse. Money and earthly property has in itself *no value*; as soon as any such is attached to it, it becomes an ἄδικον or *unrighteous* thing. This is the ἀδηλότης πλούτου, "uncertain riches," of which Paul speaks, 1 Tim. vi. 17, whose whole discourse in that place down to ver. 19, corresponds generally with the fundamental thoughts of our Lord's sayings in this place, and gives us its best scriptural exposition. Schleiermacher's remark—"Money has no obligation to remain with us, it is its well-known nature to circulate," is more sprightly than devout; and forgets that everything, as a creature and gift of God, should be continuing and not deceive and disappoint any one, an ἀληθινόν or *true* thing (as it indeed fundamentally always is): but that the unrighteousness which converts gold into mammon is avenged by the very circumstance that its expectation from it is deceived. Thus Bengel is right, as things are among men, "injustus mammonas, quia non jure fert appellationem bonorum" (unjust mammon, because it does not justly bear the appellation of *goods*). Similarly Augustin before—"de mammona iniquitatis, *i.e.*, de pecuniâ vel divitiis, quæ malæ fuerant acquisitiæ; aut etiamsi bene, *non tamen veris*, sed quas *iniquitas putat* esse divitias, quoniam nescit quæ sint veræ divitiæ" (of the mammon of iniquity, *i.e.*, of money or riches ill gotten;

* "The children of light should always be conscious with regard to mammon that something *uneasy* adheres to its possession," as Lange has well apprehended it.

or though well, *yet not true*, but what *iniquity thinks* true, because it knows not what true riches are) (*Civ. Dei*, 21, 27). It is the best, therefore, and the wisest plan, to let this "unsanctified gold" simply pass through our hands, that the heart may not come to depend upon it. It must be diligently given back again! The children of the world in *gathering* and heaping it are practising a self-deception which will issue in eternal want: they are unjust to that God who requires of his stewards that their *gathering* should be a scattering abroad. He is not an accumulating *ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος*, "rich man," increasing his capital, like that man in the parable. He desires no other putting of his money out to usury (Luke xix. 23), than the restoration to it of its true and only value, and its diligent use for the kingdom of heaven in all the ministrations of self-denying charity.

The prudent man in the parable provided for *houses*, into which he might be received; and that is the reason why our Lord here names the *αἰωνίους σκηνάς*, "everlasting *habitations* (lit. *tents*). The Israelites journeyed into the land of their inheritance in their *tents* (Jos. xxii. 4): and in this expression there was both a backward and a forward reference—even the houses of stone and the walls encompassing their cities were still but as the pilgrim tabernacles of the wilderness, an interim provision only, before those peaceable habitations and sure dwellings which God's people expected at the end. (Isa. xxxii. 18). *These* are the *everlasting* habitations, with *typical* allusion for the Israel of God;* yet not now precisely corresponding with the parable, not received into *their* habitations, as before into their houses; but those who are received themselves *may* through the grace of God receive others, just in the same sense as we may dispense to others of his gifts. The *δέξωνται*, "receive," must clearly correspond with that in ver. 4; the recompense at the resurrection of the just (ch. xiv. 14) comes from God, but in connection with the testimony, desire, and supplication of the friends who had been acquired in life; and this is the real truth and ground of reality in the *δέχεσθαι* or reception. "Heaven is, as it were, the estate of the poor, out of which they can bequeath legacies to their benefactors."† What a most gracious representation this is, far from being merely an unreal accommodation of the idea! We will not disturb its simplicity of presentation by any eschatological investigations as to how, and how far, its truth will be made manifest in a progression of accomplishment; for these last things are not clearly revealed. Thus much remains certain, that both the Old and the New Testament, rightly understood, exhibit alms-deeds to us as laying the foundation of a treasure in heaven, that charity bears its interest in eternity even to the unforgotten cup of cold water (Matt. x. 42). We may confidently rest in this middle interpretation, without "going astray, either into what would be a decided, though disguised *Crispinism*, or into the undoubted papistical perversion of the doctrine of *merit in* good works" (Zyro).

There is yet one expression which we have not closely examined—*ὅταν ἐκλίπητε*, "when ye fail." The reading preferred by Schulz and Schleiermacher—*ὅταν ἐκλίπῃ* (*ἐκλείπῃ*) seil. *ὁ μαμωνᾶς* (when the deceitful mammon fails you, departs, and leaves you deceived; and the Peshito confirms this—דמא דנמר, si defecerit; comp. moreover ch. xii. 33, *θησαυρὸν ἀνέκλειπτον*), seems at first sight to be recommended as introducing the fundamental idea which we have just been dwelling on; but when we look more closely into it, we must perceive that it is opposed to the internal connection of the whole discourse, and can only have crept in as an explanatory gloss. First of all, the making of friends with our mammon which is here enjoined, presupposes a distribution of our substance and a severance from it; and we cannot suppose at the same time any such cleaving to it as would be disappointed by an *ἐκλείπειν* or "failing." And then this reading is in general not sufficiently comprehensive, and harmonious with the context; for, in this injunction of ver. 9 every expression used in reference to the course of conduct recommended must embrace in itself both a strict applicability to what is laid down in the *parable* and a reference to its more extended *interpretation*. The *ὅταν*, "when," of this verse must correspond with the *ὅταν μεταστα θῶ*, "when I am put out," ver. 4 (from which similarly the *ἵνα δέξωνται*, in connection with the *σκηναῖς* is derived), and consequently the *persons* addressed must be the subject of the change of circumstances here represented as contingent; similarly to preserve the conformity with the *αἰωνίους*, "*everlasting*," this contingency must be generally the dismissal from life upon earth. And so we find it in fact in the ambiguous expression which is pertinently chosen—*ὅταν ἐκλίπητε* (or, with very respectable MSS. *ἐκλείπητε*); that is, first, when ye fall into the *ὑστερεῖσθαι* or *want*, of ch. xv. 14, become involved in utter failure like the man in the parable; but also as the *interpretation* of this—when ye incur that certainly impending bankruptcy of life which abolishes all personal possession, and the goods and powers of life fail and give place to the reckoning of death! This is the foundation of the well-known phraseology of the Sept.—*ἐκλείπειν*, decease (giving up the ghost, Gen. xxv. 18)—but here the general expression falls back upon the specific *defectum pati* suggested by the parable. "Since ye cannot by any worldly craft or prudence evade *that*, make it the care of your nobler prudence to provide in time for an im-

* Of this Winterberg made a *perpetuum hospitium*, a life-long abode,—which alone the wisdom of the children of light should care for.

† St. Augustine in the chapter before cited remarks: "Mirari autem soleo etiam apud *Virgilium* istam Domini reperiri sententiam. Nam cum Elysios campos poeta ille describeret, ubi putant habitare animas beatorum, non solum ibi posuit eos, qui propriis meritis ad illas sedes pervenire potuerunt, sed adjecit atque ait: *quique sui memores alios fecere merendo.*"

perishable possession and an abiding lodgment in the future γενεα. Especially ye Publicans, whom the Pharisees not untruly reprobate as sinners, for ye are all of you unjust stewards of the goods both of body and soul, in the sight of your true Lord! And all, whoever and wherever ye are, who cling to your mammon, with all the unrighteousness that adheres to it —think of the end!" Finally, let us steadily regard in its true light this most gracious accommodation of our Lord to man's innate self-regard and earthliness of thought (found constantly occurring throughout his teaching); for he here condescends to point out to us the way of true thrift and prudence, by which we may most surely secure our possessions against the fires of judgment, and, as it were, preserve the heritage which we leave here or the superabundant restitution of another life (Eccles. xi. 1). "As in earthly things ye are prudent enough not to let all your goods lie at the mercy of any one calamity. If ye really loved your money, ye would desire to enjoy it more than merely these few years. That farmer would not really love his corn who should not be glad to throw a few grains of it into the earth in order to reap it again with ten or twenty fold increase. I would counsel you prudently to ensure your worldly goods against the spoil of time, and constantly lay up your produce beyond the walls of this transitory field; for you will carry nothing hence away. See how both faithful and prudent the Lord is in his way of teaching, how he strives to win you in all kinds of ways, even *adapting himself to this passion of men*, and showing you how you may *eternally* enjoy your possessions!" (This is the pithy homiletic-exegesis of G. R. Rieger, and is not to be contemned.)

Verses 10–12. The progression and connection of thought in this epilogue were exhibited in our general review of the whole at the beginning, which now may be referred to again with advantage. It is not the "true *charity*, assuming, when embodied in outward acts, the form of a dissipation of our goods," which is pointed out as true *wisdom*, but a real *fidelity* (the word four times occurs) as it respects God's commandment, which would have his earthly goods thus applied. This is the process of the advancing interpretation; for the fundamental idea of our Lord's instruction here appears to be not the love which we owe to our neighbor, so much as the accomplishment, on our own part, in the obedience of faith, of the divine will of the Great Proprietor, in order to *our own* standing before him in final acceptance; in order, as it were, to our own *desert of eternal possessions*. This true fidelity is the prudence of righteousness, for the final account, as in Matt. xxiv. 45. Fidelity in the steward of earthly substance is the dispensing and scattering of seed for the better harvest which is abiding in eternity. Let it be observed, once more, how in the inverted relation between the parable and its interpretation, this *unrighteousness*, ver. 10 (in which the unjust steward does *not* stand as a type), is placed as the opposite of fidelity. First of all, ver. 10 presents a general introductory and convincing truth admitted by universal experience and consciousness; which has its application to the province of the administration of earthly property, and then, as a proverb and similitude, bears a further and higher application. Count nothing *slight*, be it great or small—was the sentiment of the son of Sirach, Ecclus. v. 18. The essential fidelity of the heart keeps this precept; it is the same for all objects alike. Fidelity in little things is itself something *great*, it is indeed the greatest and only true *fidelity*. If a man begins aright with little things, his conscientiousness is assured and disciplined for the greater things which may bring greater temptation; he who is not unfaithful with regard to the smallest farthing, will not be so afterwards with thousands of pounds—hence the first clause stands in the first place. But he who is unjust in little things *is* unfaithful also in much; that is, if not at once in open apparent reality, he will soon be such; and still more clearly, the many ἐλάχιστα already make up the great πολύ. All fidelity in great things without similar fidelity in the little, is but outward seeming; and similarly all petty, micrological straining out the gnat while the camel is swallowed, is no true fidelity of the heart. Consequently also the converse holds good: He who would be, and continue to be, faithful in that which is great, let him be so preëminently and perseveringly in the petty details continually occurring in life—for there is an inseparable connection between the two. But it is not the Lord's design *only* to say—"Whether ye possess much or little *of mammon*, deal with it as I now counsel you, for two mites well laid out will gain you friends in eternity, will bring you interest and recompense for the kingdom of heaven." But vers. 11, 12 immediately carry the idea further, and show that all earthly possessions generally, be they Rothschild's millions, are only ἐλάχιστον —"the least thing which God can and will bestow upon man"—comp. 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3, which almost sounds like a citation of our Lord's words. Yea more, the whole of ver. 10 is reproduced with its application to the domain of spiritual possessions and the gifts of grace—as we find it in Luke xix. 17.

All these antitheses, with their various expression, are obviously resolved into one great antithesis between the earthly and the heavenly, the temporal and the eternal. All earthly substance, which the children of this world turn to mammon, is in itself ἐλάχιστον, a "least" thing; also, through the deceitfulness of sin which clings to it, an ἄδικον, or "unrighteous" thing; and must ever be to the inner, immortal nature of man, by reason of its adventitious value, and transitional possession, an ἀλλότριον, "another's." As opposed to this, every the faintest spark of spiritual grace from the gift of God is πολύ, "much"; such possessions alone are the ἀληθινόν, "true," which never deceives (mark now ἄδικος μαμωνᾶ in opposition, manifestly equivalent to ἄδηλος ψευστής), and by right divine this only is essentially and eternally *our*

own. The *alien* earthly good, not a real *personal property*, which cannot become essentially our own,* changes its owners with every generation, when the inevitable ἐκλείπειν, "failing," asserts its rights: we dwell "in our houses" all of us only as tenants, and like those whom we receive (just as the תּוֹשָׁבִים before God, Psa. xxxix. 12) are only usufructuaries; and not indeed that with free discretion of our own, for we are *stewards*, and that which is another's is God's, who hath *entrusted* it to our fidelity, to be so faithfully employed as to win the nobler and only *real* good!† This indefinite neuter in τὸ ἀληθινόν, τὸ ὑμέτερον, "the true," "you own," stands emphatically significant, *intimating* that it is left to our own intelligence to observe *what that* means—for it is the discretion of *wisdom* which is here enjoined. But as soon as our right apprehension has reached this first stage, there is opened to it a new view. In the words of our Lord, which retain the wise indefiniteness of their *hinting* and *warning* character, the two contrasts of vers. 11, 12 do not remain strictly parallel, but the reference before intimated to a progressive *confirmation* of fidelity passes over to spiritual things also. It is most assuredly obvious that it is the gift of God's grace, the pound given wherewith to gain other, which the Lord terms τὸ ὑμέτερον; that is, according to Meyer's note—"that which is appropriate to your true nature, that which was originally (in the Creator's counsel), and shall be again (in redemption), your own, the true *dominium restituendum* of the lords of the earth created in the image of God, which was promised to the heirs of heaven by a θεὸς δώσει ὑμῖν" [God will give you]. Moreover, this critical *question* τίς ὑμῖν δώσει, "who will give you?" concerns not merely unfaithfulness in the use of earthly good, but unfaithfulness in regard to the earnest of that inheritance already received in the time of probation. Wilt thou certainly *retain* what thou hast, given to thee only preparatorily as a trust, and will God then one day give thee the full inheritance of eternal *life*?‡ Thus we see that even the *true riches* cannot become ours with perfect right and full possession, before we ourselves have become true or faithful; in the other case even the ἀληθινόν, "true," is taken from the unfaithful as being ἀλλότριον, "*another's*," instead of yielding up to them all its fulness. This is the progression of the double meaning in ver. 12 as following ver. 11; as this again finds its fundamental reason in ver. 10.

Verse 13. This saying, as reproduced here with great significance from the Sermon on the Mount, needs no further interpretation than we gave it there; as here uttered it forms a transition to those further repetitions of what had been earlier said, which the Lord, vers. 16-18, designedly here introduces. In this connection* it has two aspects; according to the one, it says (in Jensen's words)—"The servant of mammon makes (most unwisely!) that his master, which he, according to his true Master's design, should dispose of with absolute authority:" do ye make mammon subserve your eternal salvation! According to the other, it declares that *fidelity* consists in serving one Lord alone, and unfaithfulness in attempting to unite with it the service of another lord. Your true Lord is God, as your true good is the heavenly inheritance! By this, in conclusion, the discourse gives it to be understood that the entire parable and its doctrine were to apply *to the Pharisees also;* and hence ver. 14 springs up in immediate connection with these words, their ἐκμυκτηρίζειν, "murmuring," bursts forth, for their consciences convict them of being φιλάργυροι, "covetous." As it regards the contrasted and different yet essentially similar, position of the Publicans and Pharisees, between God and the world, Olshausen well says that "the former (that is, those who now turned to Christ) were outwardly most deeply involved in the world, but internally they were under the powerful influence of a longing for the divine; whereas the Pharisees, on the other hand, were outwardly linked with things divine, as the born representatives of the Theocracy, but their inward life was attached to the world, so that they turned their theocratical steward-relation to earthly ends." Thus the Lord's exhortation cries aloud to the hearts of *both*, to make their decision.

---

* As Beyschlag comments upon this saying, in the above-mentioned beautiful treatise—"Die Gütergemeinschaft im Lichte des Evangeliums" (Community of goods in the light of the Gospel), *Rhein. Monatschr.* 1850, 3: "Thou art Spirit and life, and therefore only by spirit and life to be enriched: earthly property is dead matter, which leaves thee in death, and then proves thee to have been a fool for having thought to make it thy own. Luke xii. 20."

† When Grotius translates ver. 11—the *true* mammon, or genuine possessions, he overlooks three things—that *mammon* in itself has been used already to describe the ἄδικον of earthly property, and cannot bear a good application; that μομωνᾶ as the name of an idol and master (in ver. 13 opposed to God) cannot bear a neuter adjective; and that τὸ ἀληθινόν is parallel with τὸ ἀλλότριον, ὑμέτερον, ver. 10 having begun these neuters. Erasmus has it correctly—quod verum est.

‡ To this essentially belongs, in the consummation and fulfilment of the προστεθήσεται, Matt. vi. 33, the possession of all the riches of the world in the restored powers of the spirit to which matter should ever be subservient; the dominion over the earth, and the heirship of all things glorified. "We cannot attain upon this earth to a perfect possession of our lost divine attributes and powers, because the Divinity may not *commit them to our trust* on account of our external nature" (Christianæ Käpplinger, *Beschreibungen über das Wesen der Gottheit*, etc., p. 63, comp. p. 91).

* For the sake of which the οἰκέτης is here appended, first of all (for it was to be supplied in Matt. vi. 24), equivalent to δοῦλος, in contrast with the κυρίοις; but then also at the same time as parallel with οἰκονόμος, who is no other than an οἰκέτης after all. This allusion to the *steward* is well preserved in Luther's "*Hausknecht*."

THE UNCONVERTED SINNER'S FIRST PUNISHMENT AMONG THE DEAD, AFTER REJECTING THE WORD OF REPENTANCE AND FAITH: THE RICH MAN IN TORMENTS, AND FATHER ABRAHAM.

(Luke xvi. 15–31.)

Every unprejudiced reader who is not under the mischievous influence of the fragment-hunting, disintegrating critics,* will observe that this parable stands in close connection with the former; and that their fundamental ideas lie so deep as to be perfectly one. The Pharisees also have discerned something, in what had been said, appropriate to themselves; for, they scornfully set their faces as if they would justify and exalt themselves: but it is shown only in their features and gesture, not as in chap. xv. 2 with a murmuring λέγειν, "saying;" it is as if they thought ταῦτα πάντα, "all these things," scarcely worth a word of reply, though in reality their courage was abashed. They would have said, if they could have uttered it: "Why all this trouble to teach such unjust Publicans as these a righteousness which we, the pious dispensers of alms, and we alone, have long exhibited?" while at the same time they were thinking in their hearts—"and we are shrewd enough, withal, shrewder than thou counsellest, for we can dexterously contrive to serve God and Mammon too!"† Such thoughts, however, must have been transmuted in their secret conscience into self-accusations, while the Lord, whom they had better understood than they professed, throws his clear, calm, and piercing words into the tumult and hypocrisy of their secret imaginations, directing to them immediately the discourse which had scarcely been suspended. Yea, verily, ye too may hear this; would that ye might! But ye will not receive counsel, ye will not be converted; though ye are ἐγγίζοντες (drawing near) where I teach, it is not for the sake of truly ἀκούειν or "hearing" but in order to γογγύζειν and ἐκμυκτηρίζειν (murmur). Ye are rich both in mammon and in righteousness; over whom, however, there is impending a miserable penury and failure of both! Thus does our Lord's discourse oscillate between the two parties around him: it passes from the penitent Publicans who condemn themselves, but whom God receives and justifies, once more to the impenitent self-righteous, who justify themselves while God knoweth their hearts, who will condemn and cast them down. On the one side are the Publicans, excluded from the rights of Israel, and contemptuously brought down to a level with the heathen; on the other the proud and secure *children of Abraham*, who have the word, but use it not for their salvation, who hear indeed, but *hear* not, who *believe* not, because they will not *repent*. Let it be observed, moreover, how, in this disclosed foundation of the whole discourse, the conclusion of chap. xvi. returns again into the beginning of chap. xv.; and let us note preliminarily what the wealth and sumptuous living of this man, with the frightful ἐκλείπειν or "failing" predicted against it, was designed to *signify* for the Pharisees and the ὑψηλόν of their καρδίαι (lofty thing of their hearts)! While it may here be presumed, from the analogy of the elder son in the former parable, that in the profoundest *background* a warning, threatening Love is still seeking their souls; yea, that the tormenting flame in Sheol, of which we shall afterwards hear, with the Τέκνον, μνήσθητι, "Son, remember," of Father Abraham, may actually summon even these to a late ἐρχεσθαι εἰς ἑαυτόν or *coming to oneself*, which the Publicans, entering into the kingdom of heaven before them, had already experienced for their good.

It will be seen that all the individual sayings, vers. 15–18 (which precede the last parable as an *explanatory* address, just as vers. 10–13 followed the middle one), are most accurately adapted to the innermost position of all. Possibly we have here an epitome of the chief points of the Lord's description, which had other links of connection;* though it is more probable that the whole was spoken by our Lord to these hearers in this unconnected and designedly enigmatical way, for the awakening of their attention and the rousing of their consciences.† "Yea, *ye are they* whom I mean, the so-called *righteous* (ch. xv. 7); who, however, before God are only on that account greater *sinners* in the pride of your hearts, an abomination instead of cause of rejoicing in heaven! ver. 15. *For* ye scorn and reject with hateful violence, and pervert in sinful transgression, that revelation of the truth and love of God which is brought plainly before your eyes. Law, Prophecy, and Gospel in their full inseparable harmony are exhibited to you in this day of grace, offer themselves to your acceptance—and ye despise the grace of the Gospel, ye

* The singular Sepp seems to have become one of these; for we find him saying: "The parable of the beggar Lazarus seems as if it had dropped down unintroduced from heaven among the other *disjecta membra* of the discourse!"

† This seems more probable than the intimation in Braune: "He makes light of riches, for he is poor: let him talk ever so long, he will accomplish nothing!" The reply to their secret thought, ver. 15, will not suit the supposition that such was its tenor.

* Not, indeed, as Von Gerlach too strongly says—a brief hint of a much longer reproof.

† Schleiermacher on this occasion says correctly—"Christ had only to hint what to his immediate hearers would be, if only half-spoken, much more intelligible than to us."

break the truth of the law!"* The former is the *βιάζεσθαι εἰς αὐτήν, pressing into it*, of ver. 16. The latter follows in vers. 17, 18. "For *why* is it that ye revolt against the preached kingdom of God? Because ye perceive and have heard from my lips, that in that preaching the law is not and cannot be abolished, but *fulfilled*, ver. 17. But ye have never humbled yourselves under the law, your hearts being filled with pride, unfaithfulness, hypocrisy, and adultery; ye have perverted and broken it (like false stewards of the *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ* or oracles of God), for the gratification of your lust and avarice, and for your own base political ends!" This will approve itself finally as the true meaning of ver. 18.

Verse 15. The *δικαιοῦν ἑαυτούς*, "justifying themselves" (comp. ch. x. 29), is the *trusting in themselves* that they are righteous (ch. xviii. 9) which, however, does not fully sustain itself in their consciences before God; hence they all the more anxiously seek to justify themselves, exhibit themselves as righteous, and acquire the reputation of being such *before men*. Fundamentally no man *can* justify himself before *God* (however daringly he may use the language of ch. xv. 29, and xviii. 11)—for God *knoweth the hearts* of all (Psa. vii. 10; 1 Kings viii. 39): he who will absolve *himself* is, nevertheless and on that very account, not absolved of God. This *ὑψηλόν*, "that which is highly esteemed," as being the most essential, inmost idolatry, is the essential *βδέλυγμα* "abomination," in his sight (Rom. ii. 22). *Τὸ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὑψηλόν*, "that which is highly esteemed *among men*," is by no means altogether parallel with, and the same as, *ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, "*before* men," before, although the opposite is set down again as *ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*, "in the sight of God;" but as the Lord had just been speaking of their *hearts*, it means that pride of spirit which was actually present *in* these perverted and corrupted *ἄνθρωποι*, "*men*"; and it is this alone which is the abominable thing in the sight of that God who looketh at the heart and not at the outward appearance† (Prov. vi. 16, 17, xxix. 23). But this pride of heart exhibits itself in a twofold manner, inasmuch as they who are inwardly lifted up make themselves great *before* other men, and further celebrate and magnify (enviously, yet admitting it) the external, or self-arrogated loftiness *in* others: *so far ἐν ἀνθρώποις*, "among men," includes (with a natural double-meaning which occurs elsewhere) the *ὑψηλόν* "highly esteemed" *among* and *before* men, both at the same time; as the Vulgate endeavors to express it by *hominibus*. Much that is extolled by men, yea, all that regards this outward commendation alone, is most highly offensive to the God who searcheth the heart (1 Sam. xvi. 7). Thus it is here—"*that which men* regard as highly estimable in you," just as foolishly as ye seek their high estimation. The *reason* of this, however, remains: That which is *high*, ironically spoken, that is, what would be high and exalt itself (without being raised up on high by God, 2 Sam. xxiii. 1), and thus rob the only lofty One of his honor; that it is which is abomination and idolatry in his sight. This is the *ὕψωμα*, "high thing," of 2 Cor. x. 5, and thus appears the loftiest *human* virtue and "righteousness" to be no more than a wicked pride of heart! Before grace has humbled and justified and exalted the abased sinner, all the highest excellencies to which any man may have attained, however they may have exalted him in his own estimation, or given him value in the estimation of his fellow-worms, are but *τὸ ὑψηλόν* (the *lofty* thing), abomination in the sight of God. (So does John Newton, in his letters, pertinently expound our text.) Thus profoundly does our Lord's first word penetrate the hearts of these unhappy sinners, to whom he speaks "as unto wise men," with his piercing—"God knoweth *your* hearts!"

Verse 16. Let the reader consult our exposition of Matt. xi. 12, 13. The *ἕως Ἰωάννου*, "until John" (which in its conciseness emphatically refers to something well-known, and already before urged against them), must not be supplemented by merely supplying—"*were valid* till John" (then being abolished, against which ver. 17 protests); nor will it help the meaning to insert *κυριεύουσι, δεσποτίζουσι, rule*, as if the contrast were simply between the rigor of the law and the mildness of the Gospel (for the *Prophets* are not without gentle consolation); but the right complement, the true antitheton to *εὐαγγελίζεται*, "is preached," is already in Matthew *προεφήτευσαν*, "prophesied," which has been consequently inserted in some codd. as a gloss.* But this *προφητεύειν*, "prophesying" (of which Rom. iii. 21 also speaks), is assuredly a *preparation*, since the *law* and the prophets together do what John does at the end—prepare the way for the grace of Christ, and that preëminently by *humbling* to *repentance*. The *ὑψηλόν* or self-esteem of the Pharisees had never submitted to that; they cannot, therefore, and they will not comprehend or tolerate the kingdom of God which, with its preaching to the poor, plainly declares itself to be the fulfilment and realization of all that had gone before; but it may be said of them in a bad sense—*πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται*, "every one

* Roos: Ye are a people prepared neither for the old time nor for the new!

† Thus it is far from intimating what has been superficially extracted from it—that the high, eminent, and rich as such, kings, and masters on their seats, are despicable before God! Schleiermacher would find here an oblique glance at Herod, such as might with some reason be applicable to ver. 18. A large portion of the Pharisees were his sycophantic adherents; and it is supposed that the Lord would bring it to their minds, that while they were despising the Publicans on account of their serving Rome, they themselves occupied a similar relation to the untheocratic dominion of the Idumæan family.

* Schleiermacher supplies insufficiently—*ὁ νόμος . . . . ἐκυρίευσε, ἰσχυσε*, for this is not the true "antithesis of *εὐαγγελίζεται*."

presseth into it." We shall not now repeat what was said on page 203 to justify this interpretation as necessary for the passage here: it is obviously required by the δέ, "and," of ver. 17, and the entire connection as it appears when closely examined. Thus the πᾶς, "every man," in a certain sense corresponds with the πάντες, "all," of chap. xv. 1, but by way of contrast—"Among *you* there is *not one* that repenteth to the joy of angels; *every one* of you, rather, that is, the first, the best, acts in refractory opposition. *Ye* rebel and strive mightily against the kingdom of God—instead of using a nobler violence in prayer, and striving to enter into it—in spite of its being the fulfilment of all preparation and prophecy, the end of all your service of God (Acts xxvi. 6, 7), and of its gracious *evangelical* announcement of itself.* Ye think, in your scorn, that such a Gospel and such a kingdom is only fit for publicans and harlots. But *ye* are no sinners! Is it so? How stands it between you and *the law*, which ye set against my Gospel, and which ye condemn me for breaking?"

Verses 17, 18. Ye know by the exhibition of my leading principles given on the Mount, or if ye have forgotten I repeat it to you, that —I am not come to abolish but to fulfil the law! We do not make void the law through faith—this must be ever an impossibility before God. Here we have the *strongest* formula with an εὐκοπώτερον, "easier," which exalts most emphatically the minimum of "moral order" (to speak in modern terms) above the maximum or totality of the physical system of nature: rather would God destroy his entire universe than suffer one tittle of his law to fall away.† Observe the great contrast between παρελθεῖν (vanish away, pass, go out of existence) with the simple πεσεῖν or ἐκπεσεῖν, become invalidated, or remain unfulfilled (Rom. ix. 6; 1 Cor. xiii. 8; 2 Kings x. 10; Josh. xxi. 45, xxiii. 14). "And as it does not enter my mind to desire that which is impossible before God, to relax any of those essential, permanent obligations and requirements of the law, in the case of those sinners whom I so graciously receive as my disciples, and continue so condescendingly to teach (so, *e.g.*, counselling them no unrighteousness)—so no more shall *ye* be able, with your βιάζεσθαι or *pressing*, either to endanger the *kingdom* of God, or to *do away with* one tittle of the law which in that kingdom is to be established and confirmed. Though ye are actually striving, as much as in you lies, in your cunning to do both: ye revolt not less against the law than against my Gospel, ye keep not but violate the commandments of God. This very law which ye hold up to confront me, will nevertheless remain in force an will condemn you with its *eternal*, inevitable, righteous requital, *ye adulterers!*" This gives us the transition to ver. 18, which seems so singularly unconnected, and in which Olshausen, despairing to trace any connection in its literal sense, would find a figure analogous to Rom. vii. 1–4: Ye have become divorced from the law as from a wife. (On which view the marrying of this divorced wife in the second clause would not simply be superfluous, but meaningless: for his interpretation of this—that while they divorced themselves from the law in its spiritual and eternal significance, they nevertheless married it again in its transitory aspect, holding the Old Testament economy in that externality to which they had first reduced it—is most strangely forced and artificial.) We have only simply to bear in mind that the oriental and scriptural style of teaching, especially when dealing in gnomes and words of cutting reproof, does not expressly interject the connecting words, which, however, we must supply. Here it should be: "*As for an example* your disorderly divorces, which I have only to mention as exhibiting your laxity of practice (as was said before, Matt. v. 31), which the inviolable law, confirmed with new force by me, condemns."* This demonstration was all the more intelligible to *them*, because, only a short time before, their national judicature, receding from the high standard of the law of God, had tolerated the public scandal which Herod's marriage with his brother's wife had occasioned. (Tertullian found an allusion here to this occurrence.) Thus the reference which Schleiermacher would assign to the whole discourse, will hold good so far at least as this outrage of Herod gave a pertinent exemplification. This circumstance stood in close connection with the death of John just-mentioned, and the end of his ministry (by which the way was prepared for the kingdom of God and the preaching of the Gospel); *they* had not, like *John*, done their duty and boldly said to the adulterer upon the throne—It is not lawful! The πᾶς, "every man," thus obtains the force of—"even if it were the king;" similarly the striking ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρός, "divorced *from* her husband," instead of ὑπό, "by," does not merely strongly emphasize the invalidity of the divorce, but includes the circumstance in connection with Herod's crime, that a woman herself had abandoned her husband.

We are by no means to suppose that the rich man of the parable was a Sadducee, as many have thoughtlessly assumed; for vers. 29 and 31 would then be quite inapplicable. But the Lord seems to say: "Ye Pharisees *live* a Sadducean life like Herod and his adherents, with whom ye quarrel about the law and the prophets, and the life which is after death; ye live

* Roos would very artificially defend the interpretation of Luther, which is not in harmony with the connection—"Every man—save you, presseth in." This needs no refutation; let who may supply it!

† See, moreover, the exposition of this saying in all its breadth and depth on the parallel passages of Matthew.

* Roos thinks that it was not necessary *here* for our Lord to insert any condition or exception (as in Matt. xix. 9, v. 32), because *their* divorces were altogether, and as a whole, adulterous. We have corrected this on page 66.

as if there were none, ye do not *hear* the word which ye possess and which ye deal in—ye clothe yourselves and eat and drink very differently from the preacher of repentance." Then follows the last *parable* of this trilogy, which with its *ἀνθρωπος δέ τις ἦν*, "[now] there was a certain man" (only observed, so far as we have seen, by J. Von Müller), follows in immediate connection:* "*But* how is it with you and how will it be? *Hear* yet one thing more, in addition to all this, your own history—and even down to Hades—if ye will continue to be rich and highly esteemed upon earth!"† This parable, with its progressive application to the Pharisees instead of the Publicans, joins on to the beginning and end of the preceding one, inasmuch as it shows a *πλούσιος* or "rich man" in his *ἐκλείπειν* or "failing"; but it descends therewith into the kingdom of the dead, just as the first had gone up into heaven: Joy in heaven—*Torment in hell!* It depicts the torments endured there by one who had been a luxurious sinner upon earth, who had refused to abase himself, but had remained impenitent and unbelieving to the end; and depicts it most awfully, if, peradventure, the word may yet pierce their hearts, by the double *contrast* with the comfort *there* of the pious man who had been so miserable *here*. And although there might be involved an intimation that love, even in those depths, had not utterly given up the sinner, but was still *seeking* to bring him to *reflection;* yet here, in these words of father Abraham to the *νῦν δέ* ("but now") rejected son, as before in the great Father's words to the elder son who had remained in the house, the *warning* against *unbelief* sounds out much more distinctively in the ears of these Jews, against that unbelief which, in its process of hardening, had deserved such doom, and brought the impenitent man to the flame which held out small prospect of any further salutary *μιμνήσκεσθαι* and *μετανοεῖν* ("remembering" and "repenting").‡

In the *first* and briefer *portion* of the parable, the scene of which is still upon earth, there is exhibited before our eyes a rich man living in carnality and all the enjoyment of life, as an unfaithful steward of the law and the prophets, an unbelieving servant of Mammon—in the sharpest contrast with a poor, despised, righteous man; towards whom he does not act as the preceding parable required, and therefore constantly accumulates guilt. The *inward character* of both is only hinted at; just as their private thoughts and dispositions were concealed from the sight of men till the time came when the vail of perverting appearances falls off, and each takes his true place and condition. First we have this unnamed and yet well-known rich man's condition and manner of life, indicating the *end for which he lived*, ver. 19. Over against him is the helpless *God-help*, as his name written in heaven declares him to be, ver. 20. Then in ver. 21 we have the relation of one to the other; wherein, again, the piety of the poor man, and the neglect of the rich man, are preliminarily *hinted* at. But now comes the suddenly disclosed *second* part, the essential heart of the parable—"a narrative, with its scene laid in that other world; and which, if Christ were speaking in our day, would be called by our polyhistors a *romance of heaven*" (as Kleuker says)—we would say rather, a romance of *hell!* For although it is certainly true—"so much that is deep, true, and transcendently suggestive is said of the two great regions of the other world, that every stroke of the delineation becomes the basis of a widely extended system"—yet the man in his *torment* must ever be the prominent central figure: the dead and buried unbeliever (whom the generation of the children of this world, and all his brothers above esteem meanwhile, according to Psa. xlix. 13, 14, to be happy and approve his sayings) in the torments of the kingdom of death. What a picture, and with what sublime assurance and repose presented!*

Again there are two parts: the former brief and transitional, the other being the proper and most important *scene*, most dramatically developed. First is the *change of circumstances* gen-

---

* For this *δέ* in the middle of the discourse is something quite different from that in *εἶπε δέ, ἔλεγε δὲ καί*—see *e.g.* similarly at chap. xvii. 1.

† Though this parable may possibly be fashioned upon other similar narratives used in the teaching of that age, yet we find in it abundance of what is proper to itself, and profoundly new, down to the *κεραία*. It is the blending of given elements, the arrangement and harmonising of the simple groundnotes everywhere heard, that exhibits the master of composition.

‡ A friend made me acquainted, during the publication of the first edition, with a sermon of the excellent Harms on the first Sunday after Trinity, which represents this Gospel as being inopportune and alien to *such a season*. But this alien out of Hades vindicates his own significance. As the portion selected for Trinity Sunday itself, refers to the *inscrutableness* of the ways and of the nature of God, and to the *new birth*, in which alone we can practically know the Three-One; so the institution of the Church begins with that high teaching which places this world in its true relation to the next, warning us that the exhortation of the *Holy Ghost* to repentance towards God and that faith in Christ which exercises itself in love to the brethren (comp. the Epistle, 1 John iv. 16–21), is contained in that *word* which we already *have*. This is a better vindication of the Gospel and Epistle than that which Strauss in his "Kirchenjahr" gives; comp. Nitzsch (*Prakt. Theol.* ii. 2, 391) who refers to "circumstances unknown to us" as the ground of the selection.

* To quote Kleuker (*Menschl. Vers. über d. Sohn Gottes*. p. 194) once more: "It was not possible that Jesus should assume, for its own sake, a mien of mystery, or aim to create a mere vacant astonishment, or use the tone of affected lamentation: for he spoke out of his own nature, even as Æsop did when he made his lions, asses, nightingales, and trees speak; and it was not his aim to make proselytes to *faith* by prodigies exhibited to the eye, any more than by those uttered to the ear."

erally, with the ever impending *ἐγένετο δὲ ἀποθανεῖν*, "and it came to pass that he died," of every-day life; the one in Abraham's bosom, the other shut out from the place of happiness which he beholds, and in torment, vers. 22, 23. Then follows the more detailed elucidation of the *kind*, the *design*, and the *reason* of this torment, given in a parabolical colloquy between the tormented one and father Abraham, to whom he appeals in vain. Two supplications are rejected. The former, for ever so slight a *mitigation* of the righteously ordained punishment, contains in itself an intimation of the *kind*, and receives for answer a hinted explanation of the *end*, of this torment. In the prayer, ver. 24, it exhibited itself as the pain of *deprivation*, connected with a consciousness of guilt (clinging, however, to the slender service once rendered in the crumbs which had been thrown out), but *without* any application to the alone-helping mercy *of God*.* The repelling answer, vers. 25, 26, hints at the justice and well-adjusted design of love, in the torments which *for the present* are rigidly fixed. In the second colloquy the *ground* of guiltiness is referred to: the request for *extraordinary revelation* to his brethren (which hardly conceals his own stiff-necked apology for himself as having lacked it) is rejected with a reference to *the word which was in their hands*. The request of vers. 27, 28 exhibits as well the blindness and obduracy of the offender, as his distinct consideration and reflection upon all things, and even his knowledge of the nature of repentance. The refusing father Abraham must now give two answers, for the colloquy deepens into an objection and contradiction on the part of him who is made wiser in his flames. The *first reply* points generally to the *hearing* and acceptance of that which before Christ had been given to Israel, as sufficing to lead to Abraham's bosom, ver. 29. But when the *objection*, ver. 30, carries self-justification even to this point, even while its contradiction condemns itself (for in his blindness concerning the saving ordinance of faith there is yet a knowledge of the way of repentance, in which man learns to understand faith), there follows finally the conclusive answer to the whole—*faith* in order to *repentance*, that alone can preserve the soul from future torment.† But these two things are intimated: that God's love furnishes the most superabounding means of grace, and that these are in vain to the unbelief which has been before hardened into reprobation. "Hence then, ye Pharisees, be taught by your Abraham, and use that which ye already *have*, from his time down to John, in order that ye may believe the gospel of the kingdom (ver. 16), and in him who will rise from the dead.

Verse 19. A *rich man:* "such as we *beati possidentes* (blessed with possessions), whom thou, poor Messiah, rebukest, because thou hast nothing thyself"—might these bold mockers have thought within themselves, unless our Lord's previous words had humbled them too much. A *rich man:* "as that word is used in the Scriptures from Job's time, with the bad and almost *godless* meaning attached to it in the Psalms and the Proverbs by the rich David and Solomon"—would attentive and observant hearers begin to suspect. A *rich man:* "such as the great Sermon, Luke vi. 24, had denounced a woe upon"—would the Apostles probably and other disciples interpret the words, at once discerning the aim of their Master's discourse. (Matt. xix. 23 had not yet been uttered.) *Ἄνθρωπός τις ἦν πλούσιος*, "There was a certain rich man"—altogether like ver. 1 before; for all *ἄνθρωποι* or *men* are only stewards of One above themselves, the only God, but this one acts the God himself, and as man thinks himself in the place of God. Nullum adest vestigium vel mentio transitus ullius a Pharisæis ad Sadducæos (there is no mark or mention here of any transition from the Pharisees to the Sadducees)—remarks Bengel quite correctly; but it is equally clear that this Pharisee lives *as a Sadducee*, and consequently the thoughts of his heart are such as will hereafter be discovered to be pure scepticism or *not believing*. He is simply a man of this world, a sensual lover of the good things of life (*ἐτρυφήσατε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐσπαταλήσατε*, James v. 5), knowing nothing about administering God's goods as a *steward;* he makes good living the end of life, his heart is altogether immersed in its pomp and luxuriance, and hence there is nothing more just at this point to be said concerning him. The vain preëminence of apparel is first mentioned, for this with eating and drinking is the heathenish ambition of his mammon; and his one great care is to carry both to the loftiest pitch *in the sight of men*, as if for his own precious soul. He feeds with the swine of the earth and is perfectly content; therefore has he every day his merry companions around him (*εὐφραίνεσθαι*, as ch. xv. 23, 29): and it is all *λαμπρῶς*, "sumptuously," too, so that he does not merely riot, but ostentatiously exhibits his riches and his costly apparel, like King Ahasuerus of old: if his seats are not of gold, his vessels are; if his curtains and fringes are not of fine linen, these adorn his own great person. These are all fine strokes in the delineation, each having its significance. The purple was the coloring of a woolen fabric, the byssus or fine linen was weighed against gold by reason of its resplendent whiteness. The combination not only was beautiful (hence they are always united, from Esth. i. 6, viii. 15, with *blue* and *white*, down to Rev. xviii. 12);

---

* It is only the addition of this third which makes the pains of hell: the two former had been experienced both by Lazarus and the prodigal.

† How can any one help seeing this, clearly as it stands before us! We protest again and again against the ever-recurring interpretation, that the unjust steward exhibits the "blessedness of charity"—and the rich man "the curse of selfishness."

but it was the emblem of high dignity, so that kings and priests could not outvie this fortunate one, who though neither of these himself, was a rich man to whom everything was accessible and conceded. It never occurs to his mind to think how many Lazaruses he might have clothed with the price of his sumptuous array. Moreover, he is not a mean and parsimonious man, for he enjoys his substance, parts with it freely, and has open house with grateful guests always round his table; neither is anything said of *ἀδικία* or "unrighteousness" in the acquisition of his wealth, or of any obvious want of charity or mercilessness; nothing of notorious sins or blasphemy, although he is depicted with accuracy down to his clothing: so that we may not unnecessarily imagine anything of this kind. Thus he lives and gliters *λαμπρῶς*, "sumptuously," in his royal magnificance *καθ' ἡμέραν*, "every day," as if his days would never come to an end, a blind *φρονιμώτατος εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ* (most wise one in his generation). The people deem him fortunate and happy: and many look enviously at his palace.*

Verses 20, 21. And now in strongest contrast, in a certain sense (to quote Neander) "serving as a foil to a worldly rich man," we have a pious man "stripped of *all* temporal good" in the profoundest and most abject misery; on both sides there is a description, as the *καθ' ἡμέραν* "every day," previously taught, of a permanent condition and state of mind. But the *πτωχός τις*, or "certain beggar" has a *name*, for his name alone is written before God and mentioned with honor by Christ—such is the first and most obvious meaning of this most striking designation by name in the middle of a parable. Or might it be implied thereby that in this case the parable actually presents a historical fact? Is the name mentioned by Jesus "as the authentication of an actual incident?" (Roos). The fathers many of them were of that opinion, and Theophylact found evidence that there was at that time in Jerusalem such a well-known Lazarus. Calvin is very decided on the same side, on the ground that throughout the entire Scriptures we never find a man mentioned by *name* in a *parable;* but this is not sufficient reason to reject what may be a solitary exception. It is *possible* that Christ may have seen such an occurrence, not merely including the death of both, and the funeral pomp of the one, but even the recorded continuation in the other world which was not hidden from his eye; but it is highly improbable and out of keeping, to suppose that he would single out and make prominent by *name* one case out of many similar constantly occurring, as if it had been a *rare* and *special* event. Further, if the poor Lazarus had been a notorious person, he would scarcely have been found remaining to the end at the gate with the dogs; and the publicity of his name would be opposed to that *obscurity* and *forgotten condition* among men which the Lord evidently intends to mark as the principal feature of his case in this world. Finally, if Lazarus must be regarded as a historical personage, much more must the rich with his *five brethren:* this appearance of reality in the narrative has been seized upon by many, but the truth will be seen when we come to consider ver. 28. Though the Lord might assuredly have sometimes incorporated true histories in his parables (in the higher sense they are all such); yet must we maintain, on the other hand, that in *no* parable did he ever specify any one single circumstance of actuality alone.

This poor man *lay* before the rich man's door, or properly *πυλών*, that is, the chief entrance and colonnade of his palace; *ἐβέβλητο* means more exactly that he was *cast down* there (as *βέβλημαι* is used of the sick, whom their sickness casts down, Matt. viii. 6, 14; Mark vii. 30). Here there is possibly an additional emphasis—He was laid there by the people, who thus discharged themselves of their obligation; pacifying their consciences by placing him at the *rich man's* gate: "Let him behold the poor man as he goes in and out; let him see before his very eyes what kind of people there are in the neighborhood of his rich house, and *take him in!*" But the rich man did not take the advice of Ecclus. xiv. 13–17, although the misery and end of man was thus daily obtruded before his eyes: it is a plain indication of his guilt that there Lazarus *καθ' ἡμέραν*, "every day," *lay* and continued to lie. For it is the permanent condition of the poor man which is depicted in the parable; not that he was often laid before the gate of the rich man (as Von Gerlach says)—but he was thrown there once for all. To lie excluded in the dust before the door of the festal conviviality—that was *his* dwelling: ulcers which he cannot hide, and which invite the dogs—these were his covering (*full* of sores for *ἠλκωμένος*), this his costly attire: a craving for crumbs, which at least was never fully satisfied—this was his banquet! Naked, outcast, forsaken and hungry, withal in the skin of Job! All this obviously paints only his outward *condition*, but it intimates at the same time his *frame of mind;* and both are exhibited to us in the *symbolical*, therefore not historical but parabolical, *name*. That name is probably a Græcised אֶלְעָזָר,* (*God helped*),

† Professor Weisse doubts not—if we may quote such words—that "this perverse description must be put to the Evangelist's account, who would not lose such an opportunity of venting his spleen against the rich and distinguished in this world." But where do we find a word about "the rich man being punished *only* for his riches, the poor man rewarded *only* on account of his poverty?" What doctrine can be found here which is "more poor and barren than the coarsest heathen notions of moral retribution after death!" Would that these worthies would only *read* in the New Testament what they find written there!

* Which is nearer to the form Λάζαρος than אֱלִיעֶזֶר, *Eliezer*, Abraham's servant, to whom many refer the allusion (as the hero of many Jewish tales) —on the other hand many of the fathers correctly speak, in connection with this parable, of the poor Eleazar.

Eleazar, but it also has the sound of לֹא עֵזֹר (Chald. לָא) *no-help*, and thus describes, by its double-meaning, both the external appearance and the inner state of the man so named: before men he is *helpless*, and he is at the same time thrown before the gate of his mercy for *God to help*. He now sees afar off the table at which he could not sit, and from which he could not eat; the converse of what afterwards took place. The learned are still contending whether any crumbs fell from that table for him; but they should reflect that according to the whole cast of the parable the man does not linger a few days and then *die of hunger* (which would have been recorded as the climax of his misery); consequently his ἐπιθυμεῖν, "desiring," must have received *something* to appease it, by which it was only not satisfied even to χορτασθῆναι, "being filled." Neander is wrong when he says that in his pining hunger he longed *in vain* for a crumb. Many Codices would repeat here the καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδίδου αὐτῷ, "and no man gave unto him," from ch. xv. 16 (Vulg. "et nemo illi dabat"); but that is evidently an uncorrected gloss. It is to be taken for granted that he enjoyed something, though *only* and *hardly* the crumbs which sympathising servants might gather from the leavings of the rich man's table: for it his habitual condition which is here depicted. He is at least tolerated before the gate, is not cast aside as being in the way; but neither is he lifted up into a better place, where he might receive better attendance: the rich man must have seen him just as in hell it was brought to his remembrance, but only with absolute *indifference;* full of himself he troubled himself about no one else. He certainly did not himself send him the crumbs. He did not command the offensive exhibition to be removed out of his way: for nothing availed to carry trouble to the hard heart which was covered with purple and fine linen; warmed indeed with wine, but cold to all sympathy. He did not say, in passing, to any of the people who with alacrity did his bidding—Take this hideous object away; the servants without any merit of his, threw to him the scanty ψιχίον or "crumb" occasionally; but the meanest kennel of their master was too good for him to be brought under its roof. Then come out to him *the dogs*, which had more than crumbs for their fare (as many a rich lord now-a-days fattens his horses and dogs instead of feeding the poor),* supplying the lack of *men:* this is the obvious meaning of this trait of contrast in the picture, and settles the question raised by the critics whether their licking was sympathy or greed, mitigation or exasperation of his pains. *The* dogs (with the article) are not merely animals as opposed to men, the unowned and hungry street-dogs of the East (Psa. lix. 15, 16), who might not only have licked his sores, but done far worse to him; but they belong to the house and establishment of the rich man, as Matt. xv. 27 teaches us that even in the East other dogs had "their masters." These *know* him, according to the wont of dogs, and their half-friendly, half-instinctive, dog-nature proves itself (unconsciously, of course, in this rebuking *figure*) more full of sympathy than the swine-nature of their lord, thinking of nothing but the trough. Olshausen thinks that their licking the wounds denoted their eagerness and greediness rather than their sympathy, because *dogs* bear in the Old and New Testament a character exclusively evil, and certainly are never used as the symbol of fidelity or even kindness; but to this we reply that they are not said as dogs to be thus sympathetic, but (and let this exquisite touch in the signification not escape us) their true Master sends them to his poor Lazarus, because there is no one to bind up and mollify his wounds; just as aforetime he sent the *ravens* to feed the Prophet.* "To make his sufferings endurable to Lazarus, it pleased Providence to make the dogs propitious to him: and thus to put men to shame who abandoned him in his misery" (Müralt in a passage to be quoted again). So that Bengel is not correct here—ἐρχόμενοι, venientes, non Lazari sed suâ causâ, quasi cadaver esset (*came* not for the sake of Lazarus, but their own; as if he had been a dead body); and afterwards —"dolorem exasperant" (they exasperate his pain).† For, as dogs solace their own sores, so their licking would mitigate the smart of the wounds of Lazarus. Finally, that our Lord did mean to express alleviation *we* are convinced by the ἀπέλειχον, "licked," itself; and still more clearly by the decisive ἀλλὰ καί, "moreover," which would be meaningless if an exacerbation of his pain was intended.‡ The poor abject man cannot drive the dogs away, nor would he, for they do him good; if he could only get *food* enough—that remains his only desire and lack, more humanly expressed than a similar one of the lost son, ch. xv. 16, who even amid his husks thinks still of his former good fare, while he is compelled to discover what does really satisfy and what does not.

Might not this Lazarus, then, be a sinner in this state? Oh yes, for he might have raged and blasphemed in his heart, as it is in Rev. xvi. 9–11; he might have given way to murmuring and envy; he might have *cried aloud* for the help which was due to him while there remained any breath in his body. But all this is denied of him in the narrative; his calm

* My *practical* theological readers may be supposed to know Pestalozzi's *Leinhard und Gertrud*. This will remind them of it. That little book does not teach sound dogmatics, but there is much good in it, which they may comprehend and apply better than Pestalozzi himself.

* Melancthon adduced this parallel.

† Gersdorf and many others: They increased the misery of his situation! Stein thinks that this would give the best point of connection for the cessation of his troubles and miseries in ver. 22: but there was misery enough before, and without this, as we know full well.

‡ How this ἀλλὰ καί designates the dogs "as wretched competitors of the helpless man," I cannot understand, though Lange says it.

patience, which we all the more are conscious of because it takes no pains to exhibit itself, and into which his wounds and sores have purified the soul which had been rebellious and sinful before, is intimated in that single word ἐπιθυμῶν, "desiring," which is far from being "almost without specific meaning," and indicates *far more* than the circumstance (as Ebrard thinks) that he failed to get any supply. He did not, indeed, get enough to supply and assuage his need: but that he only *desired* that partial supply, that he was content to eat it with the dog as with a companion, that he did not envy or condemn the rich man within the house before him, that he did not murmur and send forth his cries, but only sighed out his unsatisfied hunger—all this is the essential grandeur and glory of this wretched man's character, who lies there with *his sores* (mentioned, at the end, as his only heritage) a mass of misery, in that profoundest distress which makes death welcome (Ecclus. xli. 1, 2), and of whom it is not once said that he had *desired* deliverance or death. For in his self-abasement, Abraham's bosom was not counted upon so assuredly as it was by the rich man in his blinded pride.

Verse 22. So much the nearer *to him* was the redemption and consolation which awaited him, and for which he in patience waited: but to the other the torment of want! *But it came to pass:* by this trivial formula of narration (corresponding to the former—*There was a certain*) is designedly introduced their *dying;* that great transition, and reversal of positions for eternity which in this great world of confusion is daily taking place; of as universal occurrence as the contrast everywhere seen between rich and poor, and which the commerce of the world is constantly rendering more wide, can make it. He who upon earth was number two, nay, the lowest of all in the roll, has now the *precedence*, for his comfort makes haste. The beggar *died*—how do we rejoice in this as the end of all his trial and need! But his sorrow, tribulation, and misery are to come to a blessed and *joyful* end. There follows immediately something transcendently beyond that. What became of his body, from which the scent of corruption already issues; whether there is any one to say—Let us *bury* the body, or whether the corpse is again contumeliously *thrown* anywhere, is not now recorded, for it is no more matter of concernment *to him. The essential Lazarus*, who was in that body—καὶ αὐτόν, "and [*he*]," sublimely recognises a personal immortal continuance of being, according to the simple *consensus gentium* in human language—is suddenly given to the charge of other hands, and transferred to other regions. He had no brothers upon earth like the rich man, nor had he any friends, nor any mammon with which to make himself friends; but the *dogs* give place to the *angels*, who had long ago rejoiced over the repentance, and afterwards over the patience of this sinner, waiting upon it with longing, those ministering spirits of the most miserable man who should ever inherit blessedness, and expecting their permission to carry him there. They appear, as it were, attendants and helpers in his real birth into *life*. He who had lain there forsaken, is now *carried*, carefully, tenderly, and with high honor, so that no finger may come too near to the wounds of the soul (corresponding in susceptibility with those of the body), in the moment of their eternal healing. One angel, as Chrysostom preaches, would have been strong enough for this service, but it is the joy and emulation of the angels in common to bring one sinner out of his last prison-house into the wealthy place. They carry him *into Abraham's bosom*, which was most probably already in Christ's time the Jewish designation of the place of the blessed fathers in Hades,* since we can hardly suppose that our Lord is here introducing a new designation. As John lay at the table ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, "on the breast of Jesus," and the eternal Son himself, before time began, was εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, "in the bosom of the Father," so shall they that are of faith be blessed with faithful Abraham (Gal. iii. 9), who is called the father of them all, and can receive them into everlasting habitations. (Hence ver. 23, ἐν τοῖς κόλποις which at the same time includes the idea of fellowship.) The outcast has the most exalted ministry and fellowship: the abandoned one enjoys the most intimate communion with all the princes of God, in whom Israel boasted. This is very different from lying at the gate upon earth, and is even more than only sitting at the table with Abraham, Matt. viii. 11 (which *meal*, moreover, has another reference, and belongs to the βασιλεία or "*kingdom*" upon earth, not to the other world; hence Bengel is inexact when he says—"sinus præsupponit convivium; convivium, regnum *cœlorum*" [the bosom presupposes the feast; the feast the kingdom of *heaven*]—for here the discourse is of Hades).

But the rich man *also* died, not merely when his time came as it cometh to all (Job xxi. 23–26), but, as the condensed narrative signifies, only a little afterwards; his death speedily ensued. This Lazarus before his gate was probably the final probation of his life, to try whether such a sight would move him to reflection; or was he the last and only *intercessor* who lengthened his day of grace, for the crumbs' sake, which were imparted to him? Suffice it that he *died:* the bitterness of his death is veiled—how under his silken covering he found that medicaments could not save him, how he thought one moment with the heathen king Agag that the bitterness of death was past, and in the next was ruthlessly seized by the unflattering devil and hurried away.† And was *buried*—

* According to Lightfoot, בְּחֵיק שֶׁל אַבְרָהָם (in the bosom of Abraham) was equivalent to Paradise.

† A question which may be passed over by him whom it offends! In the case of Lazarus the carrying away of the soul by the angels takes place immediately after his dying; in the case of the rich man, the burying comes between the death and the

doubtless with great pomp and splendor, which however in vain would conceal his equality with the poor beggar in death; if funeral orations and monumental inscriptions had been in vogue then, in both it would have been said—Here rests one, who is now eating and drinking at a higher table in Abraham's bosom! Such was the last of him; hurried away with such fatal falsehoods in his ears, there soon remains of him upon earth only—There *was* a certain rich man; till that itself, with his name, is forgotten. And is the history ended when we hear that he also *died?* Oh no! as in relation to the dying *and* the being buried, so now there follows yet one more fearful and direful *and.*

Verse 23. And *in hell*—that is, in the realm of the dead, in the other world—it was otherwise with both respectively; the happy man is now in torments, the miserable man in Abraham's bosom. And both *immediately*, without any sleep of the soul or any pause of interval—their *dying* is the turning-point of their destiny. A common realm of the dead, in which here first both are found, is intended in this expression; and they who regard ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ, "in hell," as already equivalent to ἐν βασάνοις, "in torment," and as the antithesis of κόλπος Ἀβραάμ, "Abraham's bosom," do so simply because they do not understand what ᾅδης or שְׁאוֹל, "hell," is. The same Lord Jesus Christ who speaks in Matt. xvi. 18 of the gates, and in Rev. i. 18 of the keys of hell, uses the word in both passages according to its well known signification for all the world; only that he, the conqueror and living one, contemplates dying, death, and the realm of the dead in itself as being part of the dominion of the devil, and as exhibiting the subjection of man to his authority in a prison-house on account of sin. The *necessity* of dying, the being held captive in the realm of death, is the mournful fundamental idea of the expression; and it is very consistent that the Lord should speak concerning Lazarus, already in a place of peace and joy, without mentioning that dreary word; but now, when it is to be taken in its evil side, it comes forth into its own prominence. (Let Bengel's note be understood and carefully noted.) Assuredly we must admit here a transition into the narrower and evil signification of the word (such as necessarily afterwards became universal in the phraseology of Christians); but we cannot admit that it was according to a phraseology then already in use (of which this would be the only instance) which made ᾅδης, *Hades*, by metonymy of the whole for a part, simply equivalent to no less than γεέννα, *Gehenna*, or τάρταρος, *Tartarus*. A heathen, speaking of the final consolation of a blessed man in the Elysian fields (which also belong to Hades) would have similarly expressed himself; for, as the ἀποθανεῖν, *dying*, of the poor man has in itself a different and more gracious tone than the ἀπέθανε καί, "also died," of the rich man, so is his place in the region of the dead no longer, as it were, the kingdom and domain of death. Although, for the rest, Grotius is perfectly correct in saying—"fuit ἐν ᾅδῃ etiam Lazarus, disterminatis ᾅδου regionibus" (Lazarus also was in Hades, its several regions being distinguished).

The New Testament, like the Septuagint, derives from heathenism the word, and also its fundamental idea as grounded upon internal consciousness and even external perception (appearances of the dead and insights of the living, which are never wanting in its literature); and thus confirms its identity with the Old Testament שְׁאוֹל, *Sheol*. The etymology of the two words remarkably corresponds, notwithstanding apparent difference, and is less uncertain than manifold in its meaning; for they are actually two pregnantly mysterious words adapted to the views of the ancient world with respect to these deep things. Apart from other baseless subtilties,* שְׁאוֹל is first of all, the unknown place, the undefined *whither* after which man *asks;* but at the same time, in an undertone of meaning, the condition and place of asking and *longing* to those who are found there. Again, as שָׁאַל *shaal*, signifies to demand, it is the realm which inexorably *requires* the living and is insatiable in its exaction (as Luther says upon Psa. xvi.); but at the same time a reckoning is demanded of those who dwell there (μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις, Heb. ix. 27), and it is the prison of the true *Inquisition*, of profound and most righteous investigation. Similarly, ᾅδης bears the well-known general signification of the *unseen* land—"the *no place*, the land of forgetfulness, the region of shadows and unrealities—and at the same time (which is less generally recognised) the land *where no man can see anything* (the lifting up of the eyes and seeing, in our parable, in one sense is consistent with this, in another forms a contrast), a land of obscurity in opposition to the light of the living, the life of shadows, the "twilight of severed existence"—and thus, finally, it is the place whence there is no *prospect* or hope of

torment. Does this intend *at the same time* to give us a profound intimation that, instead of the being hurried away by the devil of which we spoke, the spirit in the case of the latter still hovers about the corpse and the sepulture, scarcely able to get entirely free, and long shivers before the commencing contrast between the glory and the torment? "It might seem by certain experiences to be established that this is one of the most dreadful sufferings of the sundered spirit of the sinner, to remain by its corpse, and to be constrained to be, as it were, partaker of its dissolution" (Kerner's *Blätter aus Prevorst*, ii. 186).

* Of which we only mention Kanne's derivation from a root cognate with שָׁלָה, the place of rest and stillness, Psa. xciv. 17, cxv. 17 (which says too little and is too gentle); and then Gesenius—tandem indagasse sibi videtur שְׁאִיָּה, cavitas"—which is too external and local, and, properly speaking without any contents. Or it must be regarded as remaining ever hollow, never full, as an insatiable abyss, Prov. xxvii. 20, xxx. 16.

return.* The old theologians had a much better acquaintance with the nature of Sheol than the more modern; though sounder views are beginning now to be admitted in the place of the rash and hasty negative dogmatics of the Reformers.†

Abraham himself, in this general sense, is in Sheol, like Jacob and Joseph, Gen. xxxvii. 35; and Samuel also is there where Saul comes *to him*, 1 Sam. xxviii. 19. Καὶ ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ, *and in Hades*, is the general antithesis to their earthly life, the lifting up of the curtain upon the scene beyond; if this had itself signified—"in the place of torments," there would have been evident an abrupt and violent change in the language; and the solemn ἐν βασάνοις, "in torments," which with its ὑπάρχων, "*being*," first introduces the absolute *issue* of all, would introduce a weakening tautology. But the discourse goes on most simply and lucidly thus: "And when he, the rich man, had all the honors done to his buried body, how was it with *his soul* which not the less on that account was *there below;* how did he take his place *there? In torments!*"‡ With almost ridiculous force of language and dogmatism De Valenti explains this hell of the rich man to be "a New-Testament description of the place and condition of the eternally damned, such as cannot be interchangeable with the Old-Testament Sheol," and so he regards Lazarus as a "New-Testament saint made perfect," and the rich man as an absolute contemner of the Gospel! He wilfully overlooks the fact that the entire parable as a narrative belongs to a period before the death and resurrection of Christ (by which the Old-Testament Sheol first lost its sole prerogative); and that, in ver. 29, the revelation given before Christ is appealed to, most decisively and designedly, as already sufficient. In like manner this period must be regarded as before the resurrection of all the dead to their definitive judgment; the discourse consequently refers only to an interval and middle state, just as before the habitations or *tabernacles*, albeit eternal, yet as tabernacles, referred to an interim. The detailed exposition of all that follows will variously and decisively confirm this view. Nor can we derive from it the notion that there is a torment of the wicked which falls short of eternal condemnation; according to the opinion of one who has been "taught by a continual study of the Scriptures, and reflection upon the Divine nature, to think, or at least to hope (!) that the Divine righteousness would never affix to the transitory errors and failings of this short life, the doom of eternal woe."* There is, indeed, κόλασις αἰώνιος, "everlasting punishment," which no investigation of Scripture, and no reflection upon the righteousness of God, can explain away; but *that* is not the subject of the discourse which we now expound.

The sometime rich man is regarded as being, in the first transition and on his first entrance into this place, dark and involved in self; but there immediately ensues a *lifting up of his eyes*, a contemplation and pondering of the condition in which he now is,† and that not induced by desire or curiosity, but enforced by *torment:* it is this which drives him to the first involuntary perception of the horror of his condition. Every lexicon will tell us that βάσανος, "torment," in its original and fundamental signification indicates a testing and investigation;‡ and then subordinately the pains which ensue as the tortures which extract confession. If the application of this sense to our passage is declined, on the ground of New-Testament usage, we are constrained to admit that there is strong apparent ground for doing so; since βάσανος, Matt. iv. 24, is used for the sufferings of sickness, βασανίζω for the being tormented and suffering without any adjunct idea, in Matt. viii. 6, 29; Luke viii. 28; Matt. xiv. 24; Rev. ix. 5, and βασανισμός for eternal woe, not only in Rev. xviii. 7, 10, 15, but also actually in Rev. xiv. 10, 11. But, on the other hand, it is overlooked that even in the New Testament the fundamental idea of the word is not unrecognized, as the title given to the tormenters, βασανιστής, Matt. xviii. 34, shows; whence Wahl says quite correctly, with reference to this wider application of the term: tortor quæstionarius, qui interest torturæ, ne adversarius servum ultra modum præscriptum vexet, quique testatur de enunciatis a servo, pretiumque hujus æstimat, si per tormenta ita læsus est ut domino fieret inutilis" (the examining torturer, who is concerned in the torture that the opponent do not torment the slave beyond the prescribed measure, and who testifies concerning the utterances of the slave, and also estimates his value in case he be so wounded by the torture as to become useless to his master.) We think, however, that the aim of this torment to work repentance is not so much indicated by this plain, though uncertain and ambiguous term βάσανοι,§

* See Von Meyer's *Blätter*, vi. 239. Other echoes and allusions in the word we now pass over: see Kerner's *Blätter aus Prevorst*, iii. 93–95.

† We may refer especially to three books—Von Meyer, *Hades* (Frankf. 1810; Salzmann, *Was ist der Tod*, *Todtenbehältniss*, etc., (Strasburg, 1810); König, *Die Lehre von Christi Himmelfahrt* (Frankf. 1842). Against this De Valenti's *Eschatology* urges an unfounded and perverted protest.

‡ Thus there is no ground for Hengstenberg's assertion (*Ev. Kirchenz.* 1849, p. 5) that the word Hades is used in the New Testament only with reference to departed sinners. In Acts ii. 27–31 the Old Testament phrase is recognized and affirmed; and, further, Rev. xx. 13 means the realm of the dead simply, as is plain from ver. 12.

* As Rössler of Merseberg publicly expounded this parable, and, at the wish of very respectable people, printed his sermon.

† This only is meant, and not—as Lange interprets it, one cannot tell why—an *outward* looking, *high* and beyond himself.

‡ Hence it is found simply βάσανον διδόναι τῆς πίστεως or τοῦ πιστὸν εἶναι, to give proof of fidelity.

§ As Meyer's note: "refining, testing" (and elsewhere "in the furnace of purification"), since

as by the process of the whole subsequent colloquy; we must aver that at least there is a slight preliminary allusion in the word which gives an intimation of a torture which may extract an acknowledgment before God, who searcheth the hearts. In this "certum *πού*" (fixed point) of Hades (ver. 28, *τὸν τόπον τοῦτον*, "this place,"—as Lazarus also experiences *ἀπενεχθῆναι* or "being carried"), which implies in itself the soul separated from the body, each man comes to *his own* place (Acts i. 25) according to the law of affinity—as he has fitted himself; and according to the law of retribution—as he has deserved: consequently in the case of the unbelievers and earthly-minded *the* torment which commences is self-understood.* Now all is over with mockery, a fearful reality and earnest begins! He who probably had scarcely known what want, sorrow, and woe meant, now suffers them all in immeasurable extent in consequence of this sudden *ἐκλείπειν* or "failing," this bereavement of every object which could satisfy the desire which still remains; through the removal of everything in which the wretched soul had found its life. "Suppose the case of a child, who, as a punishment, must give up his plaything, with the apprehension of never having it restored, and observe how he cries and laments, how he shrieks and rages as if impaled, while there is no positive woe in the case at all, only a mere deprivation and sacrifice of self-contentment and personal feeling" (Von Meyer). For the desire remains, the thirst without water, the craving and nothing to supply it. In addition to this, the envious soul beholds others enjoying happiness which it cannot have, and this increases the torment (in various degrees, the lowest of which would be the knowledge of that happiness in others; here, however, it is in higher degree, a kind of beholding it afar off); and there is the misery of being constrained to say—I might have been there too! For, finally, this consciousness gives birth to the direst torment—It is my own fault!

Against that easily-contented and impoverished, not to say wilfully-restricted exposition which allows Neander to say that it is *foreign* to the scope of this parable to give us any clue to the nature of the future life, we have only to quote the honest Val. Herberger—"We have in this parable a veritable window opened into hell, through which we can see what passes there." The Saviour, indeed, does more than merely paint pictures upon the vail; he removes it entirely, so far as *we* with our present eyes are capable of beholding. With all the indefiniteness, figurative character, and enigmas of the delineation, we have declarations and solutions enough in its few words. They teach us of a passing over of the dying, just as they are, with their consciousness, sensibility, and memory; an existence independent of the body, yet with thought and sensibility analogous to that pertaining to our incorporation in the body; they reveal to us a *place* of consolation and a place of torment (not merely hell in their own breasts, and the torment of remorse, but a flame)—both conditions and both abodes are rigidly defined and sundered, and yet not utterly without communion; finally, that the lot of the miserable is most decisively apportioned, yet not at once and as yet unalterable. In the broad, common region colloquies are possible to both; this is here only intimated to us in Scripture, but, notwithstanding the parabolical nature of the whole, we cannot but think that the conversation held must correspond to something possible, actual and real. We must attribute it to the eschatological dimness of the evangelical fathers of our church, who had too much to do with the *πρώτους* or *first things*, to see far into the distance of truth, that Luther and others following him, could so rationalistically say—"This whole conversation passed in the *conscience*, even Abraham's rejoinder was only the voice of an *accusing conscience*—Oh that I had believed!"* Strange indeed would it be, if this instruction could come to the ignorant man in such a fashion from his own self, as if his condition and what is wrought upon him were identical! Thus the Lord assuredly goes on to speak of an actual *Lazarus*, whom the rich man now sees and recognizes because he had seen him on earth (by no means merely *thought* that he would certainly be in Abraham's bosom); and with equal certainty the person and voice of Abraham is not merely an imagination of the tormented man. How this *speaking* could take place in that state, how far its figurativeness is to extend, we know as little and suspect as much as will appear hereafter in the elucidation of the finger and the tongue.

Verse 24. Instead of truly *returning into himself*, like the prodigal son, and thus finding his own heart so as to *call upon* his *God*,† he turns, with a persistence in his ancient tendency, to that which his eyes behold though only from afar. His punishment is his woe, and not his sin: he prays not for mercy, but for water. The "*have mercy on me*" was well in itself, but not addressed to the right father. That which had been in life the ground of his presumptuous confidence (see Luke iii. 8), is the starting point of his cry now: thrice does he cry and appeal with a vain—*Father Abraham!*

---

the predominant tone of the word is only parallel with *ἀδυνῶμαι*, ver. 24, and *δύνωσαι*, ver 25.

* Though the text has not the article with *βάσανοι* as with *κόλπος Ἀβραάμ*. Luther's "in *der* qual," in *the* torment, we may interpret as above, but must be on our guard against pressing it to the extreme of Theremin's—"*the* torment, that is, the only torment which deserves the name, absolute and eternal torment."

* To which Von Gerlach gives his adhesion.

† For that he absolutely *could* no more do this, because God was to him already in his final torment a consuming fire, is fundamentally untrue; applying the orthodox standard improperly. He *cannot* do so *yet*—that is certainly true; nevertheless, he is supposed to be capable of calling upon God, and probably did in the end.

against which, if he had hearkened to the prophets, Isa. lxiii. 16 would have been an effectual protest. Thus he furnishes the one solitary scriptural example of the invocation of a saint, and that a very discouraging one (Job v. 1). Although he sees only from afar, ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ὁρᾷ, he discerns and knows Abraham in the midst of his company, and among them even Lazarus himself. The truth which is thus clothed in a parabolical vesture gives us sufficing assurance that in the next world there will be a knowledge, that is a *recognition*, of other's persons. Whether he had asked and heard and thus known how the beggar was named upon earth, is a point not decided by this: the naming is more probably the parabolical method of conveying the recognition of his person. Why then should father Abraham send this Lazarus and no other? Bengel thinks—"adhuc vilipendit Lazarum herus" (the master still disesteems Lazarus), deeming him good enough to be sent on such a mission; and Lange even discerns in this "the most refined and subtile master-trait of the whole parable, that the rich man should treat Lazarus in the spirit of an *unconscious* continuation of his old earthly assumption and prerogative." He thinks that "he regards him still as a born servant of the rich—and grudges him his rest even in Abraham's bosom!" For our part we regard all this as not merely too finely drawn and far-fetched, but as utterly false. Has not the rich man been by this time constrained to acknowledge that high honor and dignity in which he now beholds Lazarus? Can we call it scornful treatment to desire from his finger one drop of mercy? We take the answer to be two-fold: it is because he *knows* this man and can point him out; *and then also*, it may be, because he had lain before his door, and had received an occasional crumb from his table. This latter supposition would, indeed, indicate the obstinate pertinacity of human nature in clinging to the slightest straw of merit: be that as it may, it shows supplementarily that Lazarus had not been altogether unobserved by the rich man. Suffice it that the rich man is now in his turn a beggar at the gate of him who once begged: and his soul does not loathe to lick the finger which had once been ἡλκωμένος or licked by dogs. As Lazarus formerly in the deep feeling of his abasement only desired the crumbs, so does the rich man now not cry for deliverance, but only for the slightest mitigation of his agony with the tip of his finger; for the conviction of guilt in his conscience (by which he anticipates the judicial sentence of ver. 25), forbids him to ask more.* And is there a *tongue* and a *finger* in Hades, as there were eyes before? This is not, indeed, used in the sense of perfect corporeity, for that has been put off; it is not on that account, however, a mere figure, but indicates a certain corresponding corporeity of the soul, with which it is already and essentially invested as in its ethereal garment, and in the analogous after-feeling of which the disembodied (though not altogether unembodied) soul can alone go forth, and be susceptible of its new existence. "The various energies and faculties, which find their outward expression in the hands and feet, and so on, are essentially in the inner corporeity; and the external bodily organs are but the patterns and expressions of that." So says the speculative seeress in Von Meyer; and the excellent father Zeller, otherwise no friend of such speculatists, seems to agree in the sentiment: "In our coporeal life it is not the eye of the body, properly speaking, which sees; but the soul sees through the eye. It is not the bodily tongue which speaks, and so forth. Thus there exists a spiritual capacity of seeing, hearing, speaking, which may find its operation and act without the organs of the earthly-corporeal body." We would add to this that it must assuredly have its operation thus when the soul lives in a disembodied state; and further that it can only be conscious of itself in the analogy of corporeity, since the laid-aside body again to be put on constitutes the formal life of the soul, which can only by this consciousness maintain in continuance during the state of interval its individual personality.* As in the heat of fever the mouth and palate are scorched and dried up, so the tormented one feels the raging of the fire on the *tongue*; but this is distinctively mentioned as the ἄκρον, "tip," of the languishing, thirsting mouth for the touch of the tip of the finger, not without a concomitant, profound allusion to the awful retributive change which has passed upon that organ, once so dainty and luxurious. It may be regarded as the tongue of that soul, which had once derived so much enjoyment from it, and now suffers so much misery" (Kleuker). After the withdrawal of that mortal draught which had been used, as a wretched succedaneum, to satisfy the desires of the soul, there remains the *internal fire* of the full, unsatisfied and raging thirst of the spirit: and, besides this, and corresponding to it, there is an *external flame*—let the emphasis of the singular in this expression be carefully noted. It is not that he is "*alone* with his naked, empty, and miserable *I*; and suffers torment in *the flames* of lusts and passions which he has carried with him;" as he was never left alone upon earth, but always accompanied by the condemning and persuading influence of God, so the same influence now returns upon him in righteousness. In that state all disparities are reconciled, in strong con-

* It is impertinent to say that he still feared any farther touching on the part of the one *formerly* unclean. For now everything is fundamentally changed: Lazarus is now the rich and pure, and the man in torment knows this full well.

* The condition of those in the realm of the dead "is, indeed, independent of the body; but all the organs of the body, eyes, ears, tongue, *have left behind their traces and operation in the soul*"—the dead "carry with them the fashioning of their former condition" (Oetinger). Dreams furnish us a mysterious analogy. [The *scenic* representations of the parable furnish too slight ground for the above theory of semi or quasi corporeity in the case of disembodied spirits.—Am. Ed.]

trast with the inequalities of this present condition of things: the outer and inner world perfectly correspond to one another. Nor must it ever be forgotten that in the personal life of the creature the inner world is never to be regarded as if independent of God and his universe as the other factor.* The pious Lazarus would have remained undamned in patient endurance even in these *βασάνοις*; but even at Abraham's table the rich man would have been ill at ease, so that its provisions would have only added to his raging fire. What he suffers is, indeed, a worse outbreak of an inward poison than all bodily sores upon earth; and because in spite of all his sense of guilt he cannot truly confess and pray, his frightful confession at first is merely—I am tormented *in this flame!* In which is painted the same horror of his inexorable present condition which is afterwards uttered again—In *this place* of torment.

Verse 25. Brouwer well says: "Abest a responsu divitis omni crudelitas aut injuria; blande miserum hominem alloquitur patriarcha" (there is an entire absence of cruelty or injury in the response to the rich man: the patriarch blandly addresses the wretched man). Not like the ant in the fable, who tells the cricket that he may now dance after having sung so long; not like the blessed mocking the damned in the Koran; nor even with that "sorrow of the blessed over the lost" which Klopstock sings of; but Abraham speaks to his wretched, tormented, and imprisoned son in calm and measured words, dignified and well-supported, full of tenderness and fatherly condescension. He does not harshly and concisely reject his petition—This should not and cannot be! but graciously speaks of the ground of rigid justice, of the design of sharp pain; and himself begins to point out and facilitate the topics of his *remembrance*, making this, as it were, his own counter-request. The *τέκνον, μνήσθητι*, "Son, remember," which comes first is, indeed, much more gracious than that of Josh. vii. 19—"My son, give, I pray thee, glory to the Lord God of Israel, and make confession unto him: and tell me now what thou hast done!" For inasmuch as Abraham still continues the father of this unworthy son (John viii. 39), not simply according to the flesh, for that relationship holds good no longer now,† but in that fulness of love and graciousness which his faith had wrought in him, and which had gone with him into another world—this *τέκνον*, "Son," is a manifest parallel with the long-suffering loving-kindness of the true Father in ch. xv. 31. What thou askest *should* not be granted, in essential justice, ver. 25, nor *can* it be, from external circumstances, ver. 26. But this *therefore* is not rigorously asserted: in its stead there is *besides all this* (*ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις*), with an almost apologetical tone of grace—And even if we, Lazarus and I, were ever so willing to help you, we *cannot* go over to you! *Remember*, that is, ponder, think within thyself, go on to think as thou hast begun: for he can do this, since nothing is wanting either to the remembrance of the past, or to the seeing and feeling of the present. This is the more definite end of torment as intimated in the first word—In Hades there is time for this! This *μνήσθητι*, *recordare*, "remember," of course refers pre-eminently to the *past* of his vain carnal life, and the guilt contracted there. As we find preparatorily in this world that in old age the memory is very remarkably quickened with respect to the remembrances of youth; so we may suppose that when the roaring cataract of earthly things is still, and the ever new and ever-shifting scenes of this sensible world disappear for ever, that the internal voice of the soul will be distinctly heard; the voice of that soul which forgets nothing, but preserves all things in the treasury of its essential memory; and that then all will find the truth of the opium-eater's representation, that the whole of the past life may be lived over again, and that all the most petty circumstantialities and the most insignificant occurrences may rise in the most lucid distinctness before the eye of the soul.* But on this account we may regard the *μνήσθητι* as demanding *not merely* such a glance *backward* at the past; but reflection upon this is supposed to go further, and the remembrance becomes pondering and *consideration*, in the full sense of the word; and the *νῦν δέ*, "but *now*," presents forthwith the proper object of that thoughtful and anxious reflection.

"Thou in thy life-time (before this state of death), even down to the burying of thy body, receivedst *thy good things*, that is, all which thou countedst good, and desiredst, and didst adhere to as such—thou didst grow old in the enjoyment of thy days, and never for a moment wert afraid of hell and the grave" (Job xxi. 13). It is not said—*from God;* for the offender must *think* of that himself, and bring it to mind that his possession in this life was the substance and treasure of God (Psa. xvii. 14): hence it was enough to say—Thou *receivedst*, reflect from whom! This, alas! he had forgotten while in life, albeit he may have often

* Not as if the immense *Not-I* had been spun out of the petty *I*, but the *I* sprung out of the *Not-I* existing before it, and ever maintains its relation to it. Alford asks here very excellently: "Where lies the limit between inner and outer to the disembodied?" This remark holds good especially in the case of these, while it has its meaning now and universally.

† This concedes no such *recognition* of sonship after the flesh, as the supplication appealed to; so that no carnal Jewish hearer might say, as the Talmud afterwards—At least the preputium is not restored, he is called *son* still! Against this supposition the *continuation* of Abraham's words gives ample testimony—Son or not, this avails not here, where thou receivest thy due!

* This book, "Confessions of an Opium-eater," has appeared in a German translation (by Amalie Winter, Weimar, 1840). The author, resting upon his own experience, expresses his conviction that to the human spirit forgetting is a thing impossible, and that the dreaded book of accounts is a man's own soul.

uttered the hypocritical ascription of all to the "blessing of the good God." And at the same time ἀπέλαβες τὰ ἀγαθά σου, "receivedst [in full] thy good things," here is quite equivalent to ἀπέχεις τὸν μισθόν σου, "hast [in full] thy reward," in Matt. vi. 16. "Likewise Lazarus evil things"—thus concisely by design: for it was not properly *his* evil, and it was in an altogether different sense that he received it—he patiently *accepted* and endured it all. These opposites (τὰ ἀγαθά, τὰ κακά) in all their complex contrast embrace the abundant matter of consideration which remembrance and reflection could awaken: while to us who hear the parable, these extreme opposites in the allotment of wealth and poverty indicate the diversified distribution of earthly good in all its intermediate degrees within the widest extremes. The expression of this first response sets out with an enigma, which it is for our reflection to solve. It is well with the wicked, and evil with the good—this is a pure contradiction, in which our thought finds it impossible to repose. The solution is at once facilitated by what is immediately added—*in their life-time*, that is, in this world, and not for ever. (Let it be noted, by the way, that this parable protests against the delusion that great distress must necessarily presuppose great guilt; as if a Job is to be compassionated or condemned on account of his boils.) But we ask further: *Wherefore* is it *evil* with the pious man even for a moment before eternity? and then we learn, secondly, that it is only of the seeming appearance of things that the word speaks, and we reflect that external evil is as the appointment of God essential good; while good is not in itself evil, except when we take it to ourselves as *our* good, the evil being the result of our method of receiving it. Abraham himself was rich in his life-time, the blessed of the Lord; but on receiving God's gifts, he knew better what was true blessedness than Laban did. Hence he can now say to this his son—Curse not now thy former wealth and prosperity: that was in itself good, equally with the evil things of Lazarus which have opened his way to consolation in my bosom. The speculatist before referred to, says: "Every evil, regarded from the right point of view, ceases to be evil. The fool and the wise man, both are a contribution to the great whole. God is just, he is love, order reigns in all his works. Disorder is in us, and has its origin in our lack of true knowledge." On which Meyer remarks: "And since this great disorder so arose at first, God must *restore* all things to their first eternal order again, by seeming disorder, which, however, is the purest consistency." Thus God appoints nothing but good, and hence the ὁμοίως, "*likewise*," in this most glaring contrast assumes its true importance, the deep meaning of which we must not be hindered from perceiving by the popular German translation *dagegen*, on the other hand. Thus, humanly speaking, it is *better* to suffer for a while in order to eternal consolation. If once more it is asked—and this introduces the *last* solution of the mystery—Wherefore did not the Lord afflict the rich man with sores in his palace, or cause his riches to melt away, in order that he might earlier have learned to reflect? The answer is plain: he *might* not have reflected even then, for *God knoweth the heart*, ver. 15. He distributes his good in the form of good things or evil things, with the highest wisdom and righteousness, according to the need and corresponding disposition of every man, and with the most profound adjustment to every case. The rich man's character of soul required from God that the harder problem of life should be set before *him*—to receive riches and fortune without damage to his soul. If he has solved it wrongly, did not God know that he would have still worse endured the probation and test of Lazarus; and is it not possible that by the bitter contrast of ensuing torment alone he was yet to be won?

"*But now* he is comforted and thou art tormented, as thou seest and feelest; *thus it is*, for *thus it is meet* at the hands of that God from whom each of you receives the righteous recompense of his justice" (2 Thess. i. 5–7). Even the Old Testament saints in Sheol (of whom *only* we can think in connection with Lazarus in Abraham's bosom) do not by any means possess *merely* a "painless, pleasureless, and dreary rest in the realms of the dead" (as De Valenti says in direct opposition to the Old Testament), but are graciously *comforted* and quickened and solaced. Abraham *rejoiced* beforehand in the day of Christ (John viii. 56). But in the tormented begins even there already the eternal justice of retribution and compensation: how much she hath glorified herself, and lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow give her! (Rev. xviii. 7). Why is this? *Remember*, my son, saith Abraham, think upon it, and thou wilt discern that thy present torment is just, and therefore the best thing that God can and will send thee: thus may thy pondering find the right way out of this present into another *future*. For the νῦν δέ, "*but now*," does not constitute an irrevocable and final end, if there is yet left him a μνήσθητι, "remember." If a father graciously says to his son under chastisement, "Reflect, my son!" there glimmers through all the punishment the distant design of love, and in the very words there is an exhortation to a right return into self, and to an earnest μετανοεῖν or repentance. The tormented and so far disinherited man is here dismissed with a warning similarly indefinite with that which the son who was in the midst of his father's possessions heard in the former parable: in both cases a long-suffering and enduring love cries—*Son!* Though repelled and outcast he is not yet entirely abandoned to despair. But will he who heard not in time past, hear now; will he come to reflection who, during a whole life-time, *when it was easier to him*, reflected not? The relation between There and Here is in this case similar to that between repenting in the propitious days of health and amid the pains of sickness: the exceptions of a late repentance are possible, but yet improbable and rare. On the one hand it might be asked:

Would not this man—when he is brought by his own torment, and by the distant sight of another's consolation, to the *πείθεσθαι* or "being persuaded" of ver. 31; when it is brought visibly, palpably, and experimentally home to his conviction, that there is a living God, as gracious as he is just, as just as he is gracious—become a penitent sinner, in his repentance giving joy to the angels in heaven? On the other hand, this true narrative shows us at the outset, that a fool like this man in his torment, though he may hear *Abraham* at least, and Moses and the prophets too, whom he may and should *remember*, yet hardly bears to receive instruction, contradicts instead of humbly learning, is only at first provoked to pride by "this place of torment," and finds it hard to reflect or moralise in the fire. Suffice that the matter remains *undecided*, and it is the design of Divine wisdom in this record to leave it so: let us not go beyond that word, and enforce upon it the certainty either of his eternal damnation, or of his final restoration.*

Verse 26. Between *us* and *you*—a sudden multiplication of persons on *both* sides: "Look around thee once more, after having looked afar off; thou hast also a fellowship of thine own, even as we are in fellowship here. And if I myself would come to thee or to you, *we* cannot!" A *χάσμα μέγα*, "great gulf," between the blessed and the miserable, even in the interim condition of Hades is *fixed*, which cannot be overleaped, either by presumption on the one hand or sympathy on the other; that is, obviously a yawning, profound, bridgeless *interval* of separation. To see and to speak to one another over this profound, remains possible; but while there is this wide latitude among the disembodied hosts, all *διαβαίνειν* and *διαπερᾶν* or passage is forbidden—*ὅπως μὴ δύνωνται*, "so that they cannot." Thus the interval between Gehenna and Paradise is not, as in the later Jewish fable, merely a hand-breadth (Eisenmenger, ii. 315); but there is a *χάσμα*, *chasm*, which is generally the signature of the *τόπος* or *locality* for the disembodied souls, in its vast extent and limitless desolation; just as the heathen speak, using the same expression, of their Hades (see, in Grotius, Hesiod, *Theogon.* v. 740) naming the *χάσμα μέγα*. Not as if the power of God was unable to fill up even this *χάσμα*; but it is not in the power of the *θέλοντες*, or those wishing, to pass from the one side to the other; the mere *willing* of "we" or of "you" cannot avail against the fixed necessity of the *νὺν δέ*, "but now," which makes the gulf.† One, indeed, as we now know, having risen from the dead, passed over this gulf when he descended into hell, and preached to the dead: his mercy opened a new way. And while the gulf between the believing and the unbelieving upon earth is just as great, the repentance of the heretofore unbeliever makes a bridge over it; and to this Abraham at the same time directs his remembrance—There *was once* no impassable *χάσμα* between Lazarus and thee. Hadst thou then gone over to him, in lifting up him out of his misery to thyself!*

That *he himself* is now tormented he has well known by sad experience from the beginning: nor is he ignorant of the interposed gulf of which he is reminded, since he could not emerge from the flame; and he therefore asked that one should come to him for the mitigation of his woe. His conscience did not permit him even to think of asking for an entire deliverance from it: with all his sense of guilt, *he could not* pray in penitence; and in this we may discern the inward ground of the real permanence of that external gulf. He now resigns himself (half-proudly) to the declaration—"*Thou* art tormented," and this is all at present! But a glance upon his fellowship around awakens a new thought within him; one which is good in itself, but which, however, he turns to evil by appending it to something which is not good.

Verses 27, 28. The undertone of this second, and apparently unselfish request, is in reality a murmuring objection tending to self-justification, which emboldened by Abraham's words, he now ventures indirectly to urge, preparatorily to the bold *nay* which is confidently thrown out in ver. 30. "Had I but rightly known; had I had sufficient *testimony* that such a place of torment as this, in all its frightful actuality, existed for all who repent not!" "If it is hopeless for me, yet would I pray thee, *father*, for my brethren, also thy sons—this will be a more acceptable request to thy graciousness." He has the clearest consciousness of all that he has left behind in the upper world; he has a perfect remembrance of his growing up, and his brothers in *his father's* house (he names Abraham *father* only, without this personal appropriation); but he neither knows nor names that third and only true "Father" (chap. xv. 18–20). Müralt, with an otherwise admirably profound penetration into the spirit of the entire parable, has very incorrectly understood this individual point; for he supposes that the rich man is here speaking of God, as their common Father, and of his people or family upon the earth: this is so unnatural and alien to the narrative as to need no refutation. The father whom he mentions is his natural father,

---

* [Rather the whole tenor of the parable, and especially *the impassable gulf*, ver. 26, renders it clear that the rich man's present torments are but the prelude to eternal pains.—Am. Ed.]

† Neither *wandeln* in a visit, nor *hinüberfahren* in perpetuity—as the German text would intimate: but the original merely strengthens the *διαβαίνειν* by introducing the *πέραν* into the second verb. Moreover (as König critically remarks) the notions of above and below are not made prominent, *κατά* is not substituted for *διά*; for both places are in the lower world.

* The *ἐστήρικται* holds good for the *νῦν*, now commencing, and not soon to end, but *εἰς ἀεί* is not added. This expression alone, consequently, does not, (as Alford says), preclude the supposition that the supplication which followed was the commencement of a better mind; though there are other reasons which oppose it.

in the same sense as the brethren: and it is all but plainly stated that he no longer lived, when he goes on to say—I *have* five brethren; for this means—I have *yet* (in life, as the soul cannot cease to think according to its habituated manner)—consequently, a father no longer living. Alas, for this father! Where is he now, on this side or on that? Possibly he was happy, and his degenerate son must now remember him with new anguish; he has forgotten to seek for him in Sheol till this moment. Why does he not forthwith ask—Send *me!* that I may most fervently and earnestly warn them, as a brother his brethren? In part, because he dare not think of this on account of the conclusion, σὺ δὲ ὀδυνᾶσαι, "and thou art tormented"; in part, because he has no desire for the yet greater torment of recognition, nor for that short respite, after which the return into his woful confinement would be all the more horrible. But it was with *Lazarus* that he began his former request, and he adheres to Lazarus still: a preacher to his distinguished brethren who would not have been in old time honorable enough; but coming from the dead would invest him with ample dignity, and insure him profound respect. Our feeling revolts against the latent *vilipendere* (disesteem) which has been discerned here, as if he should say—"He who is least among you may surely forsake his high consolation for a while in order to prevent others from falling into torment." We suppose that as Abraham had said nothing about a gulf between the under and upper worlds, the petitioner thought nothing would stand in the way of his being sent *thither*. "And although that might not depend upon the will of those who wished it, and not all who *would* go can, yet *thou*, the Prince of the house, and the receiver of the guests at thy table, hast surely the prerogative to *send* him. That he may *testify* to them; that is, not simply that he may give them intelligence of that which they have heard of already, even as I did; but that he may enforce it, and urgently warn them—Believe my testimony, there is awful justice in Hades, the 'legends about hell' have their tremendous truth!" O ye soft and sentimental preachers, discharge as sent of God the mission upon which Lazarus was not sent; keep not silence concerning hell and destruction, but testify with becoming earnestness to the earnest realities of that other world!

As it regards the *five* brethren, it is well-known that many are disposed to find an allusion here to the five sons of Annas whom Josephus mentions (*Antiq.* xx. 9, 1); in which case the man in hell might be Caiaphas, the son-in-law of Annas, and therefore the brother of the five. Thus they regard the historical character of the parable as ascertained, and account for the mention of the name of Lazarus—a most perverse idea! How utterly unlike the constant dignity of our Lord's teaching, would be all such offensive personality as this! and even apart from that, how marvellous would it be that the Lord should record the doom of Caiaphas in hell during his life-time, and include his whole story in the vague introductory phrase (ἄνθρωπος δέ τις ἦν πλούσιος)! Finally, the death of Caiaphas did not take place before the death, descent into Hades, and resurrection of the Redeemer, and ver. 31 therefore refutes the idea: besides which, it was impossible that our Lord should describe the guilt of *Caiaphas* as consisting in this, that he had been a sensual man, and that—he had not heard Moses and the Prophets. Consequently the number here is only symbolically significant as in chap. xv. 4, 8, 11. The five with the one are together six, over against whom as the *seventh* Lazarus stands in many respects. This Lazarus, consequently, is not a historical person: at most his name is chosen with some such additional allusion as ver. 31 may disclose. The *brethren* of the rich man are at the same time his true brethren in affinity of disposition and manner of life; so that the preacher may point his application and say—He has yet many brethren more; Oh hear, hear, all ye whose consciences tell you that you are they!

As it regards the good will of the dead man, that his brothers might not through a sinful impenitent death come into the place where he now is, appearances are deceitful now as they were upon earth. At furthest, we could only detect in it some natural feeling, a certain carnal family-love to the brothers of his own dear self; such, moreover, as would have no value before God, and avail not for himself. They who are disposed to go further, would say with Müralt: "Love belongs to his natural character; and this circumstance makes it plain to us, that the whole is a representation of a meritorious, and not thoroughly wicked, kind of man." But we think that this goes much too far: it is too much to attribute even that softness of good-nature, which would not have others suffer, to a man who could let Lazarus lie suffering before his eyes; and assuredly he knows nothing now of God and God's mercy, of genuine Divine love. *Or* might this egoist, in the process of his discipline of torment, have learned some little sympathy with others (although, in the *first* beginning of it, he might not even have looked round to see if others were there with himself)? Thus Olshausen thinks that "in this prayer there is clearly expressed a loving remembrance of his brethren, as well as the germ of faith in the compassionate love of God," and not merely as now arising, but as "still remaining in his soul." We doubt whether this is the obvious meaning of the parabolical exhibition in our Lord's intention; and agree with the *Berlenb. Bibel* (which indeed restores him in the end), that his continued petitioning, instead of reflecting upon the "*but thou!*" which had sounded in his ears, indicate only "the perfect *unrest* and confusion of the condemned man, wherein he is ever seeking something which he never finds, revolving like a wheel in the torment of his *self-will*, torturing and consuming himself." If it was with a view to apologise for himself that he offered the second request, its meaning cannot be pressed beyond a desire to lighten *his own* misery;

for if selfishness had brought him into this torment, we can hardly suppose that the beginning of this fire would melt it away. The brethren (whom his influence or example had helped to lead astray) will only increase his torments by their reproaches; or, by their fellowship, aggravate the frightful contrast with their former reckless fellowship in the merriment of life: for here that saying does not hold good—"Solamen miseris socios habuisse malorum" (It is a consolation to the wretched to have companions in their ills—"Misery loves company"). This his selfish and prudent prevision is well aware of; and in thus interpreting his thought, we do him only justice, giving him neither too much nor too little.

Verse 29. Abraham in his discreet dignity, does not repeat his gracious *τέκνον*, "son"; as the bold and urgent petitioner had repeated his *πάτερ*, "father." He points the too forward or rather too backward applicant to the already sufficient revelations and means of grace: that is, of course, to those pre-revelations and preparations for the gospel which were mentioned in ver. 16; for this history must be placed in a time previous to its full establishment. Thus does the parable significantly revolve round again into the former condemnation of the impenitent and unbelieving Pharisees: but as their *βίαζεσθαι*, "pressing" against the kingdom remains unmentioned, it is perfectly free from any tone which might hinder its influence upon its first hearers, the enemies of the Lord Jesus; and it fastens conviction all the more firmly and deeply in their consciences, inasmuch as the cause and the guilt of their last unbelief in his gospel is traced up to an unbelief of earlier origin, and in an earlier object. Abraham speaks as Jesus speaks elsewhere, John v. 39, 45–47, comp. Isa. xxxiv. 16. He places by his instant *ἔχουσι*, "they have," *persons* whom the petitioner very well knows, in opposition to the person whom he asks for: "They *have* (in a much stronger sense than that in which thou sayest—I *have* five brethren)—they have had hitherto, and still have, without the additional testimony of one returning from the dead, valid witnesses enough. Not only have they *the law and the prophets* in the Scriptures so denominated, but with them they have *Moses* and all the Prophets themselves (who are now here with me), as much as if they were personally living in their midst. For, in their spiritual heritage and use, a witness to the truth continues ever to live, although he be dead: thus *Moses* no less than all the Prophets is a forerunner in the faith (Heb. xi. 24–27), a preacher of life after death (Luke xx. 37). Let them *hear* these; for faith cometh of the voluntary hearing and acceptance of testimony, and is not the result of seeing manifestations, visions, signs, and wonders. But no man is constrained to believe; for, enforced repentance is no repentance, faith such as that of the trembling devils is not the faith which renews the fallen nature of man." Should not a people seek unto their God? Should they ask for the living of the dead? (Moses and the Prophets are the living unto God.) Wherefore, to the law and to the testimony! According to *this* word, in which there is no wizard deception and no delusion of spirits (as in questioning the dead there may be), Isa. viii. 19, 20.* This *testimony* is sufficient, the wisdom of God is equally displayed in refusing and concealing as in the more abounding revelations. In regard to his Israel, the children of Abraham, the extant revelations of that time was sufficient for the degree of blessedness to be obtained at that time (Abraham's bosom); certainly sufficient for the avoidance of torment. Thus the dogma of the practical sufficiency of the word of God is taught by him who himself before Moses and the Prophets received the simple word of the Almighty in order to his walking before him in perfectness. As it respects the poor heathen, it remains certain that they *have* no such word, no preachers and witnesses: and for them the request has its force: *send* unto them—not messengers from Hades, but ambassadors of the kingdom of heaven (Rom. x. 14, 15). Yea, even with regard to the blinded Jews, we can scarcely say *now* what held good then—that they have Moses and the Prophets; so far as the being able to hear them goes. Where we can suppose them now to *hear* Moses and the Prophets, they would be sufficient in this day as of old to lead them to repentance and faith, yea, to lead them now to Christ.†

Verse 30. Excited rather than humbled by the protest and reproof which he received (*ἀκουσάτωσαν*, "let them hear," that is, at the same time—Thou also mightest and shouldst have heard!) he becomes more bold and confident, and his parching tongue throws the *οὐχί*, "nay," of his contradiction over the gulf, into father Abraham's face. Very likely he had many times in his life upon earth proudly and contemptuously arrogated to himself "Moses and the Prophets whom we Pharisees hear!" though without ever actually hearing them. Hence he has become so infatuated that he will not rightly receive instruction even now. As the works of the blessed dead follow them, so follow this man his ignorance of the way of salvation, his neglect and practical contempt of the extant word, his self-will and self-vindication, his pertinacious demand of signs and wonders from the mighty hand of God. In his folly he thinks, like many others, that God might regard it as necessary to preach with other lips, and to use other extraordinary and fearful means independent of his own wise

* See the true interpretation of the original text in my "*Jesaias, nicht Pseudo-Esaias*, p. 239.

† Alford's well-meant observation seems to us unfounded: "This verse furnishes a weighty testimony from the Lord himself of the sufficieney *then* of the Old-Testament Scriptures for the salvation of the Jews. *It is not so now.*" The difference does not lie in a less sufficiency of the Revelation, but in its more clouded and darkened possession. Even now every genuine Israelite becomes a Christian, when Christ presents himself—or without that attains to salvation in Israel's faith. Christ sees him under his fig-tree, before Philip calls him

ordinance, as if man were not free in order to a free faith; and without understanding that a mightier power than that which the grace of God applies, might be much more likely to quench the smoking flax altogether. "If *one* went unto them from the dead—even though it were not Lazarus: this is the last and lowered petition which scarcely seems to ask at all, but rather goes on with the self-indicating general assertion—"then would they (properly—will they) repent! without it assuredly not any more than myself, who had not that extraordinary call." Here mark how he takes it for granted, though on grounds only within himself, that for *him* it is altogether too late; and how he utters his own condemnation with his own lips—even when in the very act of justifying himself and charging God with neglect—making mention of that little word which but seldom in earlier times, and when it would have availed, had passed his lips. He has not been altogether ignorant; thus much at least he has heard, though not with obedience, that all depended upon repentance; and he is constrained to utter this now from the depths of his heart. If thou didst know that, why didst thou not repent? No one comes into torment without having more than once or twice received, both from without and within, the exhortation to repentance (Job xxxiii. 14–18). *Repentance*—that is quite correctly the sum of the law and the prophets, but only the first part or the half of it; hence Abraham, not as the "representative of the law" (according to Olshausen), but as the father of believers, and representative of the Promise, which was before the law, supplements and completes it by pointing to *faith*.

Verse 31. He does not indeed say, in the transcendently meek answer which he gives the bold man, the great word πιστεύσουσι, *they will believe*, itself, but πεισθήσονται, "they will be persuaded," which, however, is essentially the same. This latter does not designate, as it might seem, any *persuasion* to be effected by the appearance of the dead (which would, of itself, do no good), but it means an actual internal principle and living commencement of all true faith in the whole united testimony of Moses and the Prophets—the yielding to and accepting their testimony as a truth which is to be obeyed. The five brethren glory in being believers, but their so-called πιστεύειν or believing is by no means a πεισθῆναι or persuasion, it has never sprung from or deepened into a πείθεσθαι or being persuaded; just as their already condemned brother had been an "orthodox" Jew, and yet had never believed. Conscience cries loudly in us all, as even in all the heathen—Repent! But when the word of revelation solicits and corroborates this cry of the conscience, it adds the great and preëminent exhortation of its preaching—Believe in him who, nevertheless, as thy God, is merciful, and graciously speaks with thee, O sinner! The willingness to repent becomes then the *ear* for the right and perfect hearing of this word. Thus, father Abraham himself, whose teaching the rich man possessed through the history of Moses, had borne witness against his folly upon earth by that "faith which was reckoned unto him for righteousness;" and all these things, never altogether unknown to him, would be wakened into vivid remembrance by the μνήσθητι, "remember," which the tormenting flame suggested. This conversation with Abraham, however, is not to be regarded as bearing only this signification: it is also a parabolical vehicle for the representation of an influence of the divine word which continues even in that world, of the preaching of the blessed to the miserable over the gulf, about the procedure of which we have no adequate conception. Hence we must simply regard the colloquy as being, what it essentially is, the communication and explanation of solemn truth.

The most weighty final declaration, beyond which the conversation could go no further, is to the effect—that even repentance in itself is not sufficient. As at first repentance itself only proceeds *from* a faith in the severity and truth of the law, so again does it lead *to* a faith in the promise of grace to which the Prophets especially bear witness, and becomes in the time of fulfilment a repentance for the kingdom of heaven's sake (Mark i. 15), according to the word of John and of Christ. But both hang inseparably together; there is the strictest connection between the preparatory word and that which brings its consummation, between the previous and the subsequent faith, between the ancient testimony and the new superabounding wonders. If they hear not the first, neither will they be convinced of the last, and be brought to true faith. "The true susceptibility for the acceptance of the witnesses of the resurrection must be mediated and produced by a true fidelity in the school of Moses and the Prophets" (Lange). The warning prediction of a refusal to believe is true in far the greater number of cases: properly speaking, it is always true, for the apparent exceptions, as in the case of those who were murderers at the Crucifixion and believers at the Pentecost, are to be explained by the assumption that in them there was, nevertheless, a preparatory hearing which was not found in the case of others. To those who have not believed the ancient wonders and the ancient words, the new, greatest, and most impressive miracles and words are vain; they who have neglected the right Beginning in God's alphabet will never come to understand the End, unless they are taught by that end to recommence with its first letter. "If thy five brethren are stronger spirits than Moses and the Prophets, they will most assuredly not believe one of the dead; a phantom from the realm of shadows would assuredly bear but shadowy authority for people, whose souls have more tongue than reflecting reason" (Kleuker). We would rather say—more tongue than ear! Tyre and Sidon might believe if they received signs and wonders; for they have not yet disordered and beclouded their spiritual apprehension by unbelief in a preparatory word: they have not, through persistent opposition to the truth, through ever

learning but never coming to the knowledge of it, rendered themselves unapt to faith, like Jannes and Jambres in Egypt, where Moses himself was in person (2 Tim. iii. 7, 8). The *word* itself comes out of the other world speaking of the state beyond; and God's living ones in the scriptures live it and speak it, and speak with far more emphasis and force than if a spirit visited us from Hades. This parable which we here *have*, is a most impressive revelation of a spirit: Lazarus is continuously sent in it to us, serving with his sores to point the world through successive ages to the way of eternal consolation; and has been the means of founding many a Lazaretto, monuments of honor to his own name.

For the rest, Luther's marginal gloss is quite unsound: "Here we are *forbidden* to believe hobgoblins and appearances of the dead"—for the text does no more than prophecy οὐδὲ πεισθήσονται, "neither will they be persuaded," assuming this πεισθῆναι, or persuasion, to be something good in itself, but by no means declaring the appearance of a departed spirit to be impossible, or an occurrence that never took place. There is, as we have said, no gulf between the earth and Hades, only the concealment of a veil.* But inasmuch as we all have assurance enough in the Word concerning the condition of the dead (though not specific charts of their domains, or answers which may gratify curiosity as to how they may employ their tongues and fingers there), nothing more copious or precise would avail to supply the deficiency of man's repentance. It may, indeed, *appear* to be otherwise in the case of some of our own times, for whom magnetism and spiritual noises may appear to have paved the way to faith; but that could have been only a corroboration of the word in which they were not altogether disbelievers, and Abraham's precise and solemn utterance remains unaffected in its simple truth. Did Saul repent, when Samuel, coming from the dead preached to him the same truth which he had preached to him when living? Have all, or indeed many, of those believed, who have verily persuaded themselves that they have seen such apparitions? What avails, then, "second sight" to those dissolute men of shattered nerves, to whom ordinarily such things occur?

Finally, let it be observed that Abraham in the ἐάν τις ἐκ νεκρῶν, "if one from the dead," actually admits the ἐάν τις or possibility of the request;† but even goes *beyond* inasmuch as ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ, "rose from the dead," is something very different from, and greater than, an apparitional manifestation ἀπὸ νεκρῶν or from the grave. God *will* even do that, the required sign of Jonah will be given—and to those who have been hitherto unbelieving, it will be given in vain. In this last τίς, "one," there lies an intimation which to many of his hearers was even then intelligible, carrying back this entire connected discourse to its beginning again, and revealing that it was the οὗτος, "this," of chap. xv. 2, by them rejected and scorned, who should *rise from the dead.* Even before this an actual *Lazarus* rose out of his four days' grave before their very eyes; the name might have been selected, doubtless, with reference to that event,* but the main and most important reference is to Christ himself. Not as if Lazarus here, poor and afflicted, was intended to be a type of Christ, who had not where to lay his head (according to Vitringa, to whose fancy the sores of Lazarus are the blasphemies and sins of men which he bore; the death of the rich man, the downfall of the Jewish polity; the request for the sending, the vain desire of a Messiah; the five brethren, the Babylonish Jews; the licking of the dogs, the conversion of the Gentiles); but we shall see presently at the close whom he exhibits as the contrast of the rich man, and may observe now thus much, that Abraham's τίς or *one* does omit the person of Lazarus, as he had already fulfilled the request. Suffice it that a *resurrection* from the dead did take place and was amply attested, but yet they believed not (see John xi. 53, xii. 9, 10; Matt. xxviii. 11–14); nor was Herod the Sadducee transformed by it into an orthodox Pharisee. Therefore the Lord did not *appear*, when he had risen, to all this people: that would have been still less helpful to their faith than the *testimony* of his resurrection preached to them.†

This Resurrection of Jesus is not a naked argument of immortality in the sense of the Rationalists: that truth needed not such a demonstration, and the rising again of this solitary virtuous Jewish Jesus, seen only by few, would have been but a slender proof; but the manifestation of this Only one before and after his death has its deep root, both as a power

* Of which even the poet can say, "Leicht aufzuritzen ist das Reich der Geister, Sie liegen wartend unter dünner Decke," etc. (Easily entered is the realm of Shades, and thin the veil which hides them from our view.)

† And not as Schiller's bold saying represents, "Sechstausend Jahre hat der Tod geschwiegen: Kam je ein Leichnam aus der Gruft gestiegen, Der Meldung that von der Vergelterin?" (Six thousand years hath death deep silence kept: Came e'er one back from out the deep abyss, To tell of doom?)

* This would, however, require a better foundation than Wieseler's, who (*Chronolog. Synops.* p. 322) derives it from the circumstance that just at that time the death of him of Bethany had excited these feelings. We confess, for our own part, that we cannot sympathise with such an illusion.

† The unbelief of some people is incurable. "It might have occurred to them, even after death, to endeavor to persuade themselves that there was no continuance of life, no Hades, no resurrection; as in dreams men hold long conversations, which have no meaning, and exhaust themselves in disputations to which a turn in the bed puts a happy end. We read in Swedenborg, that many of the separate spirits imagine that they are still in life; and refuse to believe that there are spirits and another world around them" (*Blätter aus Prevorst*, iii. 117).

and a doctrine in the word of prophecy, torn asunder from which and regarded alone, it loses its significance to the unbeliever in that word. (Comp. Von Meyer's *Bibeldeutungen*, p. 149.) This is once more plainly attested in our parable, as it is attested by the fulfilment in fact of its *οὐδὲ πεισθήσονται*, "neither will they be persuaded," down to our own day.

The superabounding grace of God even towards the dead, corresponding to the raising up of Jesus for the living; the highest and deepest love of the Son which led him to descend into Hades to the tormented, to make himself known even to them; the descent of Christ into hell; constitute a subject of engrossing interest, kept here entirely in the background, but which forces itself nevertheless upon our thoughts. The Living came there to the dead, as here in the upper world the Dead came to the living. But will they who sometime *believed not*, when the long-suffering of God waited (1 Pet. iii. 20), believe when the Living preaches to them in the realm of the dead? This is the great question. The preaching is recorded, but not their believing in it; thus in this parable, as throughout the entire Scripture, the voice of warning closes all and leaves its echo in our ears.

Have we now fully expounded and sufficiently explained this parable? As a *history* which goes into Hades, using a figurative vehicle for the representation of man's condition there, assuredly we have; but the *parable* is not yet fully exhausted, for the first act of it upon earth requires its interpretation. In Luke we find these three parables united, which seem to be histories and yet are not such. If the good Samaritan has a further and higher allusion, and the figures of the Pharisee and Publican in the temple signify more than the mere delineation of two then existing types and historical examples; most certainly *in this parable* we should not limit ourselves to the mere integument, and, following the common current of exposition, regard it as preaching only about the *externally* rich and poor in this world. It is altogether inadmissible to make the rich man (as Schleiermacher does) "a representative of the house of Herod;" we have discerned in him from the very beginning a *Pharisee*, whose assumed prerogative over the Publicans it was preëminently to hear Moses and the Prophets. But we fall very far short of its meaning if we restrict the parable to that allusion; and forget that it has a deeper application to us *Christians*, especially in its *internal* significance. Von Gerlach reminds us that these parables were pointed at the Pharisees, as it were *through the persons of the disciples;* but we are reminded again most emphatically that they were directed also through the Pharisees to all his disciples. For ch. xvi. 1 holds good of *all* our Lord's discourses. We have intimated our view from the outset, as Bengel aptly and concisely expresses it on ver. 19: "Dives, exemplar Pharisæorum; Lazarus exemplar pauperum *spiritu*" (the rich man is a sample of the Pharisees, Lazarus of the poor *in spirit*). But the Pharisees are of various kinds and aspects; and are themselves again to be regarded as a symbolical type, going beyond and yet resting upon, the specialties of their relation at that time to the word at that time spoken: just as we learn on another occasion, ch. xviii. 10. We have nowhere found so profound and clear an application of this parable as that given by the repeatedly quoted Müralt, whose work, *L'instinct divin recommendé aux hommes*, (Divine instinct recommended to men), Von Meyer has translated (in the *Bl. f. höh. Wahrh.* vi.).* We may therefore do well to hear him. "This enigma of the buried rich man, unrightly termed wicked, and of Lazarus covered with sores and with contempt, is well worth the attentive notice of all whom we too readily term *worthy and estimable people;* it is especially intended for them. The external riches are a figure of the internal; and the sores, by which the body is purified, signify something analogous in regard to the soul. The most sensible men mistake their friends in this condition, and condemn them instead of comforting them." It is so, alas! and the sad and "specious bye-path of merit," the subtle trust in the excellence and holiness of these their spiritual treasures, is so deceitful, that many in this condition go astray, and mistake even themselves. For it is not the *common* Pharisee alone who is pointed out and warned in this parable, but those who are most eminent also; not only those who luxuriate in art, science, and learning, but also even the proud sitters in our most holy Christian sanctuary. How many a follower of Menken or in its worse form *Collenbuschian* (this will be understood in Wuppertha1, and, it may be, elsewhere), clothes himself self-sufficiently in such *priestly* and *royal* attire, looking down upon the poor around who can go no higher than pray for—the forgiveness of sins! In how many a priest, with or without office, breaks out the Pope which, as Luther says, is latent in every man! How many a man has so far declined in his "consecration," that he can only now *enjoy himself* at his own rich table, and laud his own good things to his wondering guests with the most abundant variations of the cherished prayer—"God I thank thee," etc.; forgetting the miserable at his gate, as well as his own wretchedness! Such people have *repented* once, and therefore they are Abraham's children. But they have gradually come to neglect "daily repentance and contrition," till the complete old man emerges out of their regenerate state once more, and now—acts his pride in the garment of a Christian! They *have* indeed whatever may be had, Moses and the Prophets

* The author possesses, as a rarity, the profound psychological treatise of that writer, quoted by Meyer—*Lettres sur les Anglois et les François.*

together with Christ and his Apostles, and the Apocalypse which reveals all that may be revealed; but they *hear* no longer what these say, because they deem themselves already so well furnished with everything good. Happy that sinner whose sores break out for his spiritual healing: thrice happy would that proud and rich sinner be if he could become in time a poor Lazarus in God's sight, before his rich garments are torn off and his full table disfurnished for ever! Woe to the converted publican and sinner, if the poison still remaining should break out in the disease of spiritual pride, and he, too, should become a *rich man*, himself such a Pharisee as those who once despised him!* These are the voices with which this inexhaustible parable cries out from *both its opposite sides*, for the warning of Christendom: may its expositors and preachers find a better hearing for them than they have done hitherto! It cries *on both sides:* for, as the unjust steward is first of all exhibited to the Publican-disciples, and yet may be regarded as full of keen application to the Pharisees; so this figurative rich man, though most immediately a mirror for the Pharisees, is full of warning also for the Publicans. If Peter, as the prince of the Apostles, according to the meaning of his successors, had regarded the "hundred-fold houses and lands" responding to his "what shall I have therefore?" as a spoil which he might prematurely acquire in this world and not in the world to come, thus perverting the *servus servorum* into a title of lordship—he might indeed have been the incarnate Pope of this parable; for the papacy is the colossal historical collective-exhibition of the transformation of the poor Christian into the rich Pharisee. As the parable of the steward had obviously for its first intention to warn the converted Publicans against a second *punishment* ensuing upon unfaithful administration of worldly good; so this last parable subordinately shows *them, at the same time*, this second punishment as the result of a greater unrighteousness, of *unfaithfulness in much:* if the true riches entrusted to them must be taken away again as another man's—all, that is, which they *have* but do not rightly *use*. This is the consummation of that which is hinted at in the prodigal son's well-meant offering of himself to hired service; he exhibited in that a germ of danger which *grace* must take away, or he would become again a proud fulfiller of the law in his father's house. Wherefore, ye disciples, when the Lord speaks to the *Pharisees*, take good heed yourselves lest ye also condemn *them* without thinking of the application of his words to yourselves—for so doing ye would become such as those Pharisees yourselves!

THE TRUE FAITH WHICH OVERCOMES OFFENCES.

(Luke xvii. 1–10 [Matt. xviii. 6, 7, 15, 21, 22, xvii. 20].)

Whether the connection of this with what precedes rests upon historical sequence, or is the result of the Evangelist's selection and arrangement, cannot by us be satisfactorily determined; yet *πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς*, "to his disciples," appears to intimate that it is to be *read* and *understood* in direct union with what has just occurred, while the brief *εἶπε δέ*, "and he said," without *καί*, "also," or any other definite note, simply says—On another occasion, a little later. The article in *τὰ σκάνδαλα*, "[the] offences," seems to presuppose something out of which the question of offence suddenly springs into our Lord's discourse; but this may itself be explained variously: either as referring to some offence which had arisen from previous discourses, of which those which we have heard were made prominent; or as having been occasioned by some specific occurrence which, in a time of such general stumbling, and surrounded by such men as our Lord then saw around himself, was constantly liable to take place; or, as the simple emphasis of the expression renders most probable, the reference is to those well-known *σκάνδαλα* which, alas! were certain *to come*, which would *everywhere* be found in the path of his servants, and of which, therefore, he must speak in such absolute terms. It was doubtless in the design of the Evangelist, as being his own first view, that we should regard *the* offences here alluded to as exemplified in the murmuring and mocking Pharisees, who would keep back others from that way of penitence and faith which they would not enter themselves; just as the rich man in the parable had been a misleader of his brethren (comp. Matt. xxiii. 13 with Luke xvi. 16). Here we may apply the principle which J. Von Müller lays down for all similar cases—"Even if the Lord had uttered these words in another connection, it was doubtless his intention that they should descend to us in this connection too."* But we cannot agree with him in de-

* Compare also Matthes Weyer's ingenious and pregnant oral sayings, which touch the heart of true Christianity (published by Kaune, Nürnb. 1817). There we find—"*In the spiritual carnal life* a man lives in honor and joy, and is clothed in purple, like the rich man. Dying to this higher life of carnality, he becomes poor, hungry, full of sores, sorrow, and tribulation, like the wretched Lazarus."

* Indeed, it is further his will that we should *not merely* thus take them, but that we should pro-

clining to apply this to ver. 1, while he asserts it of ver. 5; nor can we think for a moment that the Apostles' prayer for the strengthening of faith was an unconnected fragment inserted here without any specific relation to the context. The καί, "and," of itself, ver. 5, most manifestly indicates such a connection with the preceding subject. Did the Lord *design* by his words, vers. 1-4, to bring to their consciousness the necessity of a strong, patient, benevolent *faith*, in order to the overcoming of the evil world, and the amendment of erring brethren? If this discourse followed close upon the former parable, the close of which had pointed so strongly to faith, assuredly he did; and in any case we are always justified in regarding our Lord as constantly aiming, in all that he said, at the increase of his disciples' faith. We may easily apprehend that *the Apostles* would so interpret his lesson, and be led by their Master's high requirements to that internal principle without which they could not be met; even though they did not revert to father Abraham's injunction—whose πείθεσθαι, or "being persuaded," indeed, had an entirely different reference, that is, to the saving of their own souls.

Enough: we embrace the contents of the entire colloquy, ver. 1-10, under the one general superscription—*Of the true faith which overcomes offences.* The Lord proceeds first to speak of the *offences;* asserting both that they are in themselves inevitable in this evil world; and further, that the solemn, judicial Woe does not the less on that account rest upon that man, by whom they come, ver. 1, 2. He then goes on to speak of *truth and love* as the only means of overcoming these offences, by and among his own *disciples*, vers. 3, 4. The general warning, Take heed to *yourselves!* which is uttered to all who were his disciples, is followed by the specific injunction of *truth* in the rebuking of sin, and of *love* in its forgiveness: and this latter being the more difficult, is again and more definitely enforced as an indispensable duty in ver. 4. When the Apostles answer him by that appropriate petition, which touched the very vitals of the question, he further speaks, as the connection will make evident, of that *true faith*, in the third place, which can alone give birth to such truth and love, in the endurance and forgiveness of evil. Faith in itself lays hold, generally, of the omnipotence of God in order to the victory over offences, makes that possible in God's power, which is humanly impossible; and even a little true faith, if it be consciously and courageously exerted in the matter, is sufficient to that end, ver. 6. *But*—and this is the subtle, much misapprehended turn given to the whole discourse*—inasmuch as it does not avail only to pluck up external trees, which ofttimes simply adds to the offence, but to obviate and prevent *sin* in its *root*, therefore the true faith which in this overcomes is as diffident as it is confident, as humble as it is bold, perceiving and realising both the real need of the world and its own undeservingness, yea, its own absolute worthlessness independent of the grace of God, by which everything good is effected.* This is the profound meaning and connection of the *parable* concerning the laboring servant, to whom in strict justice neither thanks nor reward is due for the performance of his bounden duty. In the *application*, ver. 10, the ἀχρεῖοι, "unprofitable," carries the argument further than the limits of the parable itself; for *we* in the sight of God are without power and worth of our own, in a much more unconditional and absolute sense than can be predicated of any servant in relation to his master.

Verses 1, 2. (See on Matt. xviii. 6, 7.) Ἀνένδεκτον, "impossible," is like οὐκ ἐνδέχεται, ch. xiii. 33. "It is not otherwise to be expected;" not merely (as Richter and Lange say), it is to be asumed, presupposed; but the ἐν of the expression points to the thing itself and its persistency; ἐνδέχεται has an impersonal signification—*res* ita admittit, it may be; hence ἐνδεχόμενος is just equivalent to being possible, admissible, feasible. In harmony with this, let not that deeper signification be overlooked: The destruction of the world—its offences being at once, by power, and without endeavor for its amendment, punished—is incompatible with the wisdom and love of God. (On the probably spurious τοῦ, see Winer, *Gramm.* § 45, 4.) *Happy* is he, therefore, who does *not* take offence at the long-suffering and patience of the Saviour of the world, and who does not himself increase the sum of the offences which are, alas! inevitable. *Woe* also, at the same time, to every individual offender in his own guilt! And δι' οὗ, "by whom," obviously sig-

---

ceed from the exemplification then given, to the general truth and its application to ourselves.

* Julius Müller, with many others, denies any connection whatever. On the other hand, C. H. Rieger traces it incorrectly: The Lord gives it to be understood that many seek a gift which they have not yet humility enough to receive and worthily to use. That would be such an absolute and peremptory refusal of the well-intended and laudable petition of the Apostles as we cannot admit. Lisco, similarly (who mixes up the lunatic of Matt. xvii. with this discourse, moreover assuming it to be identical with that of Matt. xviii.), thinks that the Lord's reply was a rebuke to their unwarranted demand, which referred only to faith in the performance of miracles! No, their request finds a better solution in its connection with vers. 1–4. The same expositor (in his parables) finds in the πρόσθες a self-complacent reference to the degree of πίστις which they already possessed, and a demand of its increase by way of merit, such as the Lord was constrained to repel: but all this is unjust to the Apostles, and involves an entire misapprehension of the parable of the servant.

* In the other part of his answer the Lord enforces the *purity* of faith (Roos).

nifies the world in all its individuals who are individually to be judged; as also the indefinite expression (and yet more plainly *τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ*, Matt. xviii. 7) itself forms a transition to the little ones of ver. 2, the disciples and brethren, who, as they are not to be offended because weak beginners, so they are themselves to take heed (ver. 3) lest they keep alive the offence by lack of truth or love, and to be careful that they do not themselves make a new offence. We were taught in Matt. xviii. that in the *μικροῖς*, "little ones," we are not simply to understand actual children, but slight and feeble believers, who yet in their childlike humility, are to be esteemed as great; so that this emphatic *τούτων*, "these," by no means indicates (as Grotius thinks)—"in medio fuisse parvulos" (that children were in their midst). We might almost regard this *τούτων* as immediately following upon ch. xv. 16; and assume that Publicans and sinners, as contrasted with the offence-occasioning Pharisees, and in their commencing weakness of faith were indicated, as being then present; though without any such allusion it may be explained as a *general* reference, *μικροί*, "little ones," who (like *τὰ σκάνδαλα*) were ever present to the Lord, and not without a designed reminiscence of his earlier words in Matt. xviii. 6. Finally, and concurrently with this, it signifies—*These* despised of the world, and lightly treated, so-called *little ones!* For, the impetuous and superficial spirit of censure cries—Wherefore are they so little and so weak, as to take offence at everything? Who can be always taking such thought how he acts towards them? But the Lord, on the contrary, exercises himself and requires from others, the most solicitious condescension to those who are thus little and weak; he declares every one of them to be as precious and inviolable, as every one who causes their offence is guilty.

Verses 3, 4. See, once more, Matt. xviii. 15, 21, 22; the seven times" of which, by Peter deemed sufficient, our Lord now echoes. But the addition *τῆς ἡμέρας*, "a day" (certainly genuine in the former clause, if not so certainly in the repetition), most solemnly strengthens and intensifies the number used, just as in the former instance the "seventy times seven" did. In ver. 3 he turns his discourse to the *μικροῖς* so much offended in this evil world, and gives them the warning *προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς*; and this means more than merely—Take heed of these Pharisees and of the wicked world!—or even —*Separate yourselves* from them! (as if to fly from the stumbling-blocks and offences; but is not that *impossible?*) This is only the transition from the previous words, and the words which follow adjoin something much broader and deeper. Take heed to *yourselves:* first, guarding against the causes of offence in the world; and then being cautious not to *take* offence, and that at *brethren*, from whom its *ἐλθεῖν* or "coming" is equally *ἀνένδεκτον* or inevitable; and, finally, in order that ye may not *give* offence *yourselves*, take heed of the *κόσμος, world*, and *ἄνθρωπος, man*, among you! All this we have explained already on Matthew. We cannot concur with Olshausen, in making our Lord's keen and searching words distinguish between the malicious *σκανδαλίζειν, offence*, of the Pharisees, and the *ἁμαρτάνειν, sin*, of the brethren springing from infirmity; he rather regards every *ἁμαρτία* as a *σκάνδαλον*, which must for the sake of truth be resisted, but also in love, in order that new sin may not rise out of it. We find nothing here of a "*gentle reprehension* and persistent forgiving" (as contrasted with rigorous severity and abandonment of a sinful brother to his sin, which alone must be guarded against); for *ἐπιτίμησον*, "rebuke," is sharply enough expressed, even in the case of brethren. (We have not here the *ἔλεγξον* of Matt. xviii. 15, taken from Lev. xix. 17, for this is a different point of view.) If even thy *brother* aggrieves thee with his sin, that is a sad case, but then the principle applies—Suffer not thyself to be offended, offend not thyself! It is not for thee, indeed, to *judge* him (Rom. xiv. 13); but to set him right and amend him in the patient long-suffering of love (1 Thess. v. 14). But merely to be patient and keep silence, submitting to it resignedly because he is a brother—that would itself be an offence. The *ἀγάπη* or love begins with *ἀληθεύειν* or truth, and this speaking the truth must be at the outset sufficiently earnest, without any weakness or false kindness of toleration, with rebuke and *threatening* of the *sin*, which otherwise may proceed to a worse extreme. Leave nothing on thy part undone, that may excite him to a true *μετανοεῖν* or repentance. Thou art supposed, indeed, to have already forgiven him in thy heart; but thou must enter into the assured peace of forgiveness with him; no more remembering his sin for reproof, only when he gives assurance of repentance. (Luther misapprehends this in his translation—If he amends himself!) Should we ask further—How am I to know this, not being able to read the heart? then comes in the reason why in the following verse *ἐὰν μετανοήσῃ*, "if he repent," is substituted by its explicit explanation in the simple *λέγειν μετανοῶ*, "say, I repent." Seven times *in a day* to sin against his brother, and again the seventh time after being six times forgiven, bespeaks no mere infirmity. Nevertheless, thou shalt not refuse thy forgiveness, if he only conquers himself so much as *to say* for the seventh time his *μετανοῶ*. This does not mean —If after so many sins he gives thee ample proof that he actually repents. The *church* may demand this in the name of the Lord, having a higher prerogative and deeper insight; but thou, an individual brother, must be contented with the apparent and visible *ἐπιστρέφειν** or "turning." But this permits no license or lightness; for if the six times before the seventh should excite suspicion against the

* The *ἐπί σε* or *πρός σε* in the Received Text which the Vulg., Luther and Meyer retain, is a gloss, which is so far correct as it teaches that the *ἐπιστρέφειν* here is not of itself the undiscernible return to God, the true repentance of the sin.

μετανοῶ, "I repent," the seventh return and declaration of repentance is, on the other hand, such a token of self-humiliation as must remove that suspicion. This is not a λέγειν, "saying," mockingly and carelessly thrown out; nor must we forget that the ἐπιτίμησον, "rebuke," on every repetition of offence, and before every repeated ἄφες, "forgive" will necessarily be more severe. Let it be observed, finally, that the Lord indirectly exhorts also the sinning brother to an humble conversion and confession; he will have his disciples, as brethren, never weary of avowing their faults and praying forgiveness, even as they are never weary of exercising forgiveness. Beautiful picture of a church and its fellowship, as it ever ought to subsist! The lack of *truth* in rebuking and confessing, and still more the lack of rebuking and yet forgiving *love*, is the secret reason of all offences *in the church*, as in the world itself!

The Apostles, the Twelve as a body, make answer to this,* and we must consider them as remembering their calling to stand before a world full of offences, illustrious examples of such fidelity and of such love; and probably as bearing in mind also what was said to themselves in Matt. xviii. concerning the future church. We may suppose that they were in common deeply penetrated by this hard and severe saying, that they spoke to one another about it, and then that they brought their concerted supplication to the Lord by the mouth of one of their number; and thus the connection becomes so much the plainer. The translation "Increase" presupposes too clear a knowledge on their part, that it was their own existing, albeit weak faith which was to be intensively increased from within; on the other πρόσθες is spoken of an increase to be added rather from without, though the prayer is not offered with a thorough understanding how that may be. But not the less on that account is this word analogous to that normal saying, Mark ix. 24; since it is only an existing faith which can thus pray for an increase of faith.† This believing desire for a greater and stronger faith *is* the grain of mustard seed, which presently plucks up other trees by the roots; and itself grows, if we continue in such desire and prayer, into a strong tree. What a strength of faith is already presupposed in their confiding in the Lord that he could add to them more faith! Indeed, if any man, being an entire unbeliever, should say—*Give* me faith as a free gift and from its very beginning! that would be no more than mockery, responded to throughout the Scriptures by repulsion, as by father Abraham in the other world.

Verse 6. But the Lord does not repel the request of the Apostles; he actually grants it, he does increase or *strengthen* their faith; although he can do this only by first encouraging their confidence in the already existing grain of mustard seed (see upon this at Matt. xvii. 20), and then by abasing in order afterwards to lift them up. When he assures them that even a slight and weak faith is, through its internal principle and energy of life (a grain of *mustard seed*, not a grain of *sand*), strong enough to do great things, if a man only possesses it, holds it fast, and uses it, he thereby contradicts, at the same time, the external προσθεῖναι, "increase," of their request, and tells them that they had already not received *too little*. Συκάμινος is scarcely the *mulberry-tree* which was very rare in that country (though this has been a meaning strenuously attached to this terminus without affix); but it is the expression derived from the Sept. and vulgarly used, though without precision, instead of συκομοραία or συκομορέα "*sycamore*," ch. xix. 4. For the Lord is here speaking proverbially of plucking up trees, as in Matt. xvii. of plucking up mountains; the figure is varied here, because *this* tree stood before his eyes. The thick-stemmed sycamore is, like our oak, wide-branched; and has in consequence strong and deep roots: so that it is significant of something very great, to say to this tree as to that mountain—ἐκριζώθητι, "Be thou plucked up by the roots!" Still more—Again take root, *be planted*, there to remain and grow! And where? Ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ; that is, not on its banks, but actually in the sea, the tree is to take root and stand! In the same sea, into which the man with the millstone about his neck, is cast. This is more than sinking mountains in the sea (Matt. xxi. 21), or as when men, having gold as grains of sand, abolish whole hills: it is a perfect ἀδύνατον or impossibility in the course of nature, and (as Bengel observes) becomes thereby a type and symbol of the spiritual, supernatural abiding of believers, firm in the tumultuous shifting sea of this world, full as it is of offence and sin. Thus the bidding the *trees* without to be removed and to be planted elsewhere, has more immediately to do with external σκάνδαλα or "offences," which would be compelled to retire before the *might* of all-powerful faith, if, and in such cases as, it might be advisable to command them thus: the love of enduring faith, which in long-suffering strives to amend the sinner, works still deeper; and it is of this our Lord proceeds to speak further.

Verses 7-9. The true and perfect faith which overcometh the world, is a firm *reliance* upon the *power* of *love*, received from God and by Him implanted in the soul; consequently it is *confidence* in the power, and yet higher confidence in the *humble* power of love.* This lies

---

* Actually the only example of such a common appeal so described, on the part of the Apostles; hence Schleiermacher thought it a suspicious circumstance foreign to the primitive records.

† The anonymous writer of *Die Evangelien, ihr Geist, ihre Verfasser, und ihr Verhältniss zu einander* (Leipz. 1845), regards the Jewish Apostles as saying—Give us *faith* in addition to our legal holiness! And the reply denies to them any faith at all—If ye had it! Woe to the writers of such books full of offence!

* The power and energy of Christian souls infi-

in the expression *But,* with which our Lord continues his discourse: loving from the love of God, is more than the laying hold of His Almightiness; it is faith which overcometh, *but* in the humility of enduring love, not as an imperative master, but as a ministering servant. It is the taking *away* of all self-confidence and of all pride which *increases* the faith, thus becoming so much the more pure in its energy. "The lack of faith has its ground preëminently in self-righteousness, in the reliance upon our own merit" (Von Gerlach). Ye are in all your influence and acting no more than *servants* of God—now how stands among yourselves the relation between servant and Lord? The servant is not at once treated as a master, but must perfectly serve till his time of rest comes; and that is his duty as a servant, for which he is entitled to no praise. *So likewise ye: All those things* which are commanded you, ye must do—that is your *obligation*—and in doing all *ye* are, over and above, no more than *unprofitable* servants; that is, ye cannot place God under any obligation, or do Him any service of yourselves; *worthless* in yourselves, God must first give you, and then preserve in you, whatever capability ye possess.

It seems to us a perfectly useless question, to ask whether there was any among the Apostles who had a servant; ἐξ ὑμῶν addresses them simply as *men* generally. (Between τίς and ὃς there is to be supplied, of course, an ἐστί). The discourse does not refer to hired servants (μισθίοις or μισθωτοῖς), to whom Rom. iv. 4 applies, but to servants who, either by birth or purchase, are the personal property of their master, whom he *hath*, or possesses, who could only demand for all their labor their meat and drink, in order that they might be able to perform that labor. In that case, *each* man must unhesitatingly perform the duty devolved on *himself* (τά διαταχθέντα, ver. 10); the ploughman not desiring the herdsman's duty, nor the reverse. This is the obvious reason why two are mentioned, the one having a harder, and the other a comparatively easier duty; for the herdsman, especially the careless and idle one, might seem to the ploughman to have an enviable place. Moreover, both these duties taken together symbolise the apostolical office, in which, however, the ἐπισκοπεῖν, or "pastoral care," would seem the more difficult task in comparison with the preparatory toil of the husbandman. It is for you only to perform faithfully and patiently the duty incumbent upon each. Count it not your chief concern to accomplish great things by strong faith, to celebrate glorious victories during a short warfare to be suddenly followed by triumph; but the great point is an *unwearied continuance* through the whole day's labour, fully and righteously measured out. Count not the time long before the rest cometh, or the great reward. Let your faith *patiently* hold fast the word of promise, which the Lord has given to you his servants—*afterwards* ye also shall eat and drink! This is and must ever be μετὰ ταῦτα "afterwards," not an εὐθέως, *straightway.* (by-and-by); for this antithesis of itself shows that εὐθέως is to be construed with the *following* words, and that to read ἐρεῖ εὐθέως together is incorrect (as in our version). (Nam sive hoc sive illud herus servo dicit, dicit ei statim, ut ingressus est ex agro. *Cito* cupiunt *accumbere*, qui missis ceteris officiis fidem sibi summam conferri oportere putant. Placent autem Deo, qui modeste incedunt, nil postulant arroganter.) [For whichever expression of the two the master addresses to the slave, he uses it as soon as the latter comes in from the field. Those desire to *take their place immediately at table*, who, laying aside other duties, think that the highest confidence is due to them. But those please God who walk humbly and ask nothing arrogantly.] The servant's rest and refreshment come *afterwards*, that is, when he hath done *all;* and more than that, what he has is only his food, not obligatory thanks. First all must be unweariedly done which the Lord requires. Hast thou all the day long ploughed or fed cattle in the *field*, and then comest home, there yet remains an *evening work*, within the house, which must also be done. Zeller makes an interesting application of this to the "inner world of the heart," in which there is no going straightway to sit down at the table when we come from our external calling and sphere of labor, but we must gird ourselves, serve the Lord, and prepare ourselves for the time when he will receive us to his supper. We doubt whether just this was intended by the parable. Either we are to limit its interpretation to the idea of obedient service rendered to the very last, as the one point of comparison; or we must regard the day as the whole period of life, the διακονεῖν or "serving" then being its *concluding work*, that of sanctifying and finally preparing the soul for the Lord and his table—such a final preparation as follows the external labor of a life, and is the finishing task which consummates obedience and patience. Suffice it that while *this* feature of the parable seems to have an indistinct allusion to a deeper meaning, the main point in it comes ont in all its distinctness—that when the *day's work* is already done, rest does not *immediately* follow, but there is a new girding and serving unto the end. For even in the eating and drinking, the *Lord* comes first, then the *servant;* first the master's δειπνεῖν waited on, then may the servant also—eat and drink. Finally: Doth the master *thank* that servant?* Is he *indebted* to him for this, as the one is master and the other servant? With great condecension, but at the same time with convincing, though gracious abatement of all his servants'

nitely transcends what the proud song says—"Wo Kraft and Muth in deutschen Seelen flammen!" (Where strength and courage flame in German souls.)

* The question with μή does not require an *affirmative* answer here; as this rule must not be rigorously applied to the inexact phraseology of the New Testament.

pride, this Lord himself answers by his *οὐ δοκῶ*, "I trow not," as if—This is at least *my* frank thought, can ye assert it to be otherwise? The Lord does not design, in these words, to commend the common practice of men, who maintaining only strict right in their commerce with one another, as a rule thank not their faithful servants; he takes the case as it is, and uses it as a similitude for the illustration of a higher truth which is shadowed forth in it. For the rest, and independently of the parable, it is a matter in itself sufficiently plain, that no *man* ought to regard himself as so absolutely the *master* of any other man; that no man should count his ploughmen and herdsmen as being no more than the field they labor in, and as only to be fed like cattle for his own profit. That the supreme, all-holy Lord, whose absolute property we are, in body and soul, by creation and redemption, does not thus regard his servants, but rather that he does superabundantly both *thank* and *reward* them, has been earlier shown in another parable, chap. xii. 37, which must be taken as the complement of this. But this is here concealed in the background;* for the present parable is obviously dealing with the prerogative and obligations of servants as such.

Verse 10. So long as we regard our performance, past or present, of that which is *commanded* us, under any delusion of its meritoriousness, such a peremptory declaration as this of our Lord befits our slavish thought: such only, no more and no less, is the meaning of this rigid and severe sentence, in which we have indeed much to abase us, and the humiliation of which is long necessary. Luther has this marginal gloss: "Here Christ speaks most simply concerning external works, and in the manner of men"—that is, according to our slavish thought. Elsewhere he graciously calls us not servants but friends (John xv. 14, 15); but this holds good of affectionate and humble children, who know well that he hath chosen them, and ordained them, that they should go and bring forth fruit. And with this the other point of view, concerning the obligatory obedience of Christians as servants, Rom. vi. 16–22, is perfectly consistent. Of this we need constantly to be reminded, on account of our tendency to abuse our freedom in the grace of God (1 Pet. ii. 16); this we ourselves gladly acknowledge as *obedient* children (1 Pet. i. 13, 14); and far on into the Apocalypse "servants of God" remains the title of honor given to the sanctified holy ones before the presence of the supreme Majesty, Rev. i. 1, vii. 3, xix. 5, xxii. 2. *Not* to serve him, not to perform as our absolute and bounden duty all that which he has commanded us, would entail a Woe (1 Cor. ix. 16), would make us ourselves a shameful *σκάνδαλον*; but the opposite never constitutes a ground of *merit* before the *Lord*. To esteem the words of his mouth, beyond what we are bound to do, *mehr denn wir schuldig sind* (as Luther's incorrect translation of Job xxiii. 12 runs), or even in love to perform more than is expressly commanded (as Neander intimates, perverting the whole)—is matter of absolute impossibility. There are n works of supererogation *in the sight of God*. The fulfilment of the law in love remains ever a debt never to be fully discharged, urging upon us incessant obligations to yet "other commandments" (Rom. xiii. 8, 9).

Thus, the application goes beyond the analogy and similitude of human things. For a faithful servant is among men *profitable* to his master (Philem. 2, *εὔχρηστος*), and may, by the service of his loving zeal going beyond his absolute duty, deserve his master's *thanks;* yea, even the slave, however rigorously regarded as a mere personal property, is yet a benefit to his owner, so that if his hand should smite him to death he would lose his worth in money, and do himself harm (Exod. xxi. 21). Further, we are of service both to our neighbors and to the world, as the salt of the earth, and the light of the world; and so far are *serviceable* to the great and good Master of the house, as being vessels of honor for the purposes of his love (2 Tim. ii. 21). But, as soon as the question arises, whether God is indebted to us in any degree, the answer is eternally—*δοῦλοι ἀχρεῖοί ἐσμεν*, "We are unprofitable servants." Nothing is to be qualified in this strong expression; it does not signify here *idle, indolent* servant (Syr. quite incorrectly, עַבְדָא בַּטְלָא); for, they are regarded as doing all; nor is it merely *abject, lowly*, or *insignificant* (as the Sept. translation *ἀχρεῖος* for שְׁפָחָה, 2 Sam. vi. 22, has been strangely adduced, where David will be had in honor of the meaner maid-servants through his own humility). So also "unworthy" is not enough—as Neander *e.g.* translates. But even as the Lord will in the great judgment cast out the servant who is worthless and unprofitable for the service of his kingdom, so must *we all* on our part be fully conscious and acknowledge that we never could have been in any sense profitable to God—that he never needed us, his worthless creatures, but that all which we have was received from him. The *Etymologicum Magnum* explains *ἀχρεῖος* simply and well—*οὗ μὴ ἔχει τις χρείαν, of what one has no need*, and so it is betwixt us and God. (See the true interpretation in Job xxii. 2, 3; xxxv. 6–8; xli. 11; comp. Ecclus. xviii. 6. For Acts xvii. 25 holds good respecting all that man may present to the great Supreme.) Is he, then, to *thank* us because we did not rise up in rebellion against himself? Is he under obligation to give us recompense because we yielded up ourselves to be dealt with in mercy, to be saved, to be prepared for all good works, and to be made capable of them? The Lord does not introduce the servants as saying, under the baseless delusion of presumption—We have been of great service to

* *Παρελθὼν ἀνάπεσαι* (with which the *παρελθὼν* of ch. xii. 37 is parallel) might here be said to mean—Come *hither*, and eat with me at your lord's table! This is the prerogative of the children, not of the servants while they remain such. "Mensæ servos adhibere manumissionis erat species" (To admit slaves to the table was a kind of manumission), as here the jurist Grotius remarks from Ulpian.

thee! nor as saying, in the well-grounded truth of an humble avowal—We are far from having done all, much has been lacking! (Ecclus. xviii. 5). He actually allows it to be taken for granted in the ὅταν, "when," that they might have done all; but only to place in their mouths all the more earnest confession of their *obligation*, to convince them that the ὠφείλομεν ποιῆσαι, "doing what was duty," takes all glorying away from the πεποιήκαμεν, "we have done." For although this πεποιήκαμεν πάντα becomes at length a glorious truth in the saints made perfect, whose sins are all expiated and covered by the δικαιώματα, or *righteousness*, of faith (Rev. xix. 8), yet is this only *by grace* conferred on such as were before *worthless* and *unprofitable*. This is the last and deepest meaning of the words, and in it the truth of the saying, 2 Cor. iii. 5, finds its superabundant justification. Thus was it that the greatest of the Apostles avowed himself ever the chief of sinners; and he that is righteous remembers abidingly his shame (Job x. 15). How many times since the first forgiveness have we all had to cry before God and man—μετανοῶ, "I repent!" How often have we had to urge our πρόσθες ἡμῖν πίστιν, "Increase our faith!" in his presence, whose persevering intercession alone has preserved our faith from becoming extinct! chap. xxii. 32. We are only, and never can be more than *vessels;* whatever good is in us for his service, he must first pour into them: as he gives us life freely, so must he give us power to labor. Therefore all the *thanking* must be on *our side*, and our only giving is—to give God the honor; as the following narrative in the same chapter, vers. 16, 18, shows. And not merely as the eyes of the servants look unto the hand of their masters; but we poor sinners must also, and more than that, wait upon the Lord our God, until that he have *mercy* upon us (Psa. cxxiii. 2). But finally, *these Apostles* themselves, in the complete performance of their apostolical functions, are no other than—the useless and unprofitable servants, sinful men, whom he had made into such successful fishers of men. As every πεποιήκαμεν, "we have done," in *external works* is altogether nothing but sin and shame *against* the true ὠφείλομεν, or "duty," so this expression of our Lord's, which Stein calls a "genuine Pauline saying," applies—and not merely by an impressive συγκατάβασις (condescension) *to this* standing-point (as Luther's gloss explains it), but essentially and pre-eminently, though alas! in experience too often overlooked—to all our acting and obedience from *faith itself*. *Faith* is in itself no merit before God, but it is the work of our *receiving*, laying hold of, and retaining the Divine gift and grace—that by which we become profitable *to ourselves*, by which we only meet our most true and profoundest obligation, since to reject the grace of God is the most daring rebellion of his miserable creatures.

THE THANKFUL ONE: THE UNTHANKFUL NINE.

(Luke xvii. 14, 17–19.)

We must leave it to the harmonists to settle the chronology of this journey of Jesus, as well as to determine how it stands related, as compared with John xi. 54, Matt. xix. 1, to the end indicated in Luke xix. 11: suffice it that this also *came to pass* in his last journey to Jerusalem. Passing through *the midst*, between Samaria and Galilee, that is upon the border; as he was *in the way towards* entering a certain village (for lepers were not permitted to be very near the gates), there met him ten unhappy men, whom misery had united as misery often does those otherwise sundered; even the unclean Samaritan is admitted on the border into their company, and they are all unclean together. They stood afar off as they were bound to do, *lifting up* with as much vehemence as possible their eager voices (in the case of him who was healed, ver. 15, it became a *loud* voice); they pay Jesus, whom they seem not to have inquired after before, and but little to know now, the honor to term him ἐπιστάτα, "Master," as if they would be his disciples—and ask him to have mercy upon them. Certainly there is faith enough here for the beginning, if we think upon the saying of that king of Israel, 2 Kings v. 7, although it be but the faith which need constrains. The Lord *saw* this less than the misery itself which troubled him; and, as the healing of a leper was one of his first miracles after the Sermon on the Mount, so here, at the end of his career, he heals ten with a single word, without a touch; and, speaking as it were in passing on, does not even say καθαρίσθητι, "be thou cleansed!" just as if the matter was self-understood. But all the more on that account he veils the great work of his own honor, and orders all things wisely for all sides: he prevents all ostentation, exercises their faith through the promise scarcely expressed on the condition of their going (in Matt. viii., on the contrary, the leper was first healed), and gives to the priests now at the last the same testimony of their rights which he had given from the beginning. And it should be observed here as well as there, with what persistency he deferred to the existing ordinances of God even in their deep degradation and perversion, as witnessing against the spirit of separation which would falsely vindicate itself by his example.* The plural

* Schlatter pointed a good application (see his sermon in Brandt's *Magazin*, i. 2): "From the *law* upon this subject we must perceive that this requi-

τοῖς ἱερεῦσι, "to the priests," is very appropriate, since while the ten were to go at first in a body, afterwards every one was to go to his individual priest, not all together in a too imposing body. And was the Samaritan to go to his Samaritan priest? That is a hard question, inasmuch as we need not assume in an unqualified manner that Jesus was supposed to see that one was a Samaritan.* In the first edition I gave my decision (with Tertullian) that Jesus would direct the Samaritan also to the only recognised true priests, τοῖς ἱερεῦσι, then in Israel; but I am now doubtful on this point, and can scarcely be content with that view. It might be said—why should he not in such a *difficult case* (and it may be presumed that the Lord penetrated the subject as such), without further entering into the matter, allow the Samaritan ordinance to pass as valid for this occasion? Why take such an occasion to institute an objection against the theocratical constitution which the Samaritans in some sense thought they retained? (Comp. Sepp, ii. 454.) To direct the poor man to the *Jewish* priests would not only have been highly paradoxical, but severe to the man himself, since he would be sure to meet with only an unfriendly reception;† and that would have been *contrary to order*, implying a *reforming* tendency in such matters as our Lord never elsewhere interfered with. Let the reader consider both, and decide for himself.

As they went they were cleansed, even as it is with us when we walk in the path of obedience, if our faith lays hold upon the not instantly fulfilled promise. Thus all these ten have believingly laid hold on this gracious word; they entertain no Naaman-objection fatal to their own hopes; and therefore it is done to them presently according to their faith. The thankful one had not yet gone far, as the history evidently shows, connecting with the ὑπάγειν or "going," of the beginning the immediate ἰδὼν ὅτι ἰάθη, "when he saw that he was healed," by an instant ὑπέστρεψε, "returned." The whole narrative is set before us with the consecutive clearness of the report of an eye-witness. Thus the man was yet so near that as soon as the ἐκαθαρίσθησαν or cleansing became visible and felt in his whole being, a matter of indubitable certainty, he could at once turn back to Jesus. Those who suppose that he had been by this time to the priest,* forget that the brief narrative with its double καὶ ἐγένετο, "and it came to pass," would be marvellously protracted, and that they must keep the Lord standing before the entrance of the village during the whole time. And the entire tone of the record precludes the supposition of Von Gerlach that the Samaritan had gone on with the rest to Jerusalem, and, afterwards returning, had met Jesus in the neighborhood of the city. Yet how often is this notion enforced in our sermons on the subject! We are convinced that the *turning back* was the instant result of the thankfulness which carried away his feelings, and that the others with colder hearts went on as they were bidden.† We might, indeed, find some sort of apology for them in this commandment of the Lord which they so punctually obeyed; but the Lord looks deeper, and values *this* obedience but lightly. He also regards the occurrence as having a *typical* significance. He beholds in these nine, contrasted with the one, the thanklessness of men as a whole. He sees in them the ingratitude of heart which many whom he had before healed had manifested, never having yet learned to glorify God; and regards this incident but as a prophetic type of what will also ever take place. Gratitude is the "beginning, middle, and end of all true human morals," or rather devotion (see Heb. xii. 28 rightly translated); ingratitude is the origin of all heathenism according to Rom. i. 21, and the root of all apostacy in Israel according to Deut. xxxii. 6. All true thankfulness goes straight up to God, even while, as this honest Samaritan shows, it does not forget the person of its helper and benefactor; hence also the Lord, himself, as the Son meekly giving the honor to his Father, makes prominent this very δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ, "giving glory to God." This is what he everywhere seeks, desirous everywhere to find it; hence the εὑρέθησαν, "there were found." Not as if he was eager to receive thanks for himself! As everything may be perverted, so this has been perverted by misunderstanding it to imply that the Lord exhorts to the diligent exaction of all thankful obligation, and to the reproof of all ingratitude; whereas the whole history teaches us in brief

---

sition to show themselves to the priests would redound to the honor of Jesus; not only must his enemies be constrained to admit that the law was not dishonored or abrogated, but rather vindicated by him, while its impotence to do anything for the healing of man was established." It is somewhat trifling with the text and weakening its force, to make the expression an assertion which recommends any special direction of souls, as if the Lord could be supposed to *point* these whom he himself had healed for further counsel and consolation to the clergy (in this case not likely to afford it).

* Neander thinks, that Jesus "took this occasion" to counteract the Jewish prejudice against the Samaritans.

† For to say with the good Roos—"the care of God over him would provide that he should be admitted into the temple," where no Samaritan might ever go—is altogether to forget our Lord's systematic principles of propriety. [We suggest that his cure by our Lord was surely sufficient to cure his heresy also, and so with a good conscience he may have presented himself (as the others ought) to the Jewish priest, and would thus doubtless have been accepted as a genuine convert.—Am. Ed.]

* Especially Schleiermacher, and on the strange ground, that "a leper, in exceedingly few instances, was in a situation to judge himself whether he was clean." Then here might be one of those few instances.

† The *Berlenb. Bibel* even supposes that the priests might have restrained them from returning, but that the one leper overcame the impediment. This might do for the nine, but better still to impute to them the cold calculation that there was time enough for thanks, when they might meet Jesus at the feast.

those two things—to avoid, and to be patient with, ingratitude.

The Lord had counted the *ten*, and knows very well that all had been healed. But he reckons still the unthankful nine, as it were, with some further design: they are still held bound. "How will they appear, when they *must* stand before their benefactor?" His *love* asks after them now, in disquiet because of their sin; just as he will one day as Judge put the fearful question which has not forgotten their ingratitude. He knew beforehand that the ungrateful always abound, and there was nothing unexpected in this; but for the honor of God and the good of men, he seeks and desires man's thankfulness.* He thinks, while his glance goes beyond and deeper than this present incident, of the many who have received bodily benefits without acknowledging the gift of God—and further, of those who have enjoyed the baptism of regeneration, have gone away in the peace and consolation of the atonement, but have afterwards forgotten their past sins, and so lived that even the Pharisee's prayer, ch. xviii. 11, would not be true upon their lips. Have they not refused to be found as *turning back?* For here the Lord points impressively to the evil which is prominent in the case of these healed ones; their thought instantly was how most quickly to *go forward*, first to the priests, and then to their homes, and to the occupation which had been suspended by their leprosy: thus does man's foolish mind ever falsely look forwards, instead of first returning *backwards* into a profound and thankful contemplation of the grace and gift of God. Gratitude is the true turning back of the heart. And is it only this *stranger*,* who received his benefit from his chance fellowship with Israelites, and who might easily have thought that he got his healing merely as included with the rest—and whose ignorance as to true worship (John iv. 22) might have excused him if he had been wanting in the *δοξάζειν τὸν θεόν*, or glorification of God—is it only this poor Samaritan, who, albeit Samaritan, is found to be so powerfully moved by gratitude? Here, also, again, our Lord points out the true ground of this gratitude and his own saying—thankfulness is infrequent because *humility* is so rare. The faith of the nine looked more at the *power*, and their theocratic prerogative in it; the Samaritan, on the other hand, apprehended and embraced the compassionate *love*—and his thankfulness overcame all the "restraint of being the only one," and acted quite differently from the rest. We see that there must after all have been something good in Samaria: here and in John iv. our Saviour's parable of the good Samaritan has its justification.

Arise—remain not lying at my feet! *Go thy way* now to the priest, thou wilt carry thy offering with a full heart! Finally, the customary, oft-repeated word—*Thy faith hath made thee whole*—has here a specific emphasis. Has not their faith also made the nine whole; how else were they cleansed? But *thy* faith, thou Samaritan unsound in the faith, is that true and genuine faith which I seek for, and therefore thee alone hath it truly *saved!*

* Steinmeyer's sermon (*Beitr. z. Schriftverst.* i. 218) is too refined in making the requirement of gratitude on the part of Jesus an act of humility and self-denial, as it might be among us.

* Ἀλλογένης—which expression seems to militate against the usual derivation from an admixture of Israelites and heathens.

WHEN COMETH THE KINGDOM OF GOD?

(Luke xvii. 20–27. [Matt. xxiv. 23–28, 37–41, 17, 18].)

That these sayings were not merely collected together by Luke, we shall be surely convinced by a right apprehension of the connection of the whole discourse as delivered by our Lord. But does the sequel down to ch. xviii. 14 continue the connection as others think? It seems exceedingly probable, inasmuch as ch. xviii. 8 still speaks of the coming of the Son of Man; and then the parable, verse 10–14 turns back to the first secret commencement of the coming of the kingdom of God into the individual heart, in the already existing separation between the two who come to worship in the temple. But these relations may have been devised by the controlling Spirit with or without the consciousness of the collating Evangelist, the formulas of connection, ch. xvii. 20 and xviii. 1, 9, not of themselves indicating any strict historical sequence.

With the mocking impatience of unbelief in *him*, whom they have in their midst, but will not hear; of unbelief in the miracles, concerning which the people could testify that when Christ cometh he could do no greater (John vii. 31); and with injurious malice in the guise of docile inquiry, these Pharisees *demand* in bitter irony, and after having already received their answer in a thousand facts: When cometh this so-called kingdom of God, so long announced as at hand and already come? (The *where* is self-understood — among ourselves!) Because they would have another salvation than that which saved from sin through faith, they regarded the testimonies and appeals which miraculous benefits to the sick so loudly uttered in its behalf, as nothing worth; almost at the end of their time of visitation their eyes yet behold nothing, and they ask in their murmuring—Will it then be soon? When shall

we see only its beginning? Certainly we must regard this as the predominant spirit of their question (as before in Isa. v. 19), for Luke concisely mentions the Pharisees; although in the case of many it might have more innocently proceeded from that Jewish ignorance generally, which ch. xix. 11, and even Acts i. 3, 6, testify to have been shared, in some degree, by the disciples and apostles themselves. The Lord's love cannot be embittered, his patience cannot be exhausted: *he answered them*, concisely indeed, as became his dignity, in despatching their bold and abrupt words, but most profoundly and pertinently giving them the fullest satisfaction of their inquiry. The answer speaks of that which the question referred to, the *beginnings* of its first coming, but correctingly refers the "kingdom of God" to something very different from that which the question intended. He might elsewhere, and on another occasion, have said—*Your* kingdom of God, that which ye expect, cometh never! But the coming true kingdom (*his own*, which their taunting unbelief inquired after) is still the same with that which was falsely expected, since the divine promise at least lay at the foundation of their hopes, and thence only could they have its terminal designation: his grace brings and offers the true gift for the satisfaction of their erring desire. Let us then be thankful to the wicked Pharisees for so full and good an answer which they procured *for us*, and which may we be able to put to good account for ourselves!

In order to indicate this, the Lord, after his first reply, turns again *to the disciples;* and in a sense blending all together, since in ver. 22 we find they are dealt with as still, like the Pharisees, overlooking and neglecting the present day of grace. He gives, consequently, on occasion of the Pharisaical question (for the slightest touch causes his doctrine to pour graciously forth in all its fullness, always giving the remedy for that sore need in man which utters the challenge), *a preliminary instruction* to his disciples *concerning the entering in of the kingdom of God.* But by this he does not intend merely its first introduction at the beginning, its essential coming, but also that future full *Revelation* (chap. xix. 11), for which he well knows the disciples' question waits. Hence his discourse falls into two parts, the second of which gives in preparatory detail, though only by way of intimation, what was afterwards to be brought into full light as the answer to another question of the disciples, in Matt. xxiv. Such is the true relation between this and the later discourse.

Thus we have first the rejection of the falsely conceived question concerning the kingdom of God then actually present, and allusion to the misunderstood, unobserved beginning with which it comes. *The kingdom of God cometh* (now and always regarded in its first coming), not with observation and external show—it cometh not thus (in my own person and manifestation), ver. 20; and not as thus come shall it be announced (its true messengers and witnesses after me shall not thus announce it), ver. 21. But it is, even with reference to these foolish questioners, already present—ἐντὸς ὑμῶν, "within you."

Then comes the preparatory instruction to his listening *disciples* (which the docile Pharisees, if such there were, might also hear for their continuous answer) concerning the *future manifestation* of this now hidden kingdom. Here, first, is the general contrast: The days *will come* which, after these present "days of the Son of Man" are over, will bring to manifestation *his day;* but this is first future, and then suddenly manifested, vers. 22–25. Such a day will, in their necessity, be desired *in vain* (first of all as one of the former days); and will be *falsely offered* to a premature satisfaction; nevertheless it will break in—as the lightning at last, but only after a first coming, manifestation, and period of the *suffering Messiah.* This is, at the same time, a perfect *elucidation* of what had been spoken to the Pharisees; and there now follows, especially for the disciples, a *closer detail* in the style of prophetic intimation. At the day of the revelation of the Son of Man—which is preceded by similar days of preparation—unexpected *judgment* will break in upon the secure world instead of the expected salvation, as all previous typical epochs teach, vers. 26–30. Even the *saved* will be able to save themselves only by a perfect devotion and abandonment of all earthly and personal things, vers. 31–33. Finally, the *separation* between the condemned and the saved will become manifest even to the severance between the nearest intimates; for that was *already existing*, though unobserved, at the beginning of his kingdom and reign, vers. 34–36. Does not thus the close go back to the beginning again? And is there not a distinct connection of thought in this perfect solution of their question?

But the blessed disciples are not yet content, and their curiosity *asks further* concerning the ποῦ, "where," of these things; they then receive *preliminarily*, as the third and briefest portion of the whole discourse, a yet more curt and repelling despatch of their question than even the Pharisees had received: they are *pointed back* to the whole previous development in order to the judgment, ver. 37. This utterance, now first given, is brought out into its full prominence afterwards in Matt. xxiv.

Verses 20, 21. Although what the Pharisees term "*the* kingdom of God," and what the Lord so terms, are very distinct, and even placed in opposition, yet the Lord graciously uses the expression common to them both; not as admitting the validity of their meaning, but because they rightly hold that which, though as a promise misunderstood, waits for a corresponding fulfilment. *The kingdom of God cometh!* This assurance given in Israel, and indeed to the orthodox in the community, is

obviously a confirmation of the great expectation of a kingdom, in its foundation and in all its uncorrupted meaning; comp. chap. iv. 22, where the *οἴδαμεν*, "we know," embraces all that was yet pure in the doctrine and knowledge of Israel. The *expectation* is justified (Acts xxiv. 15), the hope of Israel (Acts xxviii. 20) is no delusion; and we ourselves as Christians are referred to a further waiting for the manifestation of Christ and his kingdom. But this *προσδέχεσθαι*, or "expectation," has become altogether false when it degenerates into a *παρατηρεῖν*, or "*watching*," the noting and observing of the eye of sense, the looking out for externally great things and for the setting up of a *kingdom* like the other kingdoms of the world, such as forgets the essential nature of the kingdom *of God*, and what is the true *σωτηρία*, or "salvation," of men through his redeeming mercy. *This* *παρατήρησις*, "observation," the universal expectation and inquiry of the Jews, had frequently come into conflict with our Lord, as we find in the often-mentioned *παρατηρεῖν*, "laying wait," of the Pharisees; and it now finds its full expression in the blind *πότε*, "when," which *overlooks* that which was now present and obvious among them. Thus the answer runs first: "The kingdom cometh *not* for such observation and espial as yours, not as corresponding to such a lust after externally glorious things, generally not as ye Jews suppose, and quite differently from *your* expectation." But this meaning passes over into one more general, which the *μετά*, "with," as well as the omission of any *ὑμῶν*, "you," indicates: not with any such observable pageantry or even external evidence (*παρατήρησις*, may also signify —id quod observari potest), that men *must* observe it whether they will or not, as if it must make itself noticeable and known like any other *βασιλεία*, "or kingdom." Luther's otherwise excellent rendering, "with external features" (mit aüsserlichen Geberden), does not precisely hit the point, in so far as it expresses the second sense without including the transition from the former out of which it springs, omitting that rejection of all false *παρατηρεῖν*, or "observing," which we think essentially included. Pity that we dare not change *such* expressions as these in our people's Bible, else would the double meaning of "mit Aufsehen" (Engl. vers. "with observation"), perfectly correspond to the sense. Even the second meaning would be better secured by "augenschienlich"; for "Geberden" are always external, and with it creeps in the notion of man's appearance, including the preacher of rumors, the devotee, etc.—whereas Luther's meaning is that the kingdom itself cometh not, doth not increase with external manifestation. The *βιάζεσθαι*, "pressing," Matt. xi. 12 (see our exposition), with all its self-demonstration and even violence of entering in, imports less an external exhibition than a loud call, has less to do with seeing than hearing, and has its power in penetrating the inner heart and conscience. For this *kingdom*—thus further does the far-reaching meaning of the great word develop itself—is now at the first, and will be for long ages through, so far as it is *coming*, only a concealed preparation for a kingdom which is to be externally manifest; consequently it is not in and for itself, any external constitution, any visible church, although it is ever calling out and raising many such; it is no ready *when* and no geographical *where*, it is therefore no *state*, either State-church or church-State, it is not limited to place or land. "It can not be marked out on the map," says Roos. The *making a demonstration* and exciting rumor is not its usual rule or essential method, for it cometh not with legal works, nor with externally striking "awakenings," conversions, separations, societies, although all these are connected with it, and, indeed, are testimonies of its inner existence.

When it is come, and wherever it is come (this is involved in the continuous *οὐδέ*), those who shall rightly *speak* of the kingdom of God in its reality, that is, all who better understand this word, and use it more properly than ye, its witnesses and heralds, shall *say* concerning it no *ἰδοὺ ὧδε* or *ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ*, "Lo here! or, Lo there!" even as I Myself, its first Promulgator, say not of that kingdom which is come in Me—See here, it is Myself; but only intimate to faith—The kingdom of God is already come, it is already among you, and in your midst! Assuredly, on the other hand, *Preaching* has at all times cried Behold! Lo there! (Isa. xl. 9, 10, xli. 27), and the church bears her witness to all ears and to all eyes, with her *ὧδε* or *ἐκεῖ*, *here* or *there*; but the sure and certain substance of this testimony remains ever the preaching of the word. Where the Gospel of the kingdom is preached in the church, and through her missions works its way into all the world, there finally comes the kingdom raising up many an overlooked *ἐκεῖ* to confront the presumptive *ὧδε*. If *its true messengers* sent forth *should not* or *may not* say—It is here *or* there! so consequently *other men* also, though they might desire to do so in their misunderstanding, *cannot* say so with essential truth. All this lies in the simple and pregnant *ἐροῦσι*, "shall say," which excludes every human judgment, according to appearance, concerning the When and the Where of the kingdom of God. Let it be observed here preparatorily: first the kingdom *cometh*, then it *is*, as come, actually *present*; where then is the application of the true *ἰδού*, "lo!" connected with the *ἐστίν*, "is," which may not be lost sight of? Assuredly in the hearts of believers; yet it *is* not *in us* from the beginning, before its coming to us and in us, for this would contradict this *coming*; least of all could it be already in these Pharisees, who bring their unbelieving *πότε*, "when?" to the Lord, and ask the King who has appeared when his kingdom should come! Consequently the *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν*, "within you," cannot have this unqualified meaning, but only leads the way to it, as we shall go on to prove at large.

Three statements are consequently to be accurately distinguished in this compressed saying: the first speaks distinctively of the proper commencement of the *coming*; the second of what

may be said when it comes, or rather is come; and the third gives, after a twofold repudiation of error, the true information in answer to the question which still remains—Where then cometh it? The first clause refers pre-eminently to the time of Christ himself, which already typifies and enfolds every future *coming* of the kingdom in any particular place during this first period "on earth." The "Son of Man," or the expected Messiah, the incarnate Son of God, came just as a son of man, that is, not as Israel expected him, not as the thoughts of all the world would have supposed that he must come. First the still Christmas-eve; then the humble appearing unto Israel after long concealment; then, accompanying all his continuous signs and wonders, and which even these did never remove, the veil and obscuration of his abasement to the lowliness of common humanity, so that, notwithstanding all, he might ever say—Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in Me! Then the Good-Friday with *its* Ecce Homo! (*Lo here!*) with the question of the earthly vicegerent to the King of truth, turning away from such a kingdom as his with the offence of the cross; then, indeed, the resurrection, but still no manifestation before all the people; and the equally noiseless ascension to heaven; and finally, the *Pentecost*, visibly, indeed, and loudly enough, *saying*—Behold here lives in us the crucified and exalted One! Yet even now, with no "See here! or see there!" in the sense of the Pharisees, but only a *Word*, and in and through that an *inward* influence of the *Spirit!* As long and as often as the world asks, in the sense of the Pharisees, the answer is ever—*Not thus!* The second clause, again, indicates immediately the apostolical period, which is continued onwards through all times to the final revelation. Assuredly the Apostles, and all their successors, were confirmed by the power of the Spirit, were approved as the witnesses and ambassadors of the kingdom of *God*, by signs and wonders, which attested their pre-eminence over the powers both of nature and of the world, and which becoming ever more spiritual became ever more real, convincing, and historical; yet there was in them no form nor comeliness, no marks of greatness or glory for the world's eye, any more than in their Master. Even they, scorned and cast out, were πάντων περίψημα ἕως ἄρτι, "the offscouring of all things unto this day." Paul before king Agrippa and his πολλῇ φαντασίᾳ, or "great pomp," bound like his own King; a man who had done nothing worthy of death, and yet is not set free; a preacher of the Truth who, royally in his bonds, wishes for all who *hear* him, to be what he himself was! The same Paul again in the metropolis of the whole world, a preacher of the kingdom of God in bonds! Peter in *Babylon* instead of Jerusalem, the writer of epistles to the elect pilgrims of the διασπορά, or Dispersion, who are partakers of the sufferings of Christ in hope of the glory that should be revealed, who are vilified by the heathen, persecuted by the raging lion, but yet are submissive to all the powers that be—and can he be the prince of the church and the Pope? John also, in the solitary island of Patmos, a companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, receiving the Apocalypse in the Spirit, and by the same Spirit testifying to the church from the Lord—Behold he cometh, and every eye *shall* see him! himself beholding it already—Behold the tabernacle of God! And this ἀποκάλυψις, or Revelation, again, what a σκάνδαλον, or "offence," for the world and for Christendom, apparently bordering on the limits of the apocryphal! Such was the aspect and form of his kingdom at first, and such must it be till the Lord comes again, no longer to rule merely in the midst of his foes, but to make them all his footstool. Till then the Jewish and the heathen world may put their question and *demand* as here, and all the misunderstanding and impatience of Christendom may join them, and the answer here given retains its permanent and deep significance.

Alas, how often has the warning of this silencing answer been misunderstood or forgotten; how often have even *Christian men* (as presently ver. 23 prophesies) held out to the παρατήρησις, or "observation," a false gratification; but as soon as, as often as, and wherever it has been said, "Lo here, or Lo there it *is!*" there, on that very account, has been the kingdom of God no more. (For this reason the Lord carefully avoids appending the ἐστίν to this ὧδε ἢ ἐκεῖ in both verses; for it is nothing but a mere ἐροῦσιν ἰδού, which was in the former case at once rejected as worthless by the οὐδέ.) The King seemed to have come at the destruction of Jerusalem, but it was not yet the true coming of his kingdom; Rome succumbed with her majesty before the Cross, persecution ceased, and Constantine gave to the church visibility, peace, and dominion, but all this proved soon to be a false ἰδοὺ ὧδε, "Lo here!" Men thought they had the kingdom, and found it a popedom, to which Jer. vii. 4 finds sad application. The reformation erected anew the banner of the *Word* of God, and sang for a while—*He is with us* now in his own way, with his spirit and with his gifts! The kingdom must now abide with us! But has it therefore remained with either Lutheran or Reformed church as such; has it remained in the English mixed church, whose proud "with us!" is contested by a thousand varieties of dissenters, and disproved by a thousand infirmities? Let all this show with what absolute propriety and right the Lord's οὐδὲ ἐροῦσι, "neither shall they say," was spoken, applicable as it is down to our own day. The kingdom of God, we say it once more, for *now* there is need, can absolutely not be any constitution or organisation of external continuance, in the fashion of earthly kingdoms and states; it cannot be any ecclesiastical state, or state-church, or Christian empire—generally speaking it can be no church as such, although all these in their shifting forms may serve as instruments and materials for its consummation.

When, where, and how cometh then the kingdom of God? It is, indeed, truly in the world, and has been since Christ hath come.

He does not go on to say—*For* it doth not come at all, will never come as a present reality; but a distinctive and conclusive "*for*" brings with it its own *ἰδού*. "*Lo!*" the absolute and only truth of which turns all the others to a lie. What then is this true *saying* in the mouth of Truth, which is to be further affirmed and incessantly testified? He spoke then to the Pharisees—The kingdom of God is *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν*, "within you." To understand this let us begin with the *ἐστίν*, "*is*," which as the evident answer to the *πότε ἔρχεται*, "*when* cometh," must mean—It is already come, already present. Where then, and how, for these Pharisees? Just as it is elsewhere testified to them—Because Christ is come, because he liveth and worketh in their presence and in their midst! Thus the expected time is already come (John iv. 23; v. 25). So had the Baptist at the beginning announced to them—*μέσος ὑμῶν ἕστηκεν*, "standeth in *the midst of you*," and the Lord himself said at the end—*ἔτι μικρὸν χρόνον τὸ φῶς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστι*, "yet a little while is the Light *with you*," (John i. 26; xii. 35). There we have most assuredly the *first* signification of this *ἐντός*, "within;" here, as alone, rigidly understood, it can suit the *ὑμῶν*, to the plainest apprehension. (Compare, moreover, Luke vii. 16, *ἐν ὑμῖν*.)* That is, as Schleiermacher at first rightly expresses it—"The kingdom of God is being built up in the same sphere as that in which ye also live"—although he then very superficially goes on—"in that of *instruction* and communication." The miserable perversion of *Hegelianism*, which hangs upon this *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν*, "within you," the assumption that the kingdom of God is no more no less than something in the interior of every human spirit,† is contradicted by all Christendom, by all scripture, by every testimony of the Divine Spirit. This *ὑμῶν*, "you," rather embraces for the first the Pharisees generally as a basis, then in them the people whose representatives they were; and in these contemplates for its wider meaning the entire of humanity, which might hear the answer when it should put the question: *Within*, that is, in the midst of, within the circle and among, the Pharisees, the people of Israel, humanity at large, the kingdom of God is set up; just as Christ then stood in the midst of the questioners lurking around him. Thus the kingdom is everywhere near at hand, *where men can ask concerning it* because it *has been preached;* it *comes* down really *to us* without any looking for its coming from afar or from heaven, in order that it may be in us; this its coming and presence is only to be sought *within* the domain of ordinary life. But when it thus proffers itself and is *among* us, it will actually come *into* us and there establish itself, and build itself up, *internally* approving and manifesting itself. And this "inwendig" (internal) (by which Luther once more seizes the second meaning without the point of connection with the first from which it springs) can never be regarded as an *erroneous* translation; all the less as *ἐντός* (which in the only other passage of the New Testament in which it is found, Matt. xxiii. 26, is essentially equivalent to *ἔσωθεν*) is here evidently opposed to every *ἔξωθεν*, or *outward*, of an observable, visible Here or There. All the saying and pointing, from the *ἰδού*, "Behold," of the Baptist pointing to the Nazarene (in which the finger of God's Spirit, referring in all the prophets to the great Fulfiller, was, as it were, embodied) down to the witness of heaven and earth around the cross and the sepulchre; and all the *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν* of the doctrine which filled Jerusalem, of the church which consisted of multitudes saved by the only name of Jesus in their midst, all had been in vain to the unbelieving Jews—and why? Because *in them* there was no faith which came in seeking and receiving to meet the testimony. Thus have we a *transition* to this other meaning or the expression: The *kingdom*, as coming, as come, that is, acknowledged (for the question is about that), consists absolutely in nothing *external* as such; even my person in the midst of you is nevertheless no better than not there for you, because and in so far as I cannot *in you* bear witness to myself. If it comes not to that point with you, if *ye* seek not and find not the kingdom *there*—then is all your questioning, expectancy, and observation vain; ye lose the answer, and that which is actually in your very midst! It *might*, and it *ought*, and it *would* become to you, as generally to all, an *ἐντός*. Thus (as chap. xvi. 15, *ἐν ἀνθρώποις*) there is a pregnant *double-meaning* in the concise expression, which our *innerhalb* (yet better the Swiss *innert*), *within*, might reproduce; he who would wilfully reject this, must consider how his exposition, only seizing the one sense, can obtain its foundation for the other. Lange (ii. 2, 1080), for the rest agreeing with what is here advanced, prefers to find the one, proper, simple ground-thought which he supposes the word must have expressed, in the proposition that the kingdom of God generally and everywhere is a matter of the *internal* man, and we cannot contend against him on that point; yet it does not appear to us how the Lord could say this to the Pharisees with an unqualified *ἐστίν*, "is," without the former meaning as a point of junction for this latter—It is already secretly present *within* the circle of your position and circumstances, even bearing its own witness *to the inner spirit* of each. Olshausen sees, and states this clearly, when he sums up the progressive declaration which is involved in the three clauses: "The Lord, in the first place.

---

* As also the pertinent parallel expression, which Alford quotes as decisive, in Xenoph. *Anab.* i. 10, 3, *ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην ἔσωσαν* (*οἱ Ἕλληνες*) *καὶ τάλλα ὁπόσα ἐντὸς αὐτῶν καὶ χρήματα καὶ ἀνθρωποι ἐγένοντο πάντα ἔσωσαν.*

† On which seems to border the generally doubtful, often unscriptural Rud. Matthäi, when he maintains: "The kingdom *has been long grounded in the deepest interior of all* men's spirits in all times, although only through Christ it may rise into their *higher consciousness.*" Never is it to be testified as an *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν* till Christ has come to a people, till the preaching and embassage have brought and offered him.

annihilates their expectations of its glorious manifestation (which were comprehensively expressed by the term παρατήρησις); in the second place, the Saviour withdraws the kingdom of God from the visible world, as it exists in space; and in the last place, he transfers it entirely to the *inner world of spirit.*" Thus the *emphasis* falls upon the ἐντός, "*within*," in connection with which the ὑμῶν, "you," must not be especially urged (as Schaubach, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1845, rightly says)—yet the ὑμῶν is however said, as paving the way for the other deeper meaning. But he who insists upon explaining ὑμῶν by the assumption that ἐντός is *merely* ἐν μέσῳ, *in the midst*, must reflect that even then the answer might be taken as a concise *irony:* It is in your midst, and yet for you it is not come, *for it must first be in you* before you can find it needless to come to Me with your question about the πότε!* He should consider also, what Olshausen expressly declares,† "that the Redeemer by no means intends to represent the Pharisees as absolutely excluded from the kingdom of God, but would rather indicate to them the possibility of their entering into the true and spiritual kingdom; that is, if they would stoop to seek it where, by its very nature, it must first manifest itself, in the depths of the inner life." Yes, verily, this is the secret, most heart-piercing, and gracious point of the answer, which otherwise (let the expression be pardoned) would seem to despatch their mocking question in the same style,‡ if it did not just by this *enigmatical* ἐντός direct them to look for its hidden meaning. Now if one of these questioners turned *to his own inner being* to seek the kingdom there, he would find indeed no Christ in his spirit, but the Christ *before him* would then become a Christ *for him*, and that because *in him*. Thus Braune says correctly: "There might coexist with the most unlikely beginnings and most suppressed thoughts and feelings, the possibility of its appearance and entrance," manifesting itself even where it excites opposition, and Christ is yet ruling in the midst of his enemies. We would add that even the carrying away, and the involuntary pondering, of the instruction which the Lord gave in his reply, was for *all* these questioners the slight, rudimentary, first ἔρχεσθαι, or "coming," of the βασιλεία, or "kingdom," *in their inner spirit.*§

The question which the Jews still urge, and which, founded upon the good warranty of the promises of the old Testament, has been developed into an unbelieving delusion as to their accomplishment, runs thus: *When* will the kingdom at length come? The Christian question which has similarly degenerated, though based upon a similarly good foundation, runs on the other hand: *Where then* is *it come?* (To this the Lord, ver. 21, at the same time already began to reply.) It is far easier at first to answer the question, *where it is not.* We must pretermit, lest our comment should become preaching, the manifold, almost inexhaustible exposition of this—*not here or there!* We testify merely once more as the last thing which the Lord declares that it is *nevertheless* here *and* there, more and more everywhere upon earth! Where then? Where the Gospel is *preached!* ch. xvi. 16. Thus cometh the kingdom, thus it is come and is ever coming; it is proclaimed and offered at once as already having entered in, and as ever in the act of coming. But only where the *word* is preached with the outpouring and influences of the Holy Spirit, with those operations and energies which have never been suspended since the day of Pentecost, yea, since the beginning of our Lord's own preaching (Heb. ii. 3, 4); for here holds good 1 Cor. iv. 20. "If our Father in heaven giveth *us* (in our human spirit) his Holy Spirit, so that we believe in his word and in it live a divine life"—then cometh the kingdom of God in us. If his ambassadors first receive the Holy Ghost, and then become witnesses for the Lord even to the ends of the earth—then will it come to all who hearken to the Holy Ghost (Acts i. 6, 8, v. 32). Where the Spirit is, there is the kingdom; this is its true characteristic in opposition to all externality without the Spirit (Rom. xiv. 17). "Its glory is in the *hidden* life of Christians"—and in their word, their confession, their works, and their life. The preaching approves itself to be God's word concerning God's kingdom, in the consciences of all, even of the unbelievers (2 Cor. iv. 2, v. 11). It is in strong demonstration of the Spirit and of power, but then it may be said again—See and observe, how *inwardly* in the heart this power of the Spirit lives and works! The kingdom of God *externally* exhibits itself in truth only *as* an internal principle; and all its outward expression and externality is, alas! still mingled with infirmity and baseness, and sometimes concealed amid the specious lies which confess not the truth, but hold it nevertheless in unrighteousness—so that it has never yet been a *kingdom* in the *external* full reality of this word. And if thou askest after *that*, thou must ever be directed from all that is external to that which is within.

Is this, then, always to be the case, and is the kingdom ever coming never to be entirely come, that which is internally prepared never to be externally consummated? Assuredly *it will be*, for the preaching of the Gospel and the Spirit witnessing in those who believe it, testifies it from the beginning to be a *future* kingdom, one which will truly correspond to all παρατήρησις, or "observation," in even its external characteristics—The great and notable day of the Lord must come (Acts ii. 20). Of this the Lord goes on to speak.

* "For the kingdom of God is internal among *you*—but because it is not, O Pharisee, in *thee*, thou wilt *never* see it" (Dräseke).

† Only that we take it *cum grano salis*, without heresy!

‡ Where is it then? they ask. Ye have had it long enough he replies.

§ But when Shaubach discerns in the first meaning of these words "among you" a contradiction to the declaration that it was not local, not ὧδε ἢ ἐκεῖ, he falls into a misapprehension, which we obviated above by the admitted "lo here!" of the preaching and offers of the kingdom, testifying of its coming.

Verses 22, 25. To the *disciples* he discourses of that future, as to the Pharisees of that which was already present for them. Ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι, "the days will come," a new antithesis to the heretofore ἐστίν, "is." Nevertheless as that which was spoken to the Pharisees contained what was appropriate to the disciples also, so now in the transition to the disciples the words are so ordered that the Pharisees may receive them too, and ponder what is brought out into sharpest prominence in the first of these verses. For what are *the days of the Son of man?* Most obviously this is first of all a continuous explanation of the indefinite expression which the first answer shaped by the question had made use of—*kingdom of God;* consequently it is an avowal and testimony that Jesus Christ would have *his* days (יָמִים, lifetime or age, vers. 26, 28, Matt. xi. 12) regarded as the *time of the Messiah*, that is as the introduction of the kingdom of God. I am here, Daniel's Son of man; consequently the kingdom is come. He does not, however, enforce this clearer utterance directly upon the attention of the Pharisees, but meekly turns his words to the disciples, in whom he might presume such faith in his person. Those who would understand by μίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν, "one of the days," the beginning already of the day of final manifestation, ver. 26 (as if—only a dawn at least of that great day), disturb the whole chain of thought, according to which the *now present days* of his bodily presence, in the future vainly *wished back*, are closely connected with the ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστι, "is within you"; and besides so modest a desire of the future of the Lord can scarcely be thought of in any certain sense. The matter so far as we may understand it has this bearing: the disciples and Pharisees will (in a different degree on either side) wish back these lesser and slighted days of the Son of man—slighted, though in a different way, by both.* For those days of distress and perplexity (of that rejection, ver. 25, and of that judgment which will thence follow) which can alone satisfy the signification of ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι, "the days will come," (comp. ch. xxi. 6, 22, 23), the disciples will desire through their infirmity that the Bridegroom taken from them were with them again as before; but the Spirit will comfort them and point them *forwards* instead of backwards, will reveal to them the returning "Son of man," as Stephen and John beheld him, and teach them to wait for that one great and all-important Day, vers. 24 and 30. But the Pharisees, and the unbelieving Jews generally (with whom the disciples in their weakness of faith are classed), will then discern too late that they have neglected the day of Christ (John viii. 56); they will seek in vain their rejected "Son of man" or Messiah, and find him not. Thus this saying has a force *for them* like John vii. 33. 34; and seems still to cry out—While ye are spending your time in questionings, I am passing away and the day of grace is going!

Now first ver. 23 turns directly to the disciples: the general interpretation of what is here said may be seen upon Matt. xxvi. 23-27. Let not your longing for me be seduced by any delusive gratification! Such ὧδε and ἐκεῖ, "here and there," is not the right,* therefore let it not interrupt or divert you in the slightest degree from your way of patient faith (μὴ ἀπέλθητε), nor let it hurry you with impetuous earnestness to follow after a great delusion (μηδὲ διώξητε). For my coming will, like the lightning, be sudden and indubitable. The expression ἐκ τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανὸν εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν, "out of one part of heaven into the other part of heaven," is to be understood (by supplementing χώρα) of the opposite ends of the earth, as the parallel passage in Matthew shows; ἡ ὑπ' οὐρανόν is neither the whole earth, as Bengel supposes, nor is it a single land, as if the revelation of Christ extended from one land to another, as Grotius interprets, misunderstanding the lightning. The Lord speaks here of the day of his coming and manifestation in a prophetically indefinite manner; and in these preparatory words blends into one the distinctive epochs, the discrimination of which his subsequent prediction in some degree enters upon. But in ver. 25 he gives the great decisive explanation which would annihilate all false παρατήρησις, "observation," that the Messiah must *previously*, in his first manifestation, suffer and be rejected; see already upon Matt. xvi. 21, xvii. 12. And inasmuch as he sets this over against his last *parousia* (coming), this παθεῖν, "suffering," and ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι, "being rejected," at the same time embraces the whole period of his Cross-*kingdom* (τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα, 1 Pet. i. 11).

Verses 26-30. There immediately follows a second great explanatory declaration, that his "days" in the second sense will only bring *judgment* to the unbelieving world instead of the rejected, and hitherto vainly expected redemption. Once more we have, what in Matt. xxiv. and Luke xxi. is more distinctively developed, the destruction of Jerusalem and the final judgment typically blended together in one. Only thus much does the once more repeated ἡμέραι of the plural intimate, that before the ἡμέρα of ver. 30, there will be interposed periods of preparatory warning, preludes, *times* of approaching and ever-increasing judgment and manifestation, which will, however, down to the last be slighted and misunderstood. As to the particular details, see on Matt. xxiv. 37-39. Eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, first; for sensuality was the fundamental sin of the antediluvians, which will assuredly be reproduced in the last days. Only here are adjoined the days of *Lot* with their higher culture in buying and selling, planting

* Neander: Desire to have him only for one day in their midst again.

* Alford finds here a "warning to all so-called expositors, and followers of expositors of prophecy, who cry ἰδοὺ ὧδε and ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ, every time that war breaks out or revolutions occur." Well said, for English Christians especially!

and building, which again will be reproduced in the wide-extended institutions of universal industry filling the earth which is no longer to exist: thus all sensuality and all worldly culture are together included. Κατὰ ταὐτά, τὰ αὐτά, "even thus," that is, after this model and type will be the last judgment: *generally* upon the secure world turned into a Sodom like the Flood, but with *fire* like that which consumed Sodom before established as a ὑπόδειγμα, or example (2 Pet. ii. 6; Jude 7).

Verses 31-33. Moreover that in this preliminary, indefinite view, there may not be altogether wanting a hint at the destruction of *Jerusalem*, the holy city, the Lord here already utters what is more plainly stated *concerning that* in Matt. xxiv. 17, 18—although even their first hearers might have connected this with the parallel of *Sodom* if they had thought of such threatenings against Jerusalem as Isa. i. 9, 10, iii. 9; Jer. xxiii. 14; Ezek. xvi. 48. For the rest, the utterance proceeds in three clauses: first, the typical warning—Let not him who fleeth turn back! which looks forward to the typical coming of Christ in judgment upon Jerusalem, but indeed does not mean that *alone;* then a *corroboration* of this by a plain typical backward glance at Lot's wife; and, finally, the undisguised expression of the fundamental principle—more than once repeated already, Luke ix. 24; Matt. x. 39, etc., etc.—which will then hold good in its strongest sense.* There is, however, in this an advancement upon the former warning; the subject previously was the judgment upon an unbelieving world, but now the danger is alluded to which threatens the fleeing righteous, if they tarry; as afterwards, vers. 34–36, a final and rigorous separation even between the closely linked laborers in the kingdom is threatened. As they were not to come down from the house-top to fetch their stuff from the house, so they were not in fear disobediently to *turn back* upon the judgment at their heels—as *Lot's wife* had done, whose history Wisd. x. 7 had early thus symbolically explained.

Verses 34-36. So in Matt. xxiv. 40, 41, to which let the reader turn back. Here as there, we find a two-fold reference; first, an assurance that the redeemed of the Lord will live and move down to the last *in the midst of* the world, will have the society of life ἐντὸς τοῦ κόσμου, *within the world* (but *as* the children of the kingdom, so that the inward separation already exists); then, parabolically, the intimation that even the laboring servants and handmaids of the Lord will not all be found prepared. The order of Matt. xxiv. is reversed, and there is a third member added here, and placed in its strength of meaning, first: the bed indicates the *closest* fellowship of life (as in marriage), then the mill a fellowship of labor which is in some sense intimate; and finally the being together in the field (without any mention of labor) indicates any kind of fellowship generally.* Oh ye impatient questioners as to the when and the where, separate yourselves not externally before the time! It is further observable, that the Lord once at the beginning speaks of a *night* instead of his "day," ver. 30. This is not casually introduced from the allusion to the bed, but the ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί, "in that night," emphatically taking the lead, is descriptive of the *world's condition* when the lightning of the day of Christ shall burst upon it; thus it is not properly (as Grotius supposes) the *nox atra calamitatum* (dark night of calamities), for the judgments are rather already ἡμέραι, "days," of the Son of man, but the darkness of sin and unbelief, comp. presently ch. xviii. 8, and 1 Thess. v. 2–8.

Verse 37. This ποῦ, "where?" of the disciples, to which a ὅπου, "wheresoever," plainly replies, has been erroneously regarded as the undefined outcry of apprehension—How is this? when can this be? They *ask* strictly concerning the *where*, because their Master's words have been hitherto so *local*, and the undertone of their question is—Can it be that this shall happen in the holy land, in Jerusalem itself? In this appears a delusion in them similar to that which caused the Pharisees not to ask about the *where* of the kingdom, taking that for granted. The Lord here preliminarily answers by a concise, prophetical-typical, enigmatical word, the true meaning of which we have unfolded upon Matt. xxiv. 28; it remains only to remark how that meaning here applies in its simple ground-thought—Everything in its time and order, everything as it is meet! Ask not curiously after the Where, the How, or the When, but *see*, where the corruption of death is, there will the eagles come!† Where it is night, the lightning gives its frightful glare. Let it be your only care to be found as the living, and as the children of the light!

THE IMPORTUNATE WIDOW BEFORE THE UNJUST JUDGE.

(Luke xviii. 2–8.)

Hear now, what the true and faithful Witness, the only begotten Son, saith to us concerning the Father! This goes far beyond the analogy between our paternal love and the divine, between our friendship, loth to rise at midnight, yet overcome by supplication, and the divine:

* It would be instructive to collate (as Braune does in a tabular form) the *five*, properly *six*, *variations* of the expression, each one with a distinctive emphasis. Matt. x. 39; xvi. 25 (Luke ix. 24); Mark viii. 35; Luke xvii. 33; John xii. 25.

* Ver. 36 must not thus be given up; it has not simply passed over from Matthew, but has been omitted because of its similarity with the first.

† "Now should the Apostles discern how the Jewish people appeared in the sight of God" (Roos).

we have now the boldest word used in this kind of analogical argument, which no man would have dared to use concerning the holy God and righteous Father, had not the Son of God himself given it to us. But with all its condescension, the highest majesty is yet vindicated, which can never deny itself or derogate from its own dignity. It is this which is gloriously illustrated in the inexpressible and adorable benignity with which the righteous Judge of all the earth appeals to us short-sighted mortals—If I were such an unjust judge as those which ye have upon earth! But am I such?

Verses 2, 3. A history this, too common in the affairs of this evil world, and even in those of God's people Israel, as the prophetic denunciations against the corrupt judges, and promises to the oppressed widows, abundantly show; two well-known personages, therefore, appear upon the scene, with a third—the enemy—in the background, as we may now observe preliminarily. *Judges* and officers were to be appointed in Israel in all the gates of all their cities, who should judge the people with just judgment (Deut. xvi. 18), and in the time of Jesus we find still existing the judicatures mentioned in Matt. v. 21, 22. But this *κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας*, "unjust judge," despises all those injunctions which were given to the judges in the law (Exod. xxiii. 6-9; Lev. xix. 15: Deut. i. 16, 17; comp. 2 Chron. xix. 6, 7); and that not from any forgetfulness of duty, but with a bold and proud confidence rebelliously spurns it all—I know it all, *but I* fear not (the possible sometime punishment)! If there were only the fear of God, the beginning of wisdom and the foundation of the supplicating trust of faith, that of itself would teach him to have regard to the urgent supplications of a poor mortal, the cry for right and the complaint against injustice. But *this* is meant in the delineation of this bad character, in its wider sense, as it expresses the thoughts of *his own* heart in ver. 6; and not in the other sense which *ἐντρέπεσθαι*, "regard," might bear as a stronger word for reverence or awe, see Matt. xxi. 37; Luke xx. 13; Heb. xii. 9. The presumptuous man thus inverts the true relations of the two sentiments: the higher *dignity*, which demands consideration and regard, he only thinks of in connection with man; and, as it regards *God*, thinks only of the *power* to be feared, which he first scorns as the less thing, and then afterwards declares to himself that *not even* has he respect for anything human—as more immediately concerning *him*. Ah, thou proud worm, who settest thyself up for a god, because thou art a judge in a city! Hess is far from extracting the meaning when he superficially says: "He had neither religion nor honorable feeling." For *φοβεῖσθαι τὸν θεόν*, "to fear God," after all only suggests the slightest beginning of all religion; while *ἀνθρώπους ἐντρέπεσθαι*, "to regard men," on the other hand, expresses not merely the fear of people's judgment, the restraint of regard for others' estimate, but the respect for anything apart from self, and then the consideration to regard and alleviate the misery of others, the hearing of their supplication, and fear of their righteous complaint. What worse could be *recorded* of a man than this? And yet there follows the much worse thing, that *he himself* in the daring of his heart thus *speaks* of himself! Over against this man there is the *widow*, as such troubled and bowed down, and besides that, as is too commonly the case, oppressed by an enemy—not a hard-hearted believer, or anything of that sort, which might allow it to be supposed that the right was not on her side, and that the judge could not be induced to bend to her request by sympathy; but he is a persecutor, against whom she has cause of just complaint—*ἐκδίκησόν με*, "Avenge me." Schleiermacher would understand this—Give the verdict at any rate, be it for or against me, that I may know the end of this wearisome litigation; but he forgets in this unhappy violation of the spirit of the parable, that in the parallel, ver. 7, *ποιεῖν τὴν ἐκδίκησιν*, "avenge," both the certain right and the great distress of the petitioner are taken for granted. It is better to translate generally—Do me justice! in which the consequence of the judgment, her being saved from oppression, is of course included. *Thus she came* to him, that is, repeatedly, for she is to be an example of the *μὴ ἐγκακεῖν*, "not fainting":* and that is here assumed as afterwards in vers. 4, 5. Consequently *ἤρχετο*, "came [often]," is equivalent to *ventitabat* (by which she complied with her own obligation in the city where a judge dwelt); and the *οὐκ ἠθέλησεν*, "he would not," is a continual refusal of her request and repulsion of the applicant. The enemy was not necessarily mighty or influential (considerations which the proud judge did not take into account, and which would rather have moved him to maintain *his* official authority by a rigorous sentence), but might have been the judge's friend or favorite; or the poor widow had no largess to bring, without which it was not his fashion to undertake a cause, or she could not pay the costs; or it may be that when she came first he had no inclination to pursue his function, and afterwards persisted in refusing for the sake of proud consistency. What else could a poor widow expect from an *unjust* judge? Nevertheless she does not desist from urging the *judge* even as the enemy did not desist from urging her; she does not abandon the hope of pressing through every obstacle by the tenacity of her *cry;* she adheres simply (possibly with something of hope in God at the bottom, or if the parable must abide in the mere human domain, with eager expectation of man's help in her need) to this one note—Art thou not placed here as a *judge* to do right and execute justice, especially to the oppressed widow (as many times in Moses, from Exod. xxii. 22 to Deut. xxvii. 19; then also inculcated often in the

* On this word, which occurs also as *ἐγκακεῖν*, from the uncertain and various derivation, see my exposition of the Epistle to the Ephesians, ch. iii. 13. It signifies—*to desist, give up*, especially through lack of strength, to yield in fight; also, to be overcome of evil, to *succumb*.

prophets), and therefore to me? just as in chap. xi., the one makes his appeal to the other—Art thou not my *friend?*

For the rest, it must be observed in reference to the interpretation which follows, that the *widow* represents, not so much an individual soul oppressed and bereft of help, as the people, the congregation of the elect, the church apparently forsaken of God, especially in the *last time*, as predicted in ch. xvii.; so that in this point we see the *connection* of the discourse which is either continued in itself, or attached designedly by Luke. Although the church is ever the *bride* waiting for the marriage and entrance into her home, yet is she, as otherwise described in scripture, the widow, forsaken and solitary (שְׁמָמָה, Isa. liv. 1), a prey to her persecuting *enemy*. We note well, too, who he is—the same, of whom Richter's *Hausbibel* says that he is a yet greater jurist than all the Popes and all the Napoleons—the antichrist with Satan behind him.

Verses 4, 5. Ἐπὶ χρόνον, though elsewhere χρόνος signifies a long time, does not mean in in Luke's phraseology the "per multum tempus" of the Vulg., but rather the "aliquamdiu" of Erasmus, or what the English Bible translates "for a while." Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, "afterward," only indicates generally a certain space; but this formula, as well as the sense of the whole parable, rather requires us to suppose a proportionably hasty overcoming of his inflexibility through her incessant coming, and ever-urgent supplication—for the shameless man could not long endure this, as the words spoken in his heart betray. These words, however, must be carefully observed, and an undertone will be perceived in them which most expositors overlook.

First of all, assuredly, the Cyclopæan arrogance* of this language spoken ἐν ἑαυτῷ, "within himself," exhibits his shamelessness in full perfection; for he is thinking of God's undenied existence and presence even while he contemns him, and puffs from him all mankind (יָסִיחַ בָּהֶם Psa. x. 5, xii. 5) when an unfortunate child of man thwarts his purpose. And thus he will as godless and as shameless *apologize* to himself, as it were, for acting inconsistently in once doing right, overcoming the εἰ, "though," by a διάγε, "yet." Did he *refuse* before, and that absolutely—wherefore will he now do the right? Because this widow troubleth *me* (this exacting *I* is more than God or man!)—compare ch. xi. 7, 8, and note the slight oblique reproof which these words might suggest to the Apostles, who once, Matt. xv. 23, presumed to impute to Jesus the being accessible to such a motive for helping a poor woman. This becomes intolerable to the judge, he must make an end of it, that she may not by incessantly coming with ever-waxing boldness utterly destroy his peace. We understand ὑπωπιάζειν (literally to smite so as to discolor, and especially the face, then used proverbially, as in 1 Cor. ix. 27,) as a strong expression of vexatious harassing; as we should now say—"The woman torments me to death!" Not that he actually feared violence; εἰς τέλος does not mean that *in the end* she might *even* proceed to blows, but as belonging to ἐρχομένη it implies *ceaselessly* coming, in which sense it is a translation of לָנֶצַח. (The Syr. is here quite correct—לבבל צרך). It is this incessant coming which he terms ὑπωπιάζειν or *obtundere*, and he will endure it no longer. Quite correctly has Luther for ἐκδικήσω—Ich *will* sie retten, *it is my will to right her*, I will μετὰ ταῦτα, "afterward," do what ἐπὶ χρόνον, "for a while," I would not—Tel est mon plaisir, (such is my pleasure), or with the Cyclops—θυμός με κελεύει, (my spirit bids me). That is, so thinks the daring man that he means, *but* it is nevertheless not so; rather is his θυμός, "or spirit," overcome, as himself confesses, he can endure it no longer and must make an end of it. And why is this? Might he not have thrown off the burden by preventing her coming at all, inflicting upon *herself* the blows. Wherefore then did he continue so long to hold on to the mere "I will not!"? What makes him feel her coming and beseeching to be as blows in his face? We see, in short, that the man is not so utterly without feeling, not so hopelessly wicked as he had predicated of himself, and as the Lord on that account had spoken of him as being; it is *not* quite true that he feared not God nor regarded man. For he actually *regards* τὴν χήραν ταύτην, a poor, helpless woman, who besides that ran to him with her trouble; he has within him a respect, not confessed to himself for the supplication of a wretched woman for her *rights*—for he is a *judge*, and it cannot but remind him of *God*, whose prerogative it is to hear the cry of the afflicted widow and the fatherless child (Exod. xxii. 22, 23). Here we find, then, in the midst of the apparently awful contrast, a secret transition to the application, and a ground whereon to rest it. And shall God, who has placed this almost inextinguishable feeling in the heart of man, which prevents him from finally rejecting persistent supplication, not *himself hear our prayer?* He who planted such an ear shall he not hear? (Psa. xciv. 9).*

Verses 6-8.—It might seem that the application should obviously be—Behold here what the poor widow did! But more to the point, more striking, more convincing, and more in harmony with the distinctive tendency of the parable, is the impressive inference from the ἐκδικήσω, "I will avenge," of the judge, whose

* Οὐ γάρ Κύκλωπες Διὸς αἰγιόχου ἀλέγουσιν, οὐδὲ θεῶν μακάρων, ἐπεὶ πολὺ φέρτεροί εἰμεν· Οὐδ, ἄν ἐγὼ Διὸς ἔχθος ἀλευάμενος περιδοίμην οὔτε σοῦ, οὐθ' ἑτάρων, εἰ μὴ θυμός με κελεύει (Odyss. ix. 275-278). Now latterly our *philosophers* and *critics* have become such Cyclopes with the *one* eye of their θυμός, just as according to Seneca, Epist. 29 (cited by Eyth), philosophy influenced one—ut *sine metu deorum hominumque* vivas!

* This, at least, corresponds better to our feeling of the subject than to regard the judge as κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας absolutely, and to the end *utterly without feeling;* or as Alford says, His very ἐκδίκησις was ἀδικία, because he did it from *self-regard* and not from a *sense of duty.*

ἀδικία, "injustice," even in spite of himself is obliged to give way to the willingness of God to rescue man, and especially to help his crying elect. *Shall he not avenge?* * and, moreover, whom? Even the poor woman goes to him *also* as a *Judge;* but he is much more than that upon the throne of his kingdom: for here are *his own elect,* loved from eternity and called according to the purpose of his grace, to whose good all things must minister, and for whose salvation's sake the times of judgment and calamity are to be shortened (Matt. xxiv. 22). They must indeed for a while suffer from the enemy, but they cease not to cry for help before the throne of the Highest—*day and night* being a proverbial expression most significantly used for the πάντοτε of vers. 1 (Luke ii. 37). He who prays *by night* can be no hypocrite before man in his prayer; his soul is possessed by such fervor towards God as permits him not to rest. Further, the μὴ ἐκκακεῖν,† "not to faint," which was not tautological at the commencement, appears now, in the light of the parable, to denote the ever-increasing vehemence and zeal of a fervent and impetuous βοᾷν, or "crying." Let there be no darkening question here interposed—Art thou who criest certainly one of the elect? It is enough just to convert the proposition—Those who cry day and night unto God *are* by that token the elect! They implore not the ἐκδίκησις, or "avenging," of God, simply inasmuch as they suffer oppression and wrong from the evil world and its prince (Psa. ciii. 6, cxlvi. 7); for they know well that this injustice is, on account of their sins, no injustice as before the highest tribunal of God. But their *faith* in the promise, through which they have received the election of grace (see presently ver. 8), pleads with a sacred importunity, such as the Lord in ver. 1 impresses with intensity in the expression δεῖν, "ought," for the *merciful* deliverance which is their appropriate *right* now as being the elect, as much as the ἐκδίκησις was the due of the poor and oppressed widow. That ἐκδικησόν με, "avenge me," corresponds with the frequent prayer in the Psalms (κρῖνόν με κύριε, Psa. xxvi. 1, liv. 3; εἰς τὴν δίκην μου, Psa. xxxv. 23; ὅτι ἐποίησας τὴν κρίσιν μου καὶ τὴν δίκην μου, Psa. ix. 5), comp. furthermore 1 Macc. ii. 67.

How does the Lord then point the application? Assuredly what is involved here is the crying day and night, the waiting in faith for the certain answer to the question—*Will* he not grant the request, and avenge? For there is in the ἐπὶ χρόνον, "for a while," the *appearance* as if he would not come. But now when the Lord indicates *this* point of incidence between the parable and its interpretation, he designs to make prominent in it the *contrast* for stronger assurance, and as preparing the way for his own λέγω ὑμῖν, "I tell you." Luther's translation of that most important and most profound additional clause: "und sollte (er nicht) Geduld darüber haben?"—and have patience with them?" is most assuredly incorrect, and contains no clear sense at all; apart from the fact that μακροθυμεῖν, "bearing long," does not signify the merciful hearing of the request, but obviously a *tarrying* and putting off to grant it. Others read it as a question—"And doth he linger and hesitate about it? No, he certainly doth not, but is willing at once!" But this would be contrary to that doctrine of the divine delay and lingering which we find recognised in other parts of Scripture, and even in some of our Lord's other parables: the appearance, yea, the reality of such delay is essential here to the entire matter in hand. To change the reading μακροθυμῶν for μακροθυμεῖ*, would not essentially affect the sense; and we cannot but think that it corresponds with the fundamental idea of the parable, which is concentrated upon this point, to regard the καί as here standing for καίπερ; and hence Meyer corrects it—Although He forbears towards them; and the English translation has very properly—Though He bear long. But it is not just as Hassler seizes it—For he is forbearing towards them, not troubled and harassed by their unjust importunity. The most obvious and plain sense of this well-known μακροθυμεῖν† must ever be the letting them pray on without granting their prayer, the lingering with the help, the keeping silence, (Psa. lxxxiii. 2), which causes the impatient petitioners to cry out—Alas! O Lord, how long? How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood? (Rev. vi. 10). Why withdrawest Thou Thy hand, even Thy right hand? pluck it out of Thy bosom—and make *an end!* (Psa. lxxiv. 11). But we see (as Roos hits the point most pertinently) that what in the unjust judge is *hardness of heart* is in God *forbearance*"—since wisdom and love move *him* for good reasons to delay his relief, and protract their prayers. This *forbearance* is not to be regarded here, first of all, as forbearance towards a wicked world, lengthening the limits of probation (2 Pet. iii. 9), though that also is combined with it; for the ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, "with them," shows the elect to be its object. There is a mystery here, the solution of which is left to the enforcement of a faith that will not be baffled by it; an indication of *important reasons,* which God must have for such delay in the case of his own elect. If we seize this aright, then may we go on to observe, penetrating still deeper, that there is now a col-

* This is of itself much stronger than the German—Sollte Gott nicht auch?—(Should not God?) The reading ποιήσει is acknowledged by Winer, among others, to be more admissible, though Lachmann prefers ποιήσῃ: but both readings would in truth concur in the same sense.

† Strangely by Schleiermacher made to refer, in spite of the aim of the whole parable, to the blending of *working* with prayer!

* Which Bengel prefers as *insignis lectio,* and says: "Prioris membri verbum in textu transit in participium βοώντων, alterius membri verbum stat immotum, μακροθυμεῖ, longanimis est?"

† Lange says—*hochherzig,* large-minded, with a heavenly greatness of mind and requirement; but this is ungrounded.

lateral idea which was prematurely urged before: *Although* he indeed does not help on account of *his being fatigued* with their prayer"—for he significantly abides the crying much longer than the unjust judge, yet it is to him the pleasure of his love to be urgently and fervently and perseveringly prayed unto; he would be overcome by the true Israelites as he was by their forefather Israel!* Thus we see that he does not once drive away his petitioners as the judge had done many times; he merely keeps silence, and does not *grant the request*, though he patiently listens to the *pleading* continually. Here find we the "exceedingly refined meaning of *μακροθυμεῖν*" which Olshausen refers to, which, though as a fact seemingly discouraging, itself becomes an argument of confidence—"Thou *hearest* my request, however; therefore thou wilt assuredly *grant* it!" For faith thus tested and disciplined can cry, "It was only to purify me wholly, that thou couldst delay so long!" The patience of the Lord towards the world is at the same time a patience with *us* in order to our salvation: see 2 Pet. iii. 15 as following ver. 9.

Oh how will he *then* avenge and vindicate his own elect, and how speedily! Oh how will he reveal himself in superabundant kindness to the desolate one, when the reproach of her widowhood is remembered no more, declaring himself to be her Bridegroom and Husband! (Isa. liv. 1–5). Every act of salvation, and every urgent request granted, is indeed in a certain sense a *coming* of the Lord, oftentimes taking place when "least hoped for, and when the energy of faith and prayer was almost extinguished"—and this preliminary *application* may therefore be justified.† But the *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, "on the earth," is not only a coming from heaven, a descending with his saving power generally; it signifies the coming of the *Son of man*, that is, in his personal, visible presence (chap. xvii. 22)—as everywhere so here it is to be eschatologically understood. We have already referred to the question whether a connection with chap. xvii. may be here established; the *αὐτοῖς*, *unto them*, chap. xviii. 1, cannot be said, "without doubt," to continue the former discourse, still less must the *καί*, *and*, be pressed to mean *item de præparatione ad futura illa* (also concerning preparation for that future). It may be so, it may not: for *ἔλεγε δὲ καί* is after all the general formula for something new, as *αὐτοῖς* is a general definition of the disciples. We can very well understand, without any other aid, why in this last period of his teaching (since Luke ix. 51) the Lord often came back to his Parousia (coming).

The *ἐν τάχει*, "speedily," may be regarded as the Divine measurement for the whole period of forbearing delay. He cannot hasten to deliver his people, and reveal himself sooner than this wise *μακροθυμεῖν*, or long-suffering, prescribes (hence, *e.g.*, Rom. xvi. 20). His operations are ruled by his prudence, one thing after the other, everything must be done that is preparatorily required; and in the end this *ἐν τάχει* will have its proper and essential truth, in the sudden conclusion of all: this fulness of meaning the same expression is found to bear in all its comprehensiveness in Rev. i. 1. "*But* will the Son of man, when he cometh, find faith?" Thus generally taken the word would be too rigorous, especially after the crying saints have been referred to; and it seems to verge upon an entire failure in the work of redemption. This is not, however, the language here used; the article in *τὴν πίστιν*, "[*the*] faith," points especially to *that* faith of unwearied and unwearable prayer, as it were, that *absolute*, *perfected*, *consummate*, faith which the parable has set before us. It is true, viewed under two aspects, first, that the slightest, weakest faith (often being encouraged as such) has, as being faith, much power; and then, on the other hand, that "a slender, tottering faith is something infinitely little, *yea*, *as nothing*, when we compare it with the great substance of the Gospel, with the immeasurable love of God: the father tells his child that he has learned nothing when he has only learned a little, and that he shows no obedience, when his obedience is but slight" (Roos). We think, moreover, that the Lord in his gracious strictness thus puts the faith of his elect in question, only that he may found upon it a great assurance, and say: The Son of man, on that account, will not push his delay to the uttermost, for then even his elect might not be saved, they themselves might fall altogether into the *ἐκκακεῖν*, or "fainting," of despair, as if there were no Judge in heaven, and as if there did not sit upon the throne of grace a Redeemer who long ago judged and triumphed over the enemy. Let us ever humbly mourn over our want of faith, and acknowledge that the *ἐκδίκησις τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν*, "avenging of the elect," will finally spring from that unmerited grace which will put an end to their trials, and that it will not be the result of the efforts of our wrestling *prayer* alone.* For the *ἀντίδικος*, "adversary," as he has the power upon earth, so has he to the last a minimum of *right* against the elect, which, however, the consummating *mercy*, that always and conclusively perfects our faith in answering it, will utterly annihilate and extinguish; so that we shall obtain justice against Satan, and rejoice in it for ever. Thus will the Lord judge the cause of his people, and make them to rejoice in his mercy (Ecclus. xxxv. 21).

---

* Lange, according to his view as given above—"Though he deals with them in his great and incomprehensible way."

† As Baxter (*Saints' Rest*) begins his book: "When the Son of God comes with recovering grace, and discoveries of a spiritual and eternal happiness and glory, *he finds not faith* in man to believe it"—with a spiritual application to the Lord's coming into the heart.

---

* For it would be blasphemous to say, "*Faith* doeth it all!" If Jehovah had not mercifully said, "It is enough," Israel would never have *overcome*.

THE PHARISEE AND THE PUBLICAN.

(Luke xviii. 10–14.)

The πεπεισθότες ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς, who trust *in themselves*, in the fixed and presumptuous imagination that they are *righteous*, have not *the* πίστις, or "faith," which the Son of man seeks upon earth; their unqualified assumption ὅτι ἐσμὲν δίκαιοι, "that we are righteous," is contradicted by the counter-testimony of their undeniable ἐξουθενεῖν τοὺς λοιπούς, "despising others"—words which, in this superscription of the parable, sound almost like that previous haughty ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἐντρέπομαι, "I regard not man." These self-righteous ones to whom the Lord spoke were not *Pharisees;* for in that case (as Schleiermacher scarcely needed to insist) the figure of a Pharisee would not have been held up to them as a *similitude.** The πρός τινας, "unto certain," indeed continues within the circle of the αὐτοῖς, "unto them," ver. 1, and refers to certain *disciples*, whose spirit is thus indicated as being peculiar, improper, and perverted. We can scarcely assume that these τινές had given occasion for our Lord's words by any outward expression whether of trust in their own righteousness or of contempt toward others. The πρός, "unto," is, as in ver. 1 ("to the end that"), the Evangelist's intimation of the tendency and *aim* of the parable, the superscription of which is thus given; and he bids us understand that it was not intended merely for those who were then *addressed*, but that we must find the τινές of the Lord's application among his disciples of all time, and possibly in ourselves: and it is *to this* that the significant article in τοὺς πεποιθότας, *the ones* trusting ("which trusted"), and the present εἰσί, *are* ("were"), belonging to it, seem to point. It is often said, one expositor echoing another, that these proud μαθηταί, or disciples, might, after hearing the preceding parables, have declared their spirit in some such way as this—"If prayer be the question, we can pray well enough, better than others; and as to faith, that is not lacking in *us*," and so forth; but we regard such a connection with what precedes as neither indicated in Luke's words, nor probable or indeed conceivable in itself. Assuredly the brief, condensed, and diffident *prayer* of this first publican-repentance, does form an excellent pendant to the persistent crying of God's elect; and, taking the two parables together, we have in conjunction the boldness of faith and the depth of humility which co-exist in all true prayer; but all these allusions and coincidences, like those before mentioned, must be referred to the tenor of Luke's purpose, according to which he, from ch. xvii. 1 onwards, binds together, in a profoundly pregnant design, individual subjects of various kinds, and not in immediate historical sequence. (See further ch. xvii. 11, 20, xviii. 1, 10, 15, 18, 31, 35, where are merely parallel formulæ, quite distinct from those which we find in ch. xix. 1, 11, 28.) If on the assumption of a historical connection after ch. xvii., the Pharisees would have to be regarded as among his hearers, *this* of itself would not, as we have already said, prove anything to the contrary; for Olshausen's assertion goes too far when it declares the exhibition of a Pharisee in a παραβολή, or *parable*, before Pharisees themselves to be an altogether inadmissible theory.

Our Lord, moreover, persisted in his unvaried, unbroken, uniform controversy with the Pharisees, from the Sermon on the Mount down to the final Woes. But *this* parable has too often lost to our ears its simple power and grandeur, in consequence of our neglecting, through our very familiarity with it, to transpose ourselves into its scenes and realise its living impression upon those who heard it first. The simple narrative begins with the every day occurrence of two men going up to the temple; though the sharp contrast which is suddenly called up to the mind (a Pharisee and a Publican, sounding very much like in India—a Brahmim and a Pariah,) would excite the attention to a high pitch, and lead the people to expect something anti-pharisaical in what was to follow: although the righteous man comes off very well at first, his thankfulness before God seems well-grounded, and all that he says in his prayer is literally true. The hearers around must have said—"Verily they are just such, these holy men, even so do they in their very hearts regard their righteousness! And does not all this avail before God?" Then comes, forward in contrast with him the penitent, broken-spirited Publican, so graphically drawn in his reality, that one cannot but say—Such a Publican must often have exhibited just that same penitence, since the kingdom of heaven commenced among men. Many among the listening *people* (for this parable we feel was spoken openly before all) might say, yielding to their first impulse—"Now *this* poor sinner will be *also* justified and accepted with the other;" and with what a flash of sudden amazement would they hear the supreme utterance of God's own decision on the prayers—*This* man justified and *not* that! This unveiling of their hearts before God is

* Lange, indeed, opposes this obvious and often-repeated remark, by putting the converse—in that case, he says, no Publican can be supposed to be present, and no Priest or Levite when the parable of the good Samaritan was delivered. But, apart from the incongruence of the last example (for the Priest and Levite there are not the central figures), this argument overlooks the distinction between the mere listening of the Pharisees and Publicans, and their being expressly the persons addressed in the parable. Assuredly we think that the Lord would not have addressed to Publicans, *as* Publicans, a parable concerning a justified Publican. [The force of this argument is not evident to us at least. To a mixed audience of Pharisees and Publicans the contrast in this parable would rather seem to be highly pertinent.—Am. Ed.]

almost like the sudden withdrawal of the veil of Hades in ch. xvi.; but that the prayers themselves, the contrast of which must have seized all consciences, had prepared the way for it.

Verse 10. Two *men* go up to *pray:* in this simple introduction the right hearer will discern the aim and spirit of the whole; for whatever one man may be in the estimation of others, "his name hath been named already, and it is known that it is *man*," that is, a sinner before *God*, who "cannot contend with him," but must sue for mercy, (Eccles. vi. 10). The Publican's prayer is the only true prayer, not simply as the genuine expression of a first repentance, but also as the continuous ground of all prayer. But the name of God is not at once uttered, it is left to the petitioners themselves: they *go into the temple*, that is, their contemplated "praying" *appears* at first as a similar external work in both cases; the process of the parable will show, whether they both did actually go to *God* and truly *pray* to him. And it was altogether right in both cases, for the house of God is especially a *house of prayer*, and remains so even in the New Testament, where, however, Solomon's word concerning coming to *hear* (Eccles. iv. 17), has much more weight than in God's ancient typical service it could have, before the *Word* of reconciliation was set up. A *Pharisee* and a Publican—this sounded, to the people long bound and habituated to the teaching of their judges (their Gooroos, to refer once more to India,) very much like—A *pious man*, a *saint;* and a right proper *sinner!* We can scarcely realize vividly enough how astounding was our Saviour's declaration of war against the Pharisees; not less directly in the teeth of all prejudice and habitual custom than when afterwards his servants went forth announcing among the heathen—that their gods were no gods! For the specious sanctity of such devotees is more dazzling, and less revolted against by the instinct of the conscience, than all the names and glories of false gods. These two men presenting their prayers will probably suggest Cain and Abel (just as at Matt. v. 23)—but which in that case is Cain? The Publican, who yet strangely dares to tread the sanctuary? Let us hear what and how they pray, and mark how great a difference there may be in the praying of two different men.

Verses 11, 12. The great man has appropriately the precedence, and he was first named. But before we hear him, we must *look at him*, and so livingly reproduce the scene before our eyes. Then follows immediately, and very significantly for the ears of those who hear aright, πρὸς ἑαυτόν, "with *himself*," whereas we should have expected προσεύχεσθαι πρὸς τὸν θεόν, "praying to *God*." The prodigal son came εἰς ἑαυτόν, "*to* himself," the unjust steward pondered prudently ἐν ἑαυτῷ, "within himself," this man turns back again still, even when designing to pray to God only, πρὸς ἑαυτόν, "with himself," these are three not capricious gradations of the expression. But we must not, if we rightly understand this, construe the πρὸς ἑαυτόν, "with himself," with προσηύχετο, "prayed," for that would not harmonize with the ταῦτα, "thus," additionally following:* but it belongs to the σταθείς, "stood," as the *corresponding* μακρόθεν ἑστώς, "standing afar off," shows; and both design to set before us the two men in the most expressive manner, as the Lord proceeds to set forth their several prayers as heard by God. What then may be the precise meaning of σταθείς, "stood," thus absolutely used, with regard to the former? Alford thinks that, as contrasted with the ἑστώς, "standing," afterwards of the Publican (who stood merely, and remained as he came in), it is equivalent to placing himself *in position* (answering to being seated of the other usual posture)—in a studied place or attitude. This is involved in the expression, as we shall presently admit, but scarcely in the expression as it stands alone and without the additional clause, which, apart from that, will not harmonize with προσηύχετο, "prayed." Externally the position of both seems just similar, for each stands apart by himself—but what a difference under this seeming similarity! We must somewhat anticipate in order to catch this striking trait in the delineation of their character. Ἑστώς in itself indicates the prodigal's unstudied *standing* immediately after his entrance into the sanctuary; indeed it is almost left uncertain whether the fear-stricken man entered at all εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, into the temple; the μακρόθεν, "afar off," *might* be taken in a more emphatic sense—he dared not enter in, deeming himself unworthy; for his *earnestness* in prayer looked towards the sanctuary of *God*, from which his *humility* felt itself justly excluded. On the other hand, the σταθείς signifies something intentional, *he placed himself*, (ch. xix. 8,)—and we naturally ask, where and for what purpose? The answer is—in a separate place, *alone by himself*, which πρὸς ἑαυτόν, as the external expression of an internal involution in self, must imply; even if, as Rosenmüller observes, πρὸς ἑαυτόν should never mean *solus* or *seorsim*, like καθ' ἑαυτόν, yet this lies in the symbolical significance of the word. Thus it is not as Von Gerlach says (though otherwise rightly interpreting)—"He placed himself apart *boldly*, in his *usual* place;" but he turned only to *himself* (not to God), withdrawing himself into *himself* (from others), consequently carefully retreating from

* Thus neither with Bengel—"Penes se ipsum orans, *sibi auscultans*, quasi *neminem* ferens sibi proximum (he supposes — ne Deum quidem in orando!)—nor invalidating the real emphasis which is in the expression, as Olshausen does: προσηύχετο πρὸς ἑαυτόν simply as equivalent to אֶצֶר בַּלִּבּוֹ Alford leans this way, giving ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς, Mark xiv. 4, as a parallel: but the plural there makes the case very different—*among* themselves. We may obviously suppose that he did not utter his prayer *aloud* in the temple, without resorting to this; and it is very wide of the truth to interpret it, that he did not dare to let such a proud prayer be heard! [The English version, "stood and prayed thus with himself," is incorrect and ambiguous. It should rather have been, "standing by himself prayed thus," σταθεὶς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ταῦτα προσηύχετο.—Am. Ed.]

the impure neighborhood of the other despised offerer of prayer whom he met there, exhibiting himself apart, as much as possible, from all others as *the* worshipper, *the* righteous man (as the Publican terms himself *the* sinner:) thus he stands not, properly speaking, before God at all, but only before *men*,* and does not even confound himself with other *Pharisees*, who are included among the "other men" of his prayer. It was an offence to him, at first, that he was obliged to go up with the Publican at all, and with all the more solicitude, on that account, he takes his own proper place.† Thus both stand apart, each for himself; but the one is designedly in the spirit of *pride* turned to the contemplation of *himself*, the other involuntarily in the spirit of *humility* remains *far off* from that God in heaven whom he truly supplicates.

And now for the so-called *prayer* of that one. Ταῦτα προσηύχετο, "prayed *thus*,"—profuse and stately enough, at least in comparison with the Publican's λέγειν, "saying," bursting from the depths of his heart in one deep sigh, concerning which we might suppose the Publican himself saying—"Alas! I a sinner *also* went up (but once, or this time in full earnest) to pray; but as I stood there, I could not *pray*, I could *only* utter one word—God be merciful to me a sinner!" The Pharisee is not thus embarrassed: let us hear him! First comes the unrestrained and bold invocation of the name *of God*—so far well, happy they who lay hold of their privilege of entrance into his presence! "*I thank thee*" —that comes next, and, as it might seem, still better; for is not thankfulness to God proper, and seasonable, and blessed in all places and at all times? The angels only praise God, they have at least in their happy sufficiency nothing to pray for; we men have to thank God for the double benefit of creation and redemption; and that may be a high and heavenly prayer which, forgetting petition, lifts up before the presence of God thanksgiving alone. Still more: this holy man does not praise God for any earthly blessing which might have been vouchsafed, nor for any common benefit or aid such as less pious men than he might be ready enough to acknowledge to God's glory; but he *thanks* God for this, that he commits not sin, that he is not a sinner like other men. And is it for God's *grace* that he is thankful, that grace which had brought him to this, which had saved, and purified, and preserved his soul from sin? Ah no, far enough is he *from that;* for what read we next? That I *am* not as other men are—in this treacherous, this presumptuous *am*, the wretch within suddenly shows himself as he is; and all that good beginning is resolved into mere hypocrisy and factitious conventionality of words! Only a deceitful compliment to God, assumed to give his words the form of *prayer*. We mark at once, as the degenerate prayer goes on from worse to worse, why he has not anything to *supplicate* like other men have, and why *his* "*I thank thee!*" is a mere empty form of words, in which God only is the receiving party. Genuine *thanksgiving*, even if it begins, must proceed onward to *confession* —for I am worthy of nothing, less than the least of thy mercies. Turn to 1 Cor. xv. 9, 10, and see how another, once likewise a Pharisee, thanks in genuine gratitude the *grace* of God that he is what he is, a laborer above all the rest of the Apostles. But our Pharisee knows nothing whatever of sin or of grace in relation to himself. "I am a righteous man fundamentally, and since I am such, I was never anything else." The wretched man intends to pray, and has made his beginning with "O God;" but since he finds himself wanting in nothing (nay, out of his external πάντα ὅσα κτῶμαι, "all that I possess," he can give his tribute), he passes by praying altogether, and proceeds forthwith to *thanksgiving*. But even in this there is nothing but himself for him to think of, himself, the complete and consummate Pharisee is all—that he is not like other men! Yes, it is even literally—he is not ὥσπερ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, like the rest of mankind; for he despises τοὺς λοιπούς, the rest, ("others,") totally and in mass. There are only two classes of mankind in the presence of God, and himself alone constitutes one! If we do him injustice, his own foolish lips are to blame: indeed he seems to have lost all propriety and rational understanding in what he tells his God. Alas, thou prodigy of mankind, thou single and preëminent *man!* didst thou not go up as man to the temple to pray, and art thou no longer a man like other men?

Let us hear further: who are then the other men, like whom he is not? Naught but sinners; and he can most magisterially describe and condemn them in all their forms. And does he then so accurately know all other men, far and wide, their life and their hearts? As to their hearts, he thinks as little as he does of his own; but he has *seen* sins enough externally committed among them (that is assuredly true); in himself, however, he has seen none (and that, alas, God pity him! is true also). *Extortioners* they are—selfishness places that *first*, mammon being its supreme good, and the aggression of others upon that being the most grievous offence; we will leave it undetermined whether there is here a secret side-glance at *this Publican*, whom as his abhorred fellow-worshipper he has in view from the beginning. Then come the *unjust* of manifold sorts in common; and then again immediately (for he must sum up hastily in order to arrive at *himself*), that one more great scandalous sin may be

* So that the same sense comes out which has been sought in προσεύχεσθαι πρὸς ἑαυτόν, only more conformably with the occasion and the phraseology.

† Does the Lord mean to say—Separated from the unclean Publican according to the usual custom? Grotius denies this, and says—Nam *mos id ferebat*, ut publicani in atrio Gentilium, Pharisæi in atrio Israelitarum starent (for custom required that Publicans should stand in the Gentile's court, Pharisees in that of the Israelites). But it is this very *custom* which our Lord paints, only he exhibits this Pharisee, who would have a distinct *atrium iustorum* for himself apart from other people, as carrying the matter beyond mere custom.

named—very familiar to his thoughts, though he repels it from his own soul—the *adulterers*. But the enumeration is very far from running through all the commandments and prohibitions: idolatry at the beginning, and evil desire in the heart at the close of the decalogue, never occur to his thoughts. If we could suppose God to answer him by setting before him the *true* catalogue, with the question appended in each case—*Art* thou not such thyself, at least in my sight? then might a revealing light have penetrated to his soul, and he might have recognised in himself the extortioner, and even the adulterer (according to John viii. 9, and especially in the spiritual meaning). But he has never allowed the word or prohibition of God to speak to his conscience, and therefore he can speak to God with yet greater confidence; reaching the climax of his presumption when he scornfully points with his finger, and utters those fearful words of vanity (Isa. lviii. 9; Prov. vi. 13)—Or even *as this Publican!* In all this he condemns himself; for it is his misery, not to be like other men who are conscious of their sin, and that he does not pray like this petitioner standing before him. Invading God's prerogative, he gives judgment before either he or the other had been answered; he has no eyes and no feeling for the humility which loudly speaks in the external appearance of him who was *truly praying;* for what is prayer *to him*, what can he know thereof even while he is appearing to pray? Thus his inmost thoughts come frankly and plainly out into expression in this first portion of his prayer—*in that* he is no hypocrite, but "*sincerely* trusted in himself that he was righteous, and therefore he tells that to his God in the prayer which God alone heard" (Wesley). The Saviour shows in this parable, how "the internal character of the soul reveals itself in *prayer*, that is, when it is uttered not according to prescribed forms, but in its own words and *without dissimulation*" (Roos). There is a profound gentleness in the circumstance that this parable, which would graciously create shame in the sinner by the promise of mercy, does not exhibit one of those hypocrites who could never have undertaken to say before God that they were not as other men, but one of the better sort, *one who in his profound self-deception may be regarded as sincere.** The Lord makes the experiment with such a one, whether he would learn wisdom by seeing himself thus exhibited in a glass (for the parable is doubtless intended for Pharisees generally); and to his disciples he exhibits such a character in parable, confronted with which the sincere "God be merciful to me a sinner!" might lead some of them to smite upon their breasts, and be a *deductio ad absurdum*. In the hearing of men, many Pharisees among his own disciples might be very ready with their "merciful to me a sinner!" at the same time that they think in their hearts, "I thank thee that I am not like the children of the world and other natural men:" *both* a mere form of speech, the first in that case the worst of all.* This man here under the law has not gone so far; he *would*, indeed, justify himself *before God* (ch. xvi. 15), since he altogether forgets that God knoweth his heart —and how ill he succeeded in that! He places the abused name of God first, which *taken in vain* at once condemns him; the lying thanksgiving follows; and, finally, his *contempt of others*, and uncharitable condemnation of his neighbor whom he sees before him in God's presence, makes evident the groundlessness of his πεποίθησις, or self-confidence; as the violation of the second table ever presupposes a trespass against the first.

But the Pharisee-prayer has also a second part, a second table, in which the beloved I, not like other men, must come forward with its evidence, and impute to self all its authentic righteousness; so that instead of receiving his thanks God himself must conversely be made its debtor (Isa. lviii. 2). After he has repelled every imputation of violating the *prohibitions*, he does not pass to the positive ordinances of rectitude and mercy (not knowing anything of these, as it seems); but, making a great leap over this chasm, mentions at once the *works of supererogation!* His prayer, as a whole, may be variously arranged. First of all, he shows what he *is*, then what he *does*, and yet again what he *gives*. Or it may run thus: My conduct to my neighbor—all this I am *not!* My service to God—I diligently fast, and beyond the commandment! My fulfilment of the law —I go beyond its requirements, tithing even in things doubtful! (ch. xi. 42). He now reaches the end, and knows no more; even the *alms* (which, indeed, might be part of the fasting) are remarkably enough pretermined while he thinks of his mint and cummin; as to his official duty to help *other people*, so that they may become *such as he is* (Acts xxvi. 29), of that he has not the most distant thought. Even the *fasting*, which should have led to his internal mortification in order to true prayer, he despatches or achieves† twice in the week as a work of supererogation (Mondays and Thursdays

* "And in that fashion there are enough found to imitate this Publican, as they pray Our Father; they have heard the word that God is ready always to forgive poor sinners, and they have learned to smite upon their breasts, and in word and gesture closely to copy the Publican, so that one might swear, even they themselves might almost swear, that they are precisely in the state of this poor penitent. But all, meanwhile, is mere deception; they are Pharisees like the other, no better." So Luther in his sermon, fundamentally expounding the narrative as a *parable*.

* For "this self-deception, such a self-justifying estimate of self is possible, without any rank hypocrisy; it is to be found, alas! only too often among so-called excellent and *sincere* men" (Zeller, *Monatsbl.* 1844, No. 10).

† And, indeed, without much difficulty, like the Romanists now. "What was easier in the warm east, and where the day ended at six, than to fast a whole day? The great meal of the day would be in the evening" (Braune).

beyond the commandment, according to the then custom). On the *Sabbath* itself he enjoys all the more complacently his meal; and the question may arise, whether or not with ἁρπαγὴ καὶ ἀκρασία, "extortion and excess," Matt. xxiii. 25. (Thou Sunday-Christian, dost thou *pray* only *once* in the week, when thou goest into the temple?) Finally, in his beautiful conclusion, πάντα ὅσα κτῶμαι, "all that I possess," he reposes serenely, over against the God whom he invokes, on his mammon (*jactat possessiones);* as we popularly lay the emphasis upon the last word—of all that I *possess!* When we look narrowly it is not κέκτημαι, hold as property, but κτῶμαι, that is, "of all which I *acquire*, obtain by my efforts, produce;" thus making the words still worse in their significance, for he procures for himself all that he possesses. Even this κτῶμαι, which might at last have driven him to a repetition of his thankfulness for what God had *given him*, stands in blunt contrast with his εὐχαριστῶ σοι, "I thank thee"—*thank* thou *me* for what I give out of my acquired possessions! He can connect *God* and his own poor, wealthy *I* with its appendage, much more comfortably to his own mind than can the Publican, whose own probably not inconsiderable πάντα ὅσα κτῶμαι, "all that I possess," begins to weigh down his heart.

Verse 13. That the proud worshipper had most formally and ceremonially prayed, with *uplifted* eyes and hands, we may gather from the contrast which is now given: the humble man, remembering in the temple *God* and his throne in *heaven* (Matt. xxiii. 21, 22), and the invocation of that God being a great reality in *his* mouth, regards himself as unworthy even to lift up his eyes (Ezra ix. 6. Prayer of Manasses ver. 9, comp. with Prov. xxx. 12, 13)—οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, not even his eyes, not to say his hands, which the Pharisee stretches forth as a model statue of devotion. We strongly doubt whether it may be said that "the Publicans in Jerusalem were not so utterly godless, but that they remembered to go up to the temple at the time of prayer;" for these "sinners" had the reputation of not being hypocrites in their sinful life, and the appearance of a Publican in the temple might have been a very infrequent thing. The Pharisees were at home there, and their piercing glances would repel all whose thorough earnestness did not drive them to the house of prayer; and, as a rule, he also whose profound sense of need did not urge him would the rather absent himself, as his coming would never be imputed to him as an act of righteousness while he continued a "Publican." But this one has come under the mighty impulse of a *first repentance*, and as the whole makes evident, has gone up his sorrowful and burdened way; so much the more does the nearness of God in his sanctuary seize upon his spirit, so that it seems to him as if every man who beholds him sees into his sinful heart with the eyes of God himself.* The concentrated pang of deepest shame so keenly afflicts him, that he, without well knowing what he does, adopts and uses the ceremony of repentance in profound sincerity—he *smites upon his breast*, as the people did afterwards under the cross (ch. xxiii. 48)—with the ancient expression of sorrow and bitterest complaint, see Nah. ii. 8, comp. with Luke viii. 52; xxiii. 27; Matt. xi. 17. *Ubi dolor, ibi manus* (where the pain lies, there the hand presses). He has looked *inwardly*, and feels that God looks inwardly to his sinful *heart;* and therefore, as he will not lift up his eyes, so he will not open his mouth to recount and confess his individual *deeds*, the countless sins of his life: it does not enter his mind to come before God with an enumeration—This, and this, and this, *have I done!* For that might be, as, alas! it is with many—But other things I have not done, sometimes I have done good things, I am not altogether sin and evil; believe that, O God! Ah no! he does not even dare to say, in all the full bitterness of the word, what he most unconditionally avows and gives to be understood—I *am* a sinner. Τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ, (lit., *to me, the* sinner,)—in this τῷ * there is not the comparison which cold observation has detected in it—τῷ καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλῷ (*the* sinner by preëminence). Oh no, he *makes no comparison* here! The Pharisee, although σταθεὶς πρὸς ἑαυτόν, "standing by himself," casts his eyes around, to mark who was present to behold him; but the Publican has no glance to throw anywhere, he thinks of no other person under heaven. He is thus saved from the error of beginning to think—"Would that I were like other holy and righteous people, like this Pharisee!" "To the Pharisee all are sinners and he only is righteous; to the Publican all are righteous and he only *the sinner*."† There stands the great word in the parable, in all its luminous force, for ever uttering its mighty testimony from that broken and smitten heart; a word which the Pharisees pass by and never find, and which the disciples of Christ are tempted too often to forget to hold fast, as the Apostle Paul did, to the end of life—*I the sinner!* ‡

* Remark, that the Lord still vindicates the sanctity of the temple as the house of prayer, and does not make the Publican pray there in secret. (Bahrdt was very infelicitous in his observation upon this; commending the Publican because, rejecting all positive religion, he is exhibited as uplifting his heart to the great All-father, with an humble sense of human infirmity!).

* Which Thomas Scott, on his death-bed, most impressively remarked upon. Alford (against Greswell, and without noticing Scott's life, which mentions the circumstance) denies any emphasis in this τῷ, with that philological tenacity which he sometimes manifests. The parallels to which he refers, ch. vi. 24 and xi. 46, are not decisive in his favor. At least ch. vi. 24 retains a similar emphasis; and the *singular* here is something quite different from the general distinction of a class by the article.

† Westermeier, in his *Fortsetzung der evangelischen Hauspostille von Uhle.* Roos, too, says with great simplicity, and for our time almost prophetically—"The Publican does not say, I am a creature dependent upon God," etc., etc.

‡ We do not agree with Lange in his contradiction of this general view of the parable: "The

But before this word of *penitence* has escaped from his overcharged breast and comes to his lips, his *faith* has already discovered how it may be uttered before God without despair. His *shame* is not *fear* or horror; for he, ignorant Publican as he was, has apprehended and understood better than the scripture-learned Pharisee, the gracious promises of the earlier covenant; and he has embraced them with his *heart*. *Be merciful to me!* Thus does he urge in his prayer, most probably without knowing it, the beginning of Psa. li., and in the selfsame spirit of penitence and faith. He places this between God and himself the sinner; and thus, with infinitely more boldness than he was conscious of, he perfectly fills up the wide gulf between. Whether in the expression used to that end, ἱλάσθητι (ἱλάσκεσθαι, *e.g.*, כִּפֶּר, Heb. ii. 17), we have *here* intimated a *knowledge* on the part of the Publican of a "necessary propitiation" in order to the forgiveness of sins,* so that we may ground upon his words, as a *locus classicus*, our dogmatic theories, is exceedingly questionable. It is assuredly at first no more than the unbiassed apprehension in his correct feeling of the term of the Israelite phraseology for the forgiveness of sins, which *afterwards* his better knowledge might explain. As elsewhere the Sept. has ἀφιέναι, and very commonly ἵλεων εἶναι (see *e. g.* Heb. viii. 12,) for כִּפֶּר (*condonare*, properly disburthen, remove the load, cognate with כָּפָא and כָּפַל), so also we find it translating sometimes ἱλάσκεσθαι, as in Psa. xxv. 11; Dan. ix 19. Let us not disturb, by our premature and inappropriate *dogmatizing*, the incomparably profound and affecting unity of this most simple of all penitential prayers, which condenses into its heartfelt brevity the quintessence and sum of Psa. li., and which is either the easiest or the hardest prayer, as it is apprehended by the *heart*. For the heart of such as this Publican it is for ever easy and obvious enough; almost the only perfectly sincere outpouring of the most internal sorrow and supplication of the wounded heart. One glance *upwards*, which the heart sends without the eyes—one glance *inwardly*, where *the sinner* has sinned against heaven and before God—one groan breathed upwards again—*nothing more*—brings down the reconciling grace for his justification: then can he joyfully *lift up* his eyes, and utter now his own *genuine*—God, I thank Thee!

first repentance and conversion are not depicted here, this Publican is already a man of prayer; all through his pious pilgrimage his petition would be ever for mercy, and even as a ripe believer would thus enter into the house of mercy, profoundly humble." Quite true, and beautiful as an application for us—but as the first meaning of the parable? The Lord makes use of well-known characters, when he speaks of a Pharisee, and a Publican; and no man would have thought of such a rare thing as a *pious Publican*, ripe in faith! The whole representation assumes that he comes for the first time, and stands before God as a type, the sinner.

* Comp. *e. g.*, Sanders, *Papstthum*, p. 35, according to which the Publican thinks of the typical mercy-seat in the Holiest: hardly!

Verse 14. And now let us feel the sublime majesty of this Λέγω ὑμῖν, "I tell you," in the mouth of the Son of man, as it indicates God's answer to the respective prayers of these men. "*I tell you*, for I know; I have seen, I have heard, all this, in many such a case, and in many such prayers." The Lord not only knoweth what is in man, but what also is in the heart and counsel of God concerning man; here he shows himself to know what God worketh in men, and what he giveth to them. The Publican is *justified*, the sinner is acquitted and pardoned, as soon as and because he has sighed for it. The simple, and indeed singular, ἢ ἐκεῖνος, "rather than the other," is probably the true reading (quite corresponding to ch. xv. 7); but the MSS. have variously changed it for ἤπερ, ἤ γάρ, etc.; and many are even of opinion that παρ' ἐκεῖνον, or ὑπὲρ ἐκεῖνον was originally found in the text. The γάρ which Griesbach admitted, would simply, according to Winer, indicate the question—*Or the other?* But this so entirely disturbs the emphatically *decisive* distinction between the two, that even Winer prefers the emendation ἤπερ. Suffice it that its most obvious meaning is assuredly just the simple Hebrew מִן, and means to say—this man was justified before the other; that is, *the other was not!* For this Luther aptly compares Matt. xxi. 31. How could such a Pharisaical prayer as the one here described, attain to any kind of δικαιοῦσθαι, or justification? The man literally *supplicated* nothing, least of all justification! We cannot, therefore, imagine how Von Gerlach can say that "all justification before God is not denied to the Pharisee, he is only placed below the Publican!" Was it then that he had only "little forgiven" in his thoughts, like that debtor in the other parable, which is incorrectly paralleled with this? When the *application* of the parable can be safely detached from its original historico-typical figure, as it is described in the strongest lines by our Lord, and we can clearly discern how far the "Pharisee" may reappear among our Lord's own disciples, then shall we be able to see the milder force of the not undesigned *comparative* expression.* If a δεδικαιωμένος, or "justified" person, again *begins* to trust in his righteousness (Ezek. xxxiii. 13, πέποιθεν), the consciousness and the possession of justification begin to depart from him; and he recedes in comparison with the Publican who comes first before God. Therefore despise not such, and never forget that the same grace which ye have received is ready to be offered to the very first and faintest ἱλάσθητι, "be merciful," of the most abandoned reprobate, with the same fulness of love which ye yourselves have experienced.

The contrast and conflict of the two great parties which our Lord so truly describes, goes on through all ages of the church and people of God: the trusting in *works* and personal merit down to its most subtle forms, and the appeal to free, unconditional *grace*. Most assuredly

* Which Tertullian reproduces—"justificatio Pharisæo." Cyprian—"magis quam ille."

our Lord takes one side in his decisive word: and as it respects the great demarcation of character before God, this alternative holds good in all its rigor. But we must be on our guard against the parable, and ourselves distributing all men dogmatically, as they are actually found in various degrees of progress towards that great final demarcation, into the two classes, whose extremes stand here before us in their two exemplars. The young man, for example, who comes forward a few verses further on in the same chapter, who had kept the commandments, and to whom, nevertheless, something is lacking, is in truth neither like this Pharisee nor like this Publican, but his character is conceived as in the intermediate transition. Finally, in its deepest principle we think that they are not always "*two* different men" who thus "move onwards to the courts of the common temple;* but they oftentimes come together in one and the same man, so that the Pharisee and the Publican put up together one marvellous prayer. Not merely as Westermeier has it, "The mouth often says—God I thank Thee! but the self-seeking heart turns round and gives itself the glory. The confession is—We are all sinners! at bottom, however, *all* are indeed sinners, but *ourselves* not." But in the poor *heart* itself the two voices conflict with one another long after regeneration, like the accusing and excusing in the natural conscience. And it is the masterpiece of the divine grace to consummate at length the great distinction between the two: His μακροθυμία, or long-suffering, bears, forgives, and heals, even when as yet it does not find τὴν πίστιν, the pure trust and reliance upon the foundation of grace without any Pharisaical corruption. It is *this* which the great utterance at the close is designed to teach us, concerning the being exalted and the being abased, as we have already expounded upon Matt. xxiii. 12, and Luke xiv. 11. In Luke xiv. it proceeded from the *expression* of pride or humility, but here their internal principle and *root* is disclosed; Matt. xxiii., however, shows, for the warning of the disciples themselves, that the exaltation and abasement embrace a long process, and many various degrees, before the end of either is attained.

There is another feature which must not be overlooked. The Publican *went down to his house:* this is not intended simply to round off the narrative which commenced with their going up to the temple; but has a significance of its own. And, first of all, the Lord thereby commends, by a silent antithesis, the Publican's having sought God's consecrated *place* of prayer, and not having hastily sent up his prayer at his receipt of custom, or in his chamber. Or if the reader thinks commendation here too much, he does not blame him for it. Further, this κατέβη, "went down," in its close connection with δεδικαιωμένος, "justified," indicates that the Lord refers to the *consciousness* of both, in *which* the one experiences and is sure of his justification, the other not. Thus the Pharisee goes down as he came, without having silenced that evil conscience which, in spite of all his candid pride, secretly troubled his peace; indeed there impends over his head, while he thus continues to exalt himself, a fearful humiliating blow which will finally alight upon his head, and crush him into the dust. But the Publican, although he returns to his old dwelling (that is, as a bye-thought, although he remains a *Publican*), goes on his way as a new man, no more a sinner! Justified at first, he is therein, and it will be soon manifestly seen, sanctified also; furnished and ready now to say—God, I thank Thee, that Thou art merciful to me! In this gratitude he performs all good works, of which he had *promised* nothing, for grace now begins and goes on to exalt him. He gives to his God not a tenth merely, but all that he has, all the pleasant fruits which now grow in his new paradise (Cant. iv 17).

* To use the language of a miserable hymn, which has been fabricated upon the words of our text.

THE TARRYING WITH ZACCHÆUS.

(Luke xix. 5, 9, 10.)

According to his design, the Lord had only passed through Jericho, as the διήρχετο of Luke intimates at the beginning, thus harmonising the accounts of the *two* blind men whom he met on entering and on departing from the city—see our remarks on p. 384. But, always seeking souls, a sinner suddenly arrests him in his way; and in order to ensure the finding of this soul he very gladly interrupts his διέρχεσθαι, "passing through," to interpose his δεῖ με μεῖναι, "I must abide." And behold there was a man, ἀνήρ and not ἄνθρωπος, that is, a man of consequence, for he was a *chief among the Publicans.**

* We may without damage leave it uncertain, whether it was an actual farmer of the revenue, a *publicanus*, or only a chief receiver of the revenue (a comptroller who received the dues from the *portitoribus* and rendered them to the general-farmer). Although, according to the rule of the Romans, only a Roman *eques* (Knight) was generally a farmer of the revenue, yet we find in Josephus that Jews sometimes attained to this dignity—hence it was quite possible in the case of Zacchæus. (The Jewish name is found 2 Macc. x. 19, Ezra ii. 9.

And the same man (Erasmus: *et idem*, in addition) was, as it appeared, *rich*—yet did he desire to see Jesus; and that not with Herod's curiosity, but with a longing after salvation which places him by the side of the Greeks in John xii. 21. He was nearer to Jesus than those poor strangers at the feast, but had been long in beginning to concern himself about Jesus; his time, however, was now fully come. It is strange that he had never yet become acquainted with the person of this friend of publicans, whose passage through that country so near to Jerusalem, must have been frequent; but we find that he would see τίς ἐστι, "who he was," though the sequel shows that he was influenced by a deeper feeling than merely that. He is not poor, and not needing the Lord's help like the blind and the lame who fly to the Son of David for compassion; but his soul is the seat of that penitence of the publican which impels him to seek for grace. He must have *heard* much of the kindness and the earnestness of this Jesus, who had not long before called Lazarus out of his grave; but now he will and he must *see* Him for himself. And what then? The excellent Schubert (in the history of Jacob Häufer) does him injustice when he says that the desire of Zacchæus was to have a good view of Jesus. Probably it was his design afterwards to venture on such an approach as that of Nicodemus, or in some other such way as might suit him; what might follow was indistinct to his mind, *for the present* he would not intermingle with the company of His followers, certainly not press forward into the immediate presence of Jesus, for he does not presume to think of detaining the Lord who is passing through, by publicly and pressingly obtruding his own heart's need. Thus there is a befitting humility in this eminent man, who deems that an invitation to his house would not be honor enough for the Lord; a kind of diffidence of the right sort, the first commencement of a coming like Nicodemus from afar. At the beginning of His official career Nicodemus comes to the Lord from the high council, at the end of it Zacchæus comes from among the publicans. Zacchæus has *less* in him than Nicodemus, for he will merely at the first see, and not approach—so it *would seem;* nevertheless he has at the same time *more* than Nicodemus, and is entirely won more easily. The Publicans enter before the Pharisees, sinners before the righteous, and this is once more seen here. As a token of his inward earnestness, *better* than *Nicodemus*, Zacchæus comes in open day, in the middle of the town; although not in the presence of all the people (for he runs before), yet not without spectators, for the high official is not above climbing into a tree as one of the curious, sight-seeing multitude. As he was little of stature, he thought that among the people (ἀπό like ענ instead of ἕνεκα) he could not attain his end;* there was no stone, no block, to help (as Pfenninger expresses himself), nor was it necessary, for there grew the sycamore tree just at hand.† He hastens to climb up, that he may have a secure place before the crowd comes, and thus behold Jesus, unmarked either by him or by the multitude.

But he *is seen* by him who also beheld a Nathanael under the fig-tree. When Jesus came to the place, *he looked up*—why did he this, for there was no imaginable occasion to do so? *He was sensible of his presence there*—as Luther's translation has it, but the εἶδεν (like the ἰδών, ver. 41) includes a *looking* before the descrying. The Lord perceives the man who was as much as possible concealed, penetrates the secret of his heart, calls him by name, invites himself to his house: now the Lord was not accustomed in such journeyings to look up into all the trees, or to offer his visits to those who were wont to gaze at him from their branches. Thus it is not "petty and foolish, to seek anything wonderful in all this" (as Schleiermacher scrupled not before his auditory to say); but there is in it a real wonder of grace, the guiding providence of the Father guiding a soul to his seeking Son. The Lord might indeed in the ordinary way have known the *name* of this chief among the Publicans, and might indeed have seen and remarked the man who nevertheless knew him not;‡ but that he should now look up, and find him in the tree, still more that he should penetrate his heart in order in so extraordinary a manner to offer him salvation, surpasses most assuredly what is purely natural. *Zacchæus!* Thus he calleth one of his sheep by name, crying into his inmost heart—I *know* thee, I know what thou desirest! Thus does he summon the diffident man with wholesome promptitude to announce his decision before all the people; and overpowering his fear, *invites himself* to the house to which he had not been invited, thus anticipating in his grace the desire of the

Nehem. vii. 14.) For the rest, Jericho, as a great mart and place of transport, and then on account of its dates and balsam (on which there was a special impost), might well be the seat of a general office of the Publicans.

* How often does the multitude hide from us the person of Christ! The multitude of the indifferent, the followers without earnestness, the watching enemies! These are the true *little of stature*, however lofty and great, who are so "petty of spirit, that they cannot even leave the crowd, in order to see and to seek the Lord" (Gossner).

† The sycamores are not very high (that would have been unsuitable in this case), and therefore the easier to ascend; hence travellers report that they are often resorted to for pleasure, and that beds are hung among their leaves. Gossner says further—"Little soul, is there then no tree grown for thee, which thou mayest ascend, and thine eyes behold him who bringeth *salvation* to thy heart?"

‡ That he acquired the man's name (as Neander thinks possible) from the people standing round, having observed him casually, is not to be supposed: any such interposed question cannot be conceived of in the account, which gives the looking, the seeing, and the address, simply. Any such, "What is that man's name?" would be altogether inconsistent with the dignity of the everywhere typical conduct of our Lord.

man who had not dared even to draw near.* *Make haste*, and come down! Not altogether without a gracious though slight blame of the strange method which he had taken; we may indeed symbolically generalise the words: "Leave all thy own inventions and devices in thy fearful coming — *I come myself to thee!*" Climbing up and coming down, everything has its time. Zacchæus had gone before in haste, but the Lord is more in haste than he; for there would be no time for any later visit, this was the last passing through Jericho, and now was the time for one last testimony before his entrance into Jerusalem, one final public testimony to all the people before his passion, in the conversion of a Publican. I will come to thee *at thy house*, where thou wilt better see me and hear me; I will *tarry*, and interrupt my journey by resorting to thy dwelling! (Μεῖναι, equivalent to καταλῦσαι, ver. 7.) Not merely I *will*, but *I must*. What *dignity* in answer to every objection of precipitation and surprise in this σπεύσας, "make haste," and δεῖ, "must;" and at the same time what an impulse of *love*, which testifies that it must be so, that it is bound thus to tarry in the way! For it is in the Lord's commission to act thus, as is stated afterwards in ver. 10.

Zacchæus is not terrified, protests nothing good or evil, is no longer ashamed; but he is instantly won, and with *joy* receives his high guest, whom he may lead to his home. Each had found what each sought—the Saviour and the sinner. But that the Good Shepherd has found a stray lamb, that the Merciful One should now begin again to exhibit his mercy, excites new murmuring among all the beholders of this remarkable scene; that is, of course, only among that *all* which was composed of mere beholders, those who were accompanying him, ch. xviii. 39, and the inhabitants of Jericho. "He is gone to be guest with a man that is a *sinner!*" Oh wretched and blind people, to murmur at *that!* An ἀνήρ, "man," but yet a ἁμαρτωλός, "sinner," because a Publican, and even a chief among the Publicans—there is the deep-seated delusion of the people, condemning the whole class without any respect to the character of the person. On another occasion they might have spoken more respectfully of an ἀρχιτελώνης, "chief-Publican," but now, as it has to do with Jesus, he is no more to them than a τελώνης καὶ ἁμαρτωλός, "Publican and sinner."

The narrative, which is itself hastening towards Jerusalem, leaves it to be understood that between vers. 7 and 8, we are to interpose the whole time of the καταλῦσαι, "or sojourn;" for Zacchæus cannot have advanced so far as to speak as he did, before the Lord's visit, and as it were precipitately at the very door. There is more than this presupposed, also, in the εἰσῆλθε, "entered," and in ver. 11, just as in ver. 28, the journey is regarded as continuing. Schleiermacher thought, like many before him and after, that the καταλῦσαι must be taken as a tarrying over night (which the people hastily presumed when they spoke); and consequently that it was on the next morning that the proceeding of ver. 8 took place.* But the σήμερον, "*to-day*," ver. 5, did not stand in such close connection with the μεῖναι, "abide," as this assumes; rather must we regard the σήμερον, both of ver. 5 and ver. 9, as indicating that one and the same day of grace which had come to Zacchæus and his house, and which was so prominently intimated already in ver. 5.† A sojourn through the night would scarcely have been so hastily dismissed in the σταθεὶς δέ, "and he stood;" and ver. 28 continues the record of the διήρχετο, "passed through," after the interruption with a definite ἔμπροσθεν, "before."

But what must the Lord have spoken in the house of Zacchæus, whether his visit were for one hour or many! This host certainly acted more like Mary than Martha; for with what confidence of new life does he stand forth, after salvation has come to him! "With one that is a *sinner*—do the people say? Yea, verily I have been a sinner, but he, whom ye blame for not having despised me, hath taught me righteousness." Thus as a new-born child he justifies the wisdom of God, thus does he bring the quickly matured fruit of a still repentance which had received the blessing of grace, in a public avowal of penitence, of faith, of new-found righteousness. He does not address the mockers—for whose sake, however, now at the close, he speaks these words, not within the house, but outside (ἀκουόντων αὐτῶν, ver. 11)—but his new *Lord*, from whom he cannot separate himself, whom he joyfully calls his Lord, and in whose honor, and to whose praise he now makes his vow before the people. In his wealth there is much unrighteous mammon, and much of other men's goods, the restitution of which in the proper place must be ever impossible; his conscience teaches him what the parable which he had not heard had counselled to converted Publicans. Not indeed all that he had, but yet the half he gives to the poor: δίδωμι, "I give," is distinctive; it is as good as if done, for he now assumes an obligation before the whole town, the poor of which will soon claim its fulfilment. And if I have taken anything *by false accusation*,‡ I restore *fourfold!* and for meeting his official responsibilities, as the Lord had not called him from his office, he retains the other half. It is quite clear that the εἴ τινός τι, "if *anything* from any man," does *not* involve anything like a bold challenge (as 1 Sam. xii. 3), or even express a doubt whether any such could come forward: but, on the other hand, it is equally clear that he is not conscious of overreaching having been his *common* practice, and it is his intention conscientiously to watch

* The only case in which we *read* this, but not, probably, the only instance in which it occurred.

* Many even add that it was the Sabbath, and a day of rest.

† This Neander urges against Schleiermacher.

‡ Συκοφαντεῖν, usual in the Sept. for נשׁק, retains here as in chap. iii. 14 the subordinate idea of apparent right, connected with self-interested information or denouncing.

against it in such matters as had afforded occasion for it in his earlier thoughtlessness. In every case in which I have overreached, I will make compensation; if I have done it (alas! indeed, sometimes), here let a new righteousness begin! Now, then, he is a righteous man according to Ezek. xxxiii. 15. Now does he voluntarily and joyfully determine to do more than what the law, which grace does not supersede, requires of him.*

The Lord answers, as he was addressed—*πρὸς αὐτόν*, "unto him," actually speaking to Zacchæus; but with an indirectly expressed testimony to those who are around, he confirms in his good pleasure the confession and vow; rather he crowns it by the fullest assurance which he now gives, putting it upon its right foundation, and at the same time appends a *testimony* to his own *person*. The new righteousness of the sinner has a good *foundation*—thus must we understand the not unmeaning *ὅτι*,† "forasmuch." *Salvation* is come, for the Saviour has entered; hence there is joy in the tabernacles of the righteous (Psa. cxviii. 15). Again there is almost an open—*I am he!* almost a gracious illustration now in the last days of his life of his *name of Jesus*. *This day*, forsooth, for other days will now soon come; at the same time, *now first to-day* the day of grace hath dawned upon this man and his house! It was before—To-day I must abide *in thy house;* this is not all that the expression now involves, but it gives an intimation to Zacchæus, that he must henceforth guide his whole house to salvation and peace; comp. ch. x. 5, 6, and what was said upon Matt. x. 13, 14, on p. 173. The reference to the *house* as the foundation, as of human, so of political life generally, and of the *church* to be raised up, begins thus early to occur in the Lord's discourses, and then runs through the entire New Testament. Do ye despise him as a Publican? But I say unto you —*he was yet a lost sheep* of the house of *Israel*, though given up by you in your loveless bigotry, having his own claim to the Messiah, the Shepherd:‡ and now he *is* in truth through faith a *recovered*, renewed, and genuine *son of Abraham* (Comp. ch. xiii. 16.§ The Son of man is come for Israel, and indeed for the world at large, not only to *save the lost* sinners generally as ye all are, and those given up as lost by yourselves (as this Publican was), but also to *seek* them, to enter in unto them before they can invite him or *receive* him. Thus we may dogmatically say, in a sense not to be unconditionally exaggerated, that "compassionate love effects as well the beginning of the higher life as its full consummation, so that all is its work." But we have already declared in relation to this utterance, and now freely repeat it, that God *seeks* in man something which comes to meet his eternal love with the susceptibility of receiving it, and with all his seeking is far from always finding it, and consequently that it is not always produced by him.¶

PARABLE OF THE SERVANTS OF THE NOBLEMAN WHO GOES AWAY TO RECEIVE A KINGDOM.

(Luke xix. 12–27 [Matt. xxv. 14–30].)

The disciples themselves were involved in the erroneous ideas of ver. 11; and this notwithstanding all the Lord's declarations concerning his impending passion: see ch. xviii. 34. The Lord therefore adds a public and plain parable in connection with his public departure from Zacchæus; not the only instance of eschatological discourses, first pronounced in a wider circle, and then reiterated to the disciples: see Luke xii. 36–46. Jesus has just testified (not in the house of Zacchæus, but at his door, where the people, not having dispersed when he entered in, were awaiting his egress, comp. ver. 28) for what purpose he had come, and what was the true *σωτηρία*, "salvation," for the children of Abraham. And as they heard *such things*, so contradictory to all their expectations of the Messiah, he appends to this utterance before the people a parable, which should also be an appendix to all the previous announcements of his passion and departure which the disciples had heard. *This* is the meaning of *προσθεὶς εἶπε*,

* The reference to a Roman *lex de furto* which prescribed fourfold restitution disturbs the significance of this beautiful saying, and is not strictly pertinent, since there was a *lex de publicanis* which was content with the restitution of the *simplum*, after the expiration of a year. The law of Moses (Exod. xxii.) requires only in a special case, ver. 1, fivefold and fourfold restitution (hence 2 Sam. xii. 6); else, as in vers. 4, 9, only a doubling was required in compensation, just as was customary in Athens. This Zacchæus goes beyond, and doubles again.

† "*Just because* this day salvation has come to this house" (Lange).

‡ I have not gone in to a *Gentile!*

§ This view of the losing and finding again justifies the *second* sense, without any necessity for a *γέγονε* having been used. Most strangely did Erasmus refer the *αὐτός* (in which the *ἁμαρτωλὸς ἀνήρ* of ver. 7 is evidently made prominent) to *οἴκῳ*, translating — "eo quod et ipsa (domus) filia sit Abrahæ!"

¶ We may be permitted in a note to remark upon the wise and comprehensive discrimination which selected the history of Zacchæus for the Gospel of Consecration-day, in connection with the Epistle, Rev. xxi. 1–5. In the latter we have the consumma-

"he added and spake," and ταῦτα, "those things;" the latter is not intended to indicate that he had previously continued to speak on the subject. The excitement of expectation is strained to the utmost by his public approach to Jerusalem, where his avowed enemies were gathered to wait for him; and he speaks of his coming death but as a setting out on a journey from which he will return. Thus he shows how this first coming of the Son of man to seek the lost, this coming of salvation into the hearts and houses of penitent sinners, is related to the expected *kingdom* of him who was to come. He gives, further, to the converted Zacchæus, an admonition similar to that which he had given to the converted Publicans in the parable of the steward; only that as his conversion had been a deeper fact, and he had already, by anticipation, dealt rightly before all men with his unrighteous mammon, the Lord at once passes over to the administration of spiritual goods, which in that parable (ch. xvi. 10–12) had only been hinted at. The ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ πιστός, "faithful in a very little," here, ver. 17, is intended to recall that discourse; just as we have the *cities* here instead of the habitations or tents there.

When in Matt. xxv., after a short interval only, the Lord repeats what is here said to his apostles, we must understand him as impressively intimating: It still holds good, and ye must not forget what I said before in Jericho to all the people and yourselves! And in Matthew the delivery to the servants on occasion of the setting out becomes an actual fact, while here it is a prophecy. This relation of the two discourses, as well as all the fundamental ideas of the essentially similar parables, we have already discussed upon Matthew. The side-glance at the punishment of the citizens who protested against his dominion, as well as his entrance upon his kingdom, is there omitted; and these, with the other variations of the parable, have their profound significance, as we have already shown.

Verse 12. Is εὐγενής, "nobleman," private man of eminent lineage, not a βασιλεύς, or "king," by birth, and his βασιλεία, "kingdom," therefore a subordinate jurisdiction? Assuredly not, but the word contains a concealed μείωσις (meiosis) with reference to his heavenly origin. The kingdom here spoken of belongs to the Son of God, a born King, as an *allodium;* it is, on the other hand, a *feudum* which the *Son of man* is to receive: there remains the testimony, too, that in the person of this Son of man these δοκοῦντες, or "thinkers" (ver. 11), have actually before them their future King. Nothing is said here of a going away to receive a kingdom *in another place*, in heaven (as Roos mistakes); but it is a departure in order to receive the crown and return. The ground-work of this part of the parable is derived from the political relations between the power of the house of Herod and the superior authority of Rome. Herod, under the government of Antigonus, journeyed to Rome, primarily and ostensibly seeking the βασιλεία for Aristobulus, but was himself consecrated king in the Capitol (amid idolatrous rites), and after three years of troubled war, obtained possession of the kingly authority with which he had been invested—an exceptional instance—as no more than a private εὐγενής. And, more to the point, his son Archelaus, mentioned in his will, went first to Rome, where the emperor adjudicated between his claims and the claims of Antipas, mentioned in a previous will. But the Lord's kingdom is confirmed before the highest throne on manifold grounds of right: as the Son of man he is invested or rewarded with the crown, for his worthiness' sake; as the Son of David he receives the patrimonial heritage, which belonged to him from eternity as the Son of God by right of eternal birth. The going away to heaven, to the Father, is a πορεύεσθαι εἰς χώραν μακρήν, or "going into a far country;" for that world is an actual region opposed to this, and we cannot but think of ch. xv. 13, where the departure of the son from his father's house into the world is similarly described. Not merely is "heaven, to many confessors of Christ, a *far*, unknown, indifferent land" (as Lisco here preaches); but Christ himself anticipated the hard journey of *death* through the rent veil of his flesh.*

Verse 13. It has already been remarked that the ten of *His* (collective) servants is equivalent to the article in Matt. xxv. 14, and has the same meaning, as also in the case of the ten virgins; Schleiermacher incorrectly supposes that these servants might not be the highest, and not the only ones. Every one who adheres, in fidelity and obedience, to the future

---

tion of salvation in the new world, the tabernacle of God, of which all houses of God typically prophesy; in the former, the gentle commencement of salvation in the individual, in the midst of the confusion of the old world, in the hastening of the Redeemer to his cross. There all is new and openly revealed, here we have the new heart with its first confession wrought by secret grace. There is the tabernacle of God, here our own house, whose best guest is the Son of man abiding in it. There we have the word of preparation for the bride's throne, here the first call of the Saviour for the seeking of the lost. What would this salvation be, if it did not come to me and my house? This is the beginning to that end—behold the tabernacle of God among men! Hence also the intimation to press through the interposing tumult of the people, to press forward to Jesus himself; the exhortation to charity to the poor; the mention of external sonship, the priority of the seed of Abraham; and finally, in the background, the warning of judgment against the *old* Jerusalem. Two exhaustive ecclesiastical *pericopæ* (passages)!

* Sincerus Bibliophius (*Die Leipziger Religionsfrage; Wie dünket euch um die Höllensfahrt Christi?* Magdeburg, 1844) finds *here* the *descensus ad inferos* intimated, and understands by the far country the region of the head—but this is a well meaning error. The above is the only view which suits the *receiving* of the βασιλεία, or "kingdom," the establishment of which is regarded as upon earth. Elsewhere the Lord has hinted at the descent into hell, as in Matt. xii. 40, and most plainly in ver 29.

King, and thus is distinguished from the opposing citizens, is in the widest sense his servant and true minister, and is entrusted with office and work in the preparation of his kingdom. Hence it is not the twelve whom the Lord mentions; for then the people would have thought of the Apostles, and Zacchæus would have deemed himself excluded. In the meantime the departing Lord puts into the hands of his adherents a little authority and a slight gift, *as the test of fidelity;* and this appears under the *figure* (almost like a parable within a parable) of a sum of money to be traded with.* The question may arise whether the *μνᾶ*, "pound," is the Hebrew *mina* of a hundred shekels, or the Attic of a hundred drachms (about $15 of our money); but the parallel of the talents, and the general selection in the parables of money then current, are in favor of the latter. In relation to the Lord and *κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν*, "according to his several ability," every one received alike; in relation to others there is a difference in each case: and this is indicated by the variation in the parable as repeated. "Occupy, trade till I *come*—in power, judgment, and recompense;" emphatically said in contradistinction from—*till I return.* So at least in the common reading; more properly it is, perhaps, *ἐν ᾧ ἔρχωμαι*—*While* I am departing and returning, while I am on my journey.

Verse 14. These lesser gifts, to be used in calm diligence, the King has apportioned to his faithful ones; instead of *weapons*, against the rebellious people, who will not bear his dominion, and whom he bears with for a long time, till his return. The confused state of the Jewish land, split up into factions, and vexed with partizanship, had led to a deputation of fifty persons being sent to Augustus to complain, though vainly, against Archelaus (who had restored the country wasted in war, especially round Jericho, where he had built himself a stately palace): and thus does the Lord illustrate the enmity of his people, of the *πολῖται*, "citizens," of his *βασιλεία*, "kingdom," as being a solemn and formal protest sent against himself to the throne of God. There was in ver. 7 an outbreak of this enmity, which would not have the *Saviour of sinners* (*οὗτος*, ch. xv. 2) for the Messiah; but here the Lord signifies the utmost daring of their contradiction after his own death (*ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ*), the opposition of Jerusalem especially to the apostolical witness: this reaches the presence of God,† and is regarded by him as a *πρεσβεία*, or "message;" it is received at once and rejected. We must note the scornful *τοῦτον*, "this man," and the *οὐ θέλομεν*, "we *will not* have," which gives no reason for their complaint—"He is contrary to us, he is not a *persona grata* (agreeable person), we *hate* him, for all his love!"

Verses 15–19. See upon Matthew the notes upon what recurs there. The *ἐπανελθεῖν καί*, "when he was returned, then," involves in itself an obvious *ἐγένετο*, "it came to pass," for the supreme liege Lord, the Father of the Son, receives not, like Pilate, the protest of those who hate his Son. But he having received the kingdom, does not at once return in all his authority to take vengeance upon his enemies; but graciously judges and rewards first his own special servants, dependents, and confessors. Oh that he had only to praise and reward! The *διαπραγματεύεσθαι*, "gain by trading," which only occurs here in the New Testament, means elsewhere — to propose, undertake, arrange, and execute a plan, but passed naturally like *negotiari* into the meaning of *negotiando lucrari;* just as we might say—What *business* each had carried on. And, with reference to the *verbum simplex* in ver. 13, we might attribute to the *διά*, in composition, the additional idea—What each had carried on *in the meanwhile*, through the whole intervening time. The faithful servants humbly and rightly ascribe the increase, not to themselves, but to the Lord's pound—*προσειργύσατο*, "See what Thy seed has grown to!" But the Lord did not seek the *τοκός* (interest) for himself, as he might seem to do by his accommodating himself to the delusion of the slothful one (ver. 23); but the diligent retain their acquisition, and receive a great reward besides. (Let the designedly striking *τὸ ἀργύριον* of ver. 15 be rightly understood, and further the *ἵνα γνῶ*—that he might know how each had acted therewith.) In Matthew the first dispensation of gifts is various, and the reward of increase is the same in all; here, on the contrary, the pounds are the same in the case of all the ten, but the reward is different. And this is a significant variation for the two sides of the question, according as the difference of the result depends upon more or less diligence, or otherwise springs from equal diligence in the use of differing gifts. The *former* is made prominent here, and therefore the second does not receive, as in Matt. xxv. 21, 23, similar commendation with the first, but merely a brief *καὶ σὺ γίνου*, "Be thou also." What is elsewhere promised generally to the *ὑπομένοντες*, or "enduring," as a *συμβασιλεύειν*, or "joint reign" (2 Tim. ii. 12), appears here as a manifold gradation of dignity, for the more mediate future of the kingdom is here spoken of.* The *cities*, the government, the administration of which the King now distributes to his tested and approved servants (much more than the receiving into habitations), are indeed in the territory of the rebels which has nevertheless become his kingdom; and consequently indicate a further

* *Πραγματεύεσθαι* is found as the peculiar expression for commerce in the Rabbinical פְּרַגְמַטְיָא, *πραγματεία* (even Eccles. v. 9, etc., in the Targum), פְּרַגְמָטִין, *πραγματεύς*, פְּרַגְמָטוּת, *πραγματευτής*, etc. The conjecture of Michaelis, who detects an error in the translation of *minæ* for מָנוֹת, *portions*, is refuted by vers. 16 and 18

† This feature in the parable refutes the exegesis of the little book before mentioned—which in itself may be highly recommended. What would be a protest sent to Hades?

* "Ten minæ would scarcely purchase a house; and the superabundant recompense of grace is ten cities" (Von Gerlach).

continuance of their active service, in the analogy of their former service, in the established and manifested kingdom. On the one hand, this distinguishes it from the final consummation of all in equal glory; but, on the other, it may not be said that even now "the servants are appointed to rule over the hosts of the enemies of Christ." For the enemies are already destroyed, rooted out of the land; there remains between them and the servants only the great middle-class of the undecided, hitherto not led to salvation; among whom the true "vicegerents of Christ" will have enough to do, while they are spreading the holy land over all the earth. See Rev. ii. 26, xx. 4 (Psa. cxlix. 6–9, in a *good* sense). It will be easy, peaceful, and blessed work with them, to rule, and feed, and guide home the remaining sheep, when the wolf is gone, and Satan is bound!

Verses 20–26. References to wrapping up and depositing money or other precious things in handkerchiefs are frequent enough; what *might* be subordinately hinted at, over and above this use, in the σουδάριον, we have mentioned already in commenting upon Matt. xxv 18; though the word, its etymology being forgotten, designates a handkerchief of any kind. J. Von Müller's note, "This is the body"—may be regarded as trifling, just as is Chrysostom's interpretation of the earth in Matt. xxv., as the earthly sensual heart. The indolent leaving unused, the foolish hiding up, is the gist of the figure. The judging of the wicked servant out of his own mouth and confession, generally a common principle of justice (Job xv. 6; 2 Sam. i. 16), has an application here different from that of Matt. xii. 37; for here it is the mildest judgment, which, accommodating itself to the position of the defence, finds the crimination even in that. The παρεστῶτες, "they that stood by," are essentially ministers of the King distinct from these servants, who execute his commandments, and who are brought with him; that these venture the objection—"Lord, he hath already ten pounds (and ten cities besides!)," is not to be attributed to oblique envy, but to mere astonishment at the strangeness of the judgment. Thereby the great distinguishing principle which follows in ver. 26 is only prepared for and made prominent; and in such a manner that the Lord Jesus makes a sudden transition, in the interpretation of all, to himself as the βασιλεύς, or "King."

Verse 27. *Thus, in his own person*, majestically making the prediction present, he pronounces now this judicial sentence upon his enemies; instead of which we significantly find, on the repetition of the parable in the circle of the disciples, the (here presupposed) casting out of the unprofitable servant. "*My* enemies, citizens who should be my subjects, who consequently are rebels against my βασιλεία—my hand now findeth them out! (Psa. xxi. 9). They *would not* my dominion unto their *salvation*—I judge them out of their own mouth" (chap. xiii. 34). But this involves a most fearful irony, for there is another βασιλεῦσαι which they must endure! "Since they would not have the Lamb, the Lion will tear them."

And when *he had thus spoken*, had thus judicially in his own revealed royal person decreed the destruction of his foes—he went onward to Jerusalem, there to deliver himself up as the paschal Lamb into their hands!

THE ENTRANCE INTO JERUSALEM: THE STONES CRYING OUT. THE GREAT DESTRUCTION.

(Luke xix. 40, 42–44.)

We have already explained upon Matt. xxi. 2, 3, and must here assume as known, the design and significance of the Lord's kingly entrance into Jerusalem, this first and last public and festal proclamation of his coming and honor; as partly intentional on his own part, and partly permitted with regard to others. Some, the most audacious, of the Pharisees, although they do not venture themselves to suppress the voices of the multitude of his disciples, reinforced by the multitudes of the people, yet appeal to himself and require him—not to permit such impropriety! Not so much that "they were filled with anxiety, lest the great outbreak should take place at once," but with infatuated, scornful bitterness: "Suffer not thyself to be called that which thou art not! Take heed to thyself, we warn thee of the shame and the punishment which the beginning will involve!" For all this he has the right answer at hand. "Should *these* whom ye call my disciples, but all of whom I do not reckon as such, as they now encompass me with shouts—keep silence? I say *unto you*—you who not only hold your peace, but even protest—It is nevertheless the voice of truth in their mouth, this loud testimony, so hateful to you, is decreed for this time, it must be so and for your sakes! This blind people—Oh! that they were all my true disciples and subjects!—know not what they cry,* but are constrained to bear their witness this day. Therefore, I tell you—Lacking them, the stones *must* cry out, would proclaim in your stead and in theirs, what the great question is between me and Jerusalem!"† This

---

* Not "seized by a *sacred* inspiration," else we should have to understand this word as a prophecy from divine impulse.

† The 3 Fut. Pass. κεκράξονται is in this verb the

is, primarily, a common proverbial expression, similarly humiliating as in Matt. iii. 9; comp. 2 Pet. ii. 16. "Are *ye* then of stone, that ye feel not the truth, and harmonise not with it?" Yet we are not to understand in the λίθοις, "even the most obtuse" (according to Neander), stony hearts to be aroused; still less (according to Von Gerlach) that God, if humanity remained insensible, would give to inanimate nature hearts and voices for his praise; or, as Hess puts it in the strongest way, "These stones around, which have witnessed so many of my deeds, echo of themselves my honor and my praise!" But the indication, immediately following, of the *stones* of the temple and of Jerusalem to be destroyed, ver. 44, gives us the right clue to our Lord's meaning when he uses the prophetic future: "*These* will soon cease with their *Hosanna*, without any injunction of mine, they will soon exchange it for *Crucify him!* fulfilling your desire, and obviating the danger you fear —but *then* will there arise a very different witness to my kingly power, which will cry out very differently against your unbelief!" For in the back-ground of this proverb there lies a hint of a saying in the Scripture, which we must consult in connection with this passage.

The prophet Habakkuk, after he has announced, in ch. ii. 4, life to the just by faith, and the opposite to all proud opposers, when *he that cometh* will come without delay,* turns in ver. 5 to the prediction of judgment upon Babylon, yet in such a manner as to include in his far-reaching threatenings a denunciation of similar doom upon unbelieving and unjust Israel. What woe should then break in upon the empire of robbery, upon the magnificence founded upon spoil; how should then the fearful account be demanded! For עֲבֹטִים, ver.6, is not thick clay or mud, according to the Syr. and Vulg. (as also it is rendered עב של טיט in the Rabbin. Commentaries), but as the Targumist rightly expresses it —תקוף חיבין, *pigneratio, copia æris alieni quod quis contraxit* (pawning the amount of others' money which one has accumulated). Now must the spoil be rendered back; suddenly rise up נֹשְׁכֶיךָ, that is, with prophetical double-meaning — *those who bite thee*, and thy creditors! Thou shalt be robbed of that which thou hast robbed—in righteous recompense. The nest on high is not secure enough. Ver. 10 says—Thou hast consulted shame to thine house, brought disgrace wilfully upon thyself, by cutting off many people; thou hast thereby *sinned against thy soul* (comp. Prov. viii. 36), or, thine own soul, thou thyself hast sinned, and incurred this penalty—which better suits vers. 4 and 5. And now for the words of ver. 11: For the stone (each one) shall cry out of the wall and the cross-beams of the wood-work shall answer it, agreeing to testify against thee! These are not the stones and the beams of the cities laid waste by Babylon, which complain against the destroyer (as in Sallust the devastated walls, and burnt beams of Saguntum *manus Punicas ostentabant* [showed the Carthaginian hands]), but the firm and well-built stones and beams of the house, vers. 9, 10, built in wickedness, of the city, ver. 13, established in vanity and blood-guiltiness—"proclaim the guilt and shame of their original." They should cry out and witness (comp. ch. i. 2); and that not merely as *poscentes justitiam a Deo ut suo loco restituantur* (demanding of God justice that they may be restored to their place) (as Burk quotes), but in the laying waste of their bootless labor (ver. 13), when the individual stone comes out מִקִּיר, "out of the wall," and every beam מֵעֵץ "out of the timber," they will cry out; and the doom will bear witness of the guilt! But the Lord will then appear in his holy temple, that all the earth may keep silence before him! ver. 20. Let it be observed, then, with what profound significance the Lord uses this expression to indicate the destruction of this Jerusalem, transformed as it were into *Babylon;* how in this preliminary word he already announces the judgment which presently comes distinctly before his contemplation.

The jubilant cry had begun when the procession reached the κατάβασις, "descent," of the Mount of Olives; the Lord comes now nearer and nearer to the *city*, as it is here termed not without emphasis, the holy city, the city of God in its external glory. He beholds it from that very position where afterwards it was beleaguered by its enemies, at a similar paschal feast. His eyes, which everywhere look for faith, which had looked through its streets and into its sanctuary for faith in vain, now *behold* the city near, and in its *naked reality*. No external appearances of glory, where the way of *peace* is not known, can deceive him; no Hosanna of his disciples can give him joy, for thus cometh he not nor the kingdom of God. In the midst of the acclamations, which he does not repress, *his* heart breaks out in lamentation over the people of this city and the city of this people—Have I been so long with you and ye have not known me! Do ye thus surround me with Hosannas, who will so soon crucify me? Not that a "silent flow of sorrowful tears mingles with the general festivity;" not merely that he ἐδάκρυσεν, "wept," as in John xi. 35; but much more than that, he ἔκλαυσεν, *wept* with the lamentation of consummate sorrow, and ἐπ' αὐτήν, "over it." It is said in the letter of Lentulus that Christ never *laughed*, and we could believe that; *weep* indeed he did, much oftener than we know of. At the grave of Lazarus the Lord saw Mary weeping, and the Jews who were with her weeping too; but here he alone is the weeper amid the universal joy. But now, as then, he thinks not of his own honor or of his own sorrow; the tears of the sympathising High Priest even now, before Gethsemane, concern our sins,

---

usual form instead of the unused regular form; as in other cases, when the Perf. acquires the signification of the Present, it is also used—formed from the Dor. verb κεκράγω. Hence it is not necessary or proper to refer to the Attic signification of this paullo-post future — it should and it must so be. (Erasmus: mox clamabunt.)

* See my exposition of this passage, as cited in Heb. x. 37, 38, in the *Hebräerbrief*, ii. 74.

which are his sorrow and his heart's deepest woe. "The man of God wept"—that was a great thing as said of Elisha, when he beheld in spirit the evil which Hazael would inflict upon Israel (2 Kings viii. 11). The Son of God wept over the guilt and doom of Jerusalem and her children—and that is infinitely greater, a *μυστήριον προφορικόν*, (divulged mystery), to which corresponds an *ἐνδιάθετον*, (conception), in the depths of the *σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ*, "bowels of the mercies of God." Love, after doing all in vain, can only weep; were God to become man, he could but do this; rather God is man here and therefore weeps.* In what multitudes of his members upon earth have these tears since continued to flow! And "how many have been converted by these tears of our Lord, in the place of those who would not then be converted!"

Verse 42. Passion permits no parable, as Hess remarks, and mighty indeed is the passion which seizes the Lord's heart, when he first looks upon the scene of the events that were then to transpire. But the first, and the predominant question, is *lamentation;* just as in Matt. xxiii. the undertone of lamenting love is heard even amidst the predominant anger against those who would not be saved. The construction of the former clause with *ὅτι* and *εἰ*, "*that*" and "*if*" (both omitted in our version), together is to be narrowly observed. The *ὅτι*, coming first, gives, as it were, an answer to the astonishment of those who saw and heard him weep: *Therefore* I weep, *that* is the cause of my tears! The *εἰ* is evidently equivalent to *utinam*, as in the Sept. for אִם, and as in Luke xii. 49, xxii. 42. Luther's translation by *wenn* (if) involves the easily perverted, and often abused idea, that apology, and not accusation, is to be sought here. In truth, this is a lamentation, the bitterness of which is its accusation. Nor is it right to say that our Lord *here* regards their guilt "in its mildest form as ignorance," for he has already spoken in ver. 27 of their *not willing* and their refusal; consequently he here means no other than wilful, self-condemned ignorance —else wherefore the terrific judgment? Ah *if* thou hadst known — only then wouldst thou have escaped the judgment—then could I have saved thee from it! *Even thou* entire Jerusalem—is this in contrast with the multitudes of disciples who were greeting him as their King?† Scarcely; for even these Hosannas were not the result of a real *knowledge*, and it is this word which has here the emphasis. Or does the Lord oppose the pre-eminently corrupt inhabitants of the metropolis (as Hess thought), to the Israelites who followed him from Galilee and the land generally? We think not, for to us this *καί*, "even," involves no such comparison. The Lord is thinking altogether and only of the *city* over which he weeps, as the elect metropolis and nevertheless the murderess of the prophets, about to reject and slay the Messiah himself. The first *καί* consequently signifies—Oh that thou *especially*, whom it concerns and who needed it so much! (for even *thou*, or it is no other than thou who art blind!) The following *καίγε* then adds—And *truly*, or even now *at least* in this day of final invitation! In this *thy day*. To interpret *ἡμέρα* as merely *time*, is also inexact; for although all the *ἡμέραι τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, "days of the Son of Man," constituted one great time of grace "for which two thousand years had been preparing" (Tholuck), a *καιρὸς τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς*, "time of visitation," as afterwards more generally embraced in ver. 44, yet the Lord had now in his soul this one last day of gracious offer, the day of his entrance into Jerusalem as a king into his own city—not without allusion to Psa. cxviii. 24. This was *thy* day; then came thy King to thee yet once more in meekness, as the Prince of peace, offering peace to thee: and yet thou remainedst in thy enmity, discernedst not *τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην σου*, "the things which belong unto thy peace," and knewest not how to be the true Salem of thy Melchizedek!* Oh what could not the Lord have done, what achievements wrought, with this excited people, had he only become, but not in righteousness, *their* King and their Messiah! But it was not this which would subserve their peace—this he *knows*, but not they. Therefore they plunge themselves into ruin through their foes, instead of receiving his peace. This last and vainly obtesting lamentation repeats now at the end what Moses in the beginning (Deut. xxxii. 28, 29) had proclaimed and denounced against this people. But now it is hidden from thine *eyes*—although thou seest with thine eyes "thy King riding upon an ass"—although thine eyes have seen the wonderful works which are praised (ver. 37), and among them the resurrection of Lazarus (John xi. 18, 19). It is *hid* through thine own fault, according to the righteous judgment of the Father, who can make his revelations only to babes (Matt. xi. 25). Hidden from thee is thy sin, my salvation and my peace, hidden from thee the word of prophecy in thine hands; hidden therefore is the swiftly coming judgment. For this latter is not to be excluded, as the continuous *ὅτι*, "for," of the following verse shows. The Lord takes this last expression from Isa. xxix. 9–12; a chapter to which his ensuing announcements point our attention.

Verses 43, 44. "Because thou hast neglected thy day, the day of peace, therefore days of conflict, tumult, and abasement will come (as

* Compare the beautiful observation of Von Gerlach, against the error of universal restoration, as against the other error of predestination. Jesus did not weep through "short-sighted grief," instead of contemplating the ultimate disappearance of all sin and all misery. Rather does he give expression to God's sorrow over the lost!

† Or — Thou also, as thy King. (So Lange, though far fetched and confused on the whole passage.)

* Not only Sepp, but Wetstein also, recognises the profound allusion to the name of the primitive, holy *city of peace:* Utinam quæ diceris Jerusalem re ipsâ esses Jerusalem, ac *videres* ea, quæ *pacem* tibi præstare possent!

xxiii. 29)—they will break in with frightful horror upon thy blind security," as is expressed in the additional *ἐπί σε*, "upon thee." Now comes the plain and undisguised description of those days, as they are even now before *his* eyes; the *tres gradus angustiarum* (three steps of distress) in living presentation, as they lead to that final consummation—not one stone upon another! *Thine enemies*—thus does he plainly designate the Romans, whose Cæsar they vainly prefer to their own King (John xix. 15); for they must be understood in these words by every reader. Yet should it not be alleged against him that he does not at once *name* them, since it is very far from his design to summon the people to a conflict with that power to which he assigns the final victory. They will cast a *χάραξ*, "trench," about thee, an encampment, a line of circumvallation, most firmly fortified; not always the case in sieges, but predicted here in expressions which have a typical meaning, even as they were literally fulfilled in due time. Let Isa. xxix. be consulted (on the prophetic reference of which see on Matt. xxiv. 15), where Ariel is threatened, the city where David dwelt, in which year is added to year of vain revolutions of feasts. Note there the "multitude of *thy strangers*" (ver. 5); and (ver. 3) וְצַרְתִּי עָלַיִךְ מָצוֹר, "and I will lay siege against thee with a mount" (Sept. *καὶ βαλῶ περί σε χάρακα*)—which in its first fulfilment, is again expressly remarked in Ezek. xxi. 22. And from this verse is taken the *περικυκλώσουσι*, "compass thee round," which is carried on in the *συνέξουσί σε πάντοθεν*, "keep thee in on every side," see there סָבִיב, "round about" (lit. *like the circle*). But it gives also an echo of the old denunciation of Moses, וְהֵצַר לְךָ בְּכָל־שְׁעָרֶיךָ, "and he shall besiege thee in all thy gates," Deut. xxviii. 52. The *συνέχειν* implies an entire inclosure and shutting in, thus anguish being added to anguish and without hope of salvation; and Titus, as we know, caused the entire city to be surrounded by a *wall* of thirty-nine stadia when the materials of the ramparts failed him. *Καὶ ἐδαφιοῦσι σε*, "and shall lay thee even with the ground"—such is the end of all thy proud magnificence! *Ἐδαφίζειν* is generally to cast down to the ground, and is then used of demolished cities—to make them even with the ground, *ἄνω κάτω στρέφειν*, "to turn upside down." (See Isa. xxix. 4, *πρὸς τὸ ἔδαφος*, and Deut. xxviii. 52, עַד רֶדֶת.) The same word applies, in another sense, to the inhabitants put to the sword, and in its most fearful meaning, to the little ones of Jerusalem dashed on the ground—see Psa. cxxxvi. 9; Isa. iii. 25; Ezek. xxxi. 12; Hos. x. 14, xiii. 16, Sept. A spurious reading referred the *τέκνα σου ἐν σοί*, "thy children within thee," back to ver. 43, not being able to connect with them the *ἐδαφίζειν*, or "razing." The Lord, who here, as everywhere, utters the language of earlier prophetic contemplation, concentrating all aspects in one human view, embraces in *τέκνοις* a comprehensive meaning; first, by a usual expression, the inhabitants of the city; then the other children of the land gathered together in one at the feast (at the fulfilment nearly two millions in all) in the metropolis, as the *ἐν σοί*, "within thee," indicates; and finally, the actual children of this present generation, as appears in ch. xxiii. 28, 29, and as was frightfully realised in their *ἐδαφίζειν* after the typical judgment denounced upon Babylon (Psa. cxxxvii). Last of all, not one stone remains upon another—and of this we have already spoken on Matt. xxiv. 2. *Then* indeed will the stones cry out; then will each one of them bear witness—I also am from the walls of desolated glory, am a witness that he whom this city rejected was and still is her King.*

The close of the prophecy turns back to the commencement of the *lamentation;* but now with the wrathful judicial word instead of the fruitless wish of love. "Ah, hadst thou known! Therefore, because thou *hast not* known! Because of that, and not because of all thy sin and transgression! If this day thou wouldst receive me, all would be atoned and forgiven." But the Lord knows that this will not be, and therefore speaks of the future as if it were the past: he embraces the whole time preceding the judgment as the time of gracious visitation, although he especially means the days of his manifestation. There are for every land and every people, and even for every soul, definite times of visitation, of which one must be the last: hence it concerns all to *know*, as well the grace of the visitation, as also that that grace has only its appointed *time*. Jerusalem knew neither, and was hurled to the dust—but her King and Saviour *wept* over her! With what joy will he, whose love wept over the impending downfall of the old Jerusalem, glory in the new Jerusalem perfected at last (Isa. lxv. 19)! Thus speaks Baxter; but better still will Bengel's exclamation, on ver. 27 of the same chapter, harmonise with our thoughts—"O meek and gracious King! But who will be able to endure the sword of his mouth, when he shall be seen upon the white horse (Rev. xix. 11)!"

We conclude with the admonition which the mercy of these *tears* of the Lord Jesus, sealing the *grace* and the *truth* of all his sayings, urges upon many who will read this book. Know thou the day of thy visitation, that so *thine enemies*, to whom thou mayest now be betraying thy King, may not, in the judicial anguish of death, encompass and hem thee in on every side, tormenting thee till thou art cast down into the abyss!

---

* When Frederic the Great asked Professor Gellert—What he thought of *Christ?* he replied—What thinks your majesty of the destruction of the city of Jerusalem?

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

BS2555 .S85 1864 v.1
The word of the Lord Jesus : the risen
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00049 7919